Elwyn M. Stimson	Richard J. Ofstad
Albert Arsenault	Julius W. Ireland
Frank A. Gunner, Jr.	Harold E. Allen
David A. Van Evera	Harold G. Schlendering
John V. Kelsey	Charles E. Hinsdale
John F. Corbett	Clay A. Boyd
Robert B. Farrelly	William J. Howatt
James H. Clark	William G. Shoop
Kenneth R. Chamberlain	David S. Randall
Philip L. Crawford	James W. Sperry
Clifton N. Harvel	James A. Michener
Leslie T. Bryan, Jr.	George G. Pafford
James W. Poindexter	Edwin G. Winstead
Wilbur A. Free	William C. Esterline
Robley E. West	William H. Marsh
John H. King, Jr.	James R. Blackwell
Robert J. Bear	Leo J. Dulacki
Arthur K. Bourret	George W. E. Daughtry
James R. Wallace	Raymond M. Hogue
Hoyle R. Barr	Bruce B. Hammond
Donald P. Frame	Stanley J. Nelson
Douglas A. Bangert	John H. Brickley
Thomas G. Bronleewe, Jr.	David R. Griffin

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps Reserve for temporary appointment to the grade of lieutenant colonel, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

James F. Coady	Irving Schechter
John A. Hefti	Leonard G. Hicks
Ernest E. Codere	Warren S. Siverstsen
William R. Watson, Jr.	John E. Gorman
Joseph H. Griffith	George M. Chinn
George L. Shead	Henry W. Bransom
William H. Kennedy, Jr.	Blaine H. Baesler
	Edward J. McGee
Harold L. Oppenheimer	Charles D. Gray
	Paul E. Bardet
Foster C. LaHue	Fred W. Haxton
John J. Padley	Clarence C. Gordon
James M. Joyner	James W. Dodson
Leo B. Case	John A. Reeder
William J. Dickinson	Glen E. Martin

The following-named officer of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of lieutenant colonel for limited duty, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Kennard F. Bubier

The following-named women officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of major, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Helen J. McGraw
Barbara J. Bishop
Emma H. Hendrickson

The following-named officer of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of captain for limited duty, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

James B. Seaton

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of first lieutenant for limited duty, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Albert J. Assad
James L. McGuire

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of commissioned warrant officer, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

James H. Harrington	Ralph E. Johnson
Daryl G. Sheehan	Charles W. Keeton
George C. Hunter	Charles D. Pierce, Jr.
Ray W. Patterson	

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate January 16 (legislative day of January 8), 1951:

FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE ADMINISTRATOR

Millard F. Caldwell, Jr., of Florida, to be Federal Civil Defense Administrator.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 17, 1951

(Legislative day of Monday, January 8, 1951)

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:

Eternal God, clouds and darkness are around Thee, yet righteousness and judgment are the habitation of Thy throne which is established forever upon the moral pillars of the world. In times heavy with crisis Thou hast called us to play our part in one of the creative hours in human history.

In the midst of the startling changes of our day, may we be delivered from the paralysis of pessimism and cynicism. We thank Thee that in the name of a free people ours is now the high privilege of signing anew, with our own sacrifice, the immortal declaration, crimsoned with the devotion of the founding fathers: "We mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor."

In this age on ages telling, may we fail not man nor Thee. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, January 16, 1951, was dispensed with.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, Mr. KEFAUVER was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate for the remainder of the week.

CALL OF THE ROLL

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Aiken	Hendrickson	Monroney
Anderson	Hennings	Morse
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Benton	Hill	Murray
Brewster	Hoey	Neely
Bridges	Holland	Nixon
Butler, Md.	Humphrey	O'Conor
Butler, Nebr.	Hunt	O'Mahoney
Byrd	Ives	Pastore
Carlson	Jenner	Robertson
Case	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Chapman	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Chavez	Kerr	Schoeppel
Clements	Knowland	Smathers
Connally	Langer	Smith, Maine
Cordon	Lehman	Smith, N. J.
Dworshak	Lodge	Smith, N. C.
Eastland	Long	Sparkman
Ecton	McCarran	Stennis
Ellender	McCarthy	Taft
Ferguson	McClellan	Tobey
Flanders	McFarland	Watkins
Frear	McKellar	Welker
George	McMahon	Wherry
Gillette	Magnuson	Williams
Green	Martin	Young
Hayden	Millikin	

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSON], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] is absent because of illness.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to make insertions in the RECORD, introduce bills, and transact routine business, without debate.

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

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. LANGER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

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

S. 15. A bill to amend section 215 of title 18 of the United States Code (Rept. No. 3);

S. 34. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code, relating to the mailing of obscene matter (Rept. No. 4);

S. 35. A bill to provide for the appointment of deputy United States marshals without regard to the provisions of the civil-service laws and regulations (Rept. No. 5);

S. 44. A bill for the relief of John E. Turri and Edward H. Turri (Rept. No. 6);

S. 46. A bill for the relief of Ruth Obre Dubonnet (Rept. No. 7);

S. 48. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Lucillo Grassi (Rept. No. 8);

S. 51. A bill for the relief of Arthur Henrik Sorensen, Maren Anderson Sorensen, and minor child, Evelyn Sorensen (Rept. No. 9);

S. 52. A bill for the relief of Delfo Giorgi (Rept. No. 10);

S. 53. A bill for the relief of Vittorio Quilici (Rept. No. 11);

S. 54. A bill for the relief of Stella Jean Stathopoulou (Rept. No. 12);

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

S. 56. A bill for the relief of Francis Kueen San Thu, Mary Luke Thu, Catherine Thu, Victoria Thu, and Anne Bernadette Thu (Rept. No. 21);

S. 57. A bill for the relief of Ertogroul Osman and Mehmed Fahreddin (Rept. No. 13);

S. 58. A bill for the relief of Edulji Dinshaw and his sister, Mrs. Bachoo Dinsha Woronzow (Rept. No. 14);

S. 59. A bill for the relief of Vernon Crudge (Rept. No. 15);

S. 62. A bill for the relief of Stefanos Stefanou (Rept. No. 16);

S. 63. A bill for the relief of Marie Louise Ardans (Rept. No. 17); and

S. Res. 6. Resolution authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary to employ additional personnel from February 1, 1951, to January 31, 1952, and increasing the limit of expenditures; and, under the rule, referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

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

S. 27. A bill to prohibit the transportation of obscene matters in interstate or foreign commerce (Rept. No 18);

S. 32. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, section 456, so as to increase to $15 per day the limit on subsistence expenses allowed to justices and judges traveling while attending court or transacting official business at places other than their official stations, and to authorize reimbursement for such travel by privately owned automobiles at the rate of 7 cents per mile (Rept. No. 19);

S. 45. A bill for the relief of Alfred F. Bosche (Rept No. 20); and

S. Res. 7. Resolution to increase the limit of expenditures under Senate Resolution 366, Eighty-first Congress, relating to the internal security of the United States (Rept. No. 24); and, under the rule, referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I report favorably an original concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 6) providing for the suspension of deportation of certain aliens, and I submit a report (No. 22) thereon.

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

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 6) was ordered to be placed on the calendar, as follows:

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

A-4494764, Abbattista, Argelo.

A-6649984, Allen, Marie (nee Marie Elkaim).

A-9702578, Andersen, Juel Fridolf.

A-5960218, Angemi, Spartaco Bruno.

A-5919641, Assimakopoulos, Nicholas Zaferes.

A-6879549, Azar, Michel Joseph, or Michel J. Azar.

A-1620703, Baffetti, Domenico, or Dominick Baffetti.

A-4561458, Beckley, Marianne, or Marianne Schmiddt or Marianne Hummer (nee Novak).

A-6571866, Berg, Zisel, or Zisel Berger or Zisel Weisberg.

A-7096076, Berzins, Edgars.

A-6149421, Bodenstein, Shika Ichimaru (nee Shika Ichimaru).

A-1680171, Camilleri, Anthony, or Tony Camilleri.

A-6983111, Casperson, Laura Nathalie (nee Norve).

A-3624427, Castiglione, Lorenzo, or Lorenzo Castigliome.

A-5044552, Cecchettini, John, or Giovanni Cecchettini.

A-6919958, Cha, Sang Dal.

A-6414162, Chieu, Nellie Ho (nee Lam Qu Ho or Nellie Ho Cuang).

A-3259491, Coffey, Else Frieda (nee Finke); Else Bruse; Else Scheuer.

A-5224398, Cohen, Abraham.

A-9619532, Connolly, Martin William.

A-6953537, Corsini, Renato.

A-6765891, Daoud, Shafic Said.

A-6498462, De Espina, Hilaria Lopez, or Hilaria Lopez-Navarro.

A-7264814, De Guzman, Rizalina Lacson.

A-2925042, Diamantis, Dionisios, or Dennis Diamandes.

A-5942495, Dias, Raul Pereira.

A-5304087, Di Meglio, Vincenzo.

A-1167701, Dollah, Osman, or Osman Bin Abdullah.

A-6432327, Donovan, Mary Louise, formerly Parliament, formerly Hosey, (nee Campbell).

A-5002249, Dum, Philip (alias Philip Dunn).

A-3726963, Durloff, Svetko Tomasoff, or Steve Tomoff.

A-5697769, Echevarria, Doroteo Julian.

A-3528948, Eddir, Kader Hassen.

A-7112643, Escobar, Alejandro.

A-3370128, Esses, Solomon, or Selim Esses.

A-6029718, Evans, Bella (nee Grayston).

A-7145083, Farruggia, Rosario.

A-7092042, Feniquito, Elisea Gan (nee Elisea Balza Gan).

A-7222054, Ferreira, Antonio Jose Fernandez.

A-4312604, Flegenheimer, Fritz Simon.

A-5744395, Fogel, Isidore (alias Isaack Fogel).

A-5764688, Frese, Paul Arthur, or Paul Arthur Freese (alias Paul Purps).

A-4690590, Fulop, Fred, or Frank Fulop or Ferenc Fulop.

A-4591964, Garcia, Jose, or Joseph Garcia.

A-4927109, Giannopoulos, George, or Georgios Demitrios Giannopoulos or George Poulos or Papas or Georgios Nikalau or Nikolaou.

A-4951906, Gill, Kehar Singh.

A-3235095, Giustetti, Alessandro.

A-7180884, Glob, Alec or Alex, or Alec Thomas.

A-6245601, Glucksman, Marlies Ursula (nee Marlies Ursula Justo).

A-4799562, Gray, John Bashford.

A-6146891, Haas, Erich J., or Erich Jindrich Haas.

A-6811553, Heller, Brigitta Anna.

A-5240152, Helmer, David.

A-4879697, Hilbig, Carl Erich.

A-7209285, Hjalmarson, Katrin, or Katrin Olefsdottir.

A-3070145, Horvath, John Ivan.

A-5214251, Hovland, Robert Bernhard.

A-9529388, Isaksen, Gunner Dyvald Peter.

A-1075286, Johansen, Sanrof, or Sanrof Haakon Eugen Johansen.

A-7183631, Kalmoutis, Panayotis Gregory.

A-6910241, Kampakis, Dimitra R.

A-3351960, Kawazoe, Takeru, or Tony Kawazoe.

A-7779912, Kazerooni, Atta.

A-4468413, Kelter, Teofila, or Tola Kelter.

A-5818461, Kluender, Gustav August or Klunder (alias "Painter Gus").

A-5668279, Kobayashi, Mitsuye Mary, or Mitsu Kobayashi or Misuye Kobayashi.

A-7240155, Korkala, Pekka Vilhelm.

A-6712035, Kuh, William Shing Zung.

A-6712034, Kuh, Frances Siu-Fong (nee Weigh).

A-7286269, Langner, Rosemary.

A-4859725, Lindstrom, Alfred Waldemar.

A-4081171, Lissi, Anna, or Anna Hafer (maiden name).

A-3715068, Llano, Jose, or Jose Llano or Jose Maria Llano Llano.

A-1314199, Luciani, Giovannantonio, or John Luciani.

A-6743629, Lupich, Giorgio.

A-7083636, Luzio, Jose Simoes.

A-6723349, Lyras, Angelici Marcou, or Angelici Lemos Lyras.

A-6709422, Madamba, Antonio Quezada, Sr.

A-6719051, Madamba, Antonio, Jr.

A-1345411, Madura, Julius.

A-5165335, Madussi, Rolando.

A-5217072, Malara, Tina, or Gleta Pizzi.

A-5027817, Manrique, Manuel.

A-5633420, Masciantonio, Ilarione, or Nick Palmer or Pietro Paolillo or Pedro Paulillo.

A-5755532, Mastroianni, Giuseppe, or Joseph Mastroianni or Joe Mannella or Jose Di Leva or De Leva.

A-6541438, Mendelsohn, Bernard Edward.

A-5954825, Mereu, Mario Leonida.

A-3283859, Monasch, Jenny (nee Fiedler or Jennie Monasch).

A-4865080, Moussouris, Spiros, or Spiridon Alexander Moussouris.

A-3487088, Oberg, John Eric, or John Erik Oberg.

A-6717821, Ochoa-Flores, Jose, or Jose Flores or Domingo Rosales Camacho.

A-5445858, Oi, Hisao or Hissao Ohi.

A-1830007, Olas, Joseph, or Jozsef Olasz.

A-3091879, Onofrow, Emil A.

A-2401745, Palij, Mikolaj Miroslaw, or Nicholas M. Paley or Nicholas Miroslaw Paley.

A-2834362, Palty, Esther, or Esther Palti (alias Esther Behar).

A-1761010, Panagiotatos, Peter, or Panagiotes Rautopoulos.

A-2342133, Pantazopoulos, Vasilios.

A-4145970, Papadopoulos, Ioannis, or John Macos Pappas or John Pappas.

A-4145352, Parkin, Isidore Thomas, or Thomas Parkin.

A-6600188, Patnode, Margaret Isahel (nee Mullan).

A-5867753, Pavani, Joseph Angelo, or Giuseppe Angelo Pavani.

A-4703493, Paw, Chang, or Chang Poow.

A-6217770, Pena, Blanca.

A-7048361, Pernetzky, Elfriede, or Elfriede Pernetsky or Elfriede Pernetzky.

A-9533370, Petrakis, Constantino.

A-1887297, Piccardo, Gerolamo, or Geralamo Piccardo.

A-1032804, Psilos, Georgios Konstantinos.

A-7044122, Quan, Raymond, or Quan Chung.

A-6930030, Rativo-Padilla, Silby, or Silby Padilla.

A-5166772, Reid, Lawrence Edward.

A-5166771, Reid, Engusina Mary (Maria) (nee MacDonald or Ina M. Reid).

A-4597393, Rempelos, George Athanasios.

A-3725754, Rubinich, Joseph.

A-3869904, Saldida, Tomas Da Silva, or Tomazda Da Silva Tavares or Thomas Daldito.

A-5053444, Sandgren, Frans Gustav Adolf.

A-5648038, Santina, Amerigo Della, or Amerigo Santina.

A-5117774, Schleicher, David, or Adolf Teofil Schleischer.

A-4507409, Selunske, Josephine (nee Josephine Rosnowska).

A-5258420, Shonbron, Anne, or Anne Schoenbrun.

A-5543701, Siepiola, Antoni Wladyslaw.

A-6965416, Speelmans, Elizabeth, or Elizabeth Weeda Speelmans.

A-6580473, Stadelman, Mildred Nancy, or Nancy Mildred Stadelman formerly Price nee Morris.

A-4372508, Svendsen, Hjalmar Edmond, or Elmer Svendsen.

A-6756313, Sulich, Sonia (nee De Rossi).

A-6431929, Szor, Szmul Majer, or Sam Ezor or Johan Stefansky.

A-2681150, Tages, Jesus Gonzales, or Jesus Gonzales Tager or Jesus G. Tages or Tager or Jesus Tager or Jesus Gonzales.

A-5714435, Tampases, Serafem George, or Charles G. Tampases or Serafim Tambassis.

A-3269682, Tart, Sarah, or Sarah Katz.

A-5301016, Tomiak, Ivan, or Ivan or John Tomiak.
A-9777004, Trataros, Ioannis Stamatiou.
A-5060613, Tsotsos, John Kyriakos.
A-9510722, Vahtrik, Herman.
A-1700534, VanNuland, Anton Cornelius, or Thomas Cornelius Van Nuland or Thomas Van Nuland.
A-6094784, Varian, Luz Garcia Panganiban.
A-4301526, Vassallo, Domenico.
A-7019104, Vassura, Rudolph Gaspare.
A-2300625, Verhas, Gustav Joseph Jan, or Gus Verhas.
A-1260632, Wollhandler, Sol Zoltan.
A-6937214, Woo, John Edward, or John E. Woo.
A-6937215, Wu, Jessie (alias Jessie Woo, Chi San Wu).
A-4761538, Wright, Frances Julia, or Frances Julia Long Caton (nee Rose).
A-7297128, Wysor, Frances Marie (formerly Frances Marie Chong).
A-5465927, Yunus, Syed Muhammad, or Ayed Mohammed Yunus or Sirdar Yunnus or Sirdar Mohammed Yunus Kahn or Mohammed Yunus Hattliffe.
A-7083047, Zaharas, Peggy C., or Pigi C. Zaharas.
A-9776764, Zervos, Iphigenia (nee Papademetriou).

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, also from the Committee on the Judiciary, I report favorably an original concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 7) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens, and I submit a report (No. 23) thereon.

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

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 7) was ordered to be placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress favors the suspension of deportation in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has suspended deportation for more than 6 months:
A-7092801, Abouab, Ariane Phedre.
A-5978374, Achilles, Gerhardt August.
A-9810844, Albretsen, Marthon.
A-5048385, Alexander, Catherine De Solminihac.
A-4193719, Alias, Giovanni, or John Alias.
A-5671895, Aloisio, Giuseppe, or Giuseppe Alosio.
A-6570463, Alvarez, Luicia Rosa Bignotti, or Louise Bignotti Alvarez.
A-6260600, Amanatides, Eleni, or Helen Sampsonidore.
A-4093060, Andersen, Chris or Christen or Kristen.
A-9501239, Andersen, Kari August.
A-5372680, Anderson, Esther Amelia.
A-2909231, Andersen, Rolf.
A-9148555, Andersson, Vaino Armas.
A-1662197, Andersen, Theodor Martin, or Theodore Martin Andersen.
A-6953538, Antonelli, Dario Luigi.
A-6608350, Aquino, Esperanza Diaz.
A-1423084, Ardelea, Pantilimon, or Mike Ardela.
A-5530715, Arrieta, Sebastian San Vincente.
A-5530721, Arrieta, Maria Justina Esteban Diaz de Durana de Arrieta.
A-5362500, Artune, Frederick Schwarz.
A-2551993, Arvanitakis, Christos Efthimios.
A-2799961, Asimenios, Ioannis Spyros, or John Spiros Asimenios.
A-9782991, Avgoustatos, George.
A-4918655, Backer, Theophiel Louis.
A-4918721, Backer, Irma Marie (nee Vanhooren).
A-2641976, Badurova, Valeria or Badur or Badura.
A-2244801, Ballas, Maximos or Max or Max Dimitrios.
A-4062431, Ballas, John N., or Ioannis N. Ballas.
A-3331609, Balsiger, Karl.
A-4503266, Balzano, Raffaele.
A-6191301, Barron, Jane Ann.
A-6191300, Barron, Frances Virginia.
A-6491811, Bathori, Bela Gal.
A-6091747, Beerbohm, Lea Delia.
A-6764200, Bell, Katherine (nee Williams).
A-6507004, Beniawski, Izrael.
A-6361238, Benito, Amable Angel Agtral Pe.
A-6592469, Beredjik, Albert Zaharia, or Albert (Avram) Zaharia, Beredjik or Albert Berejik, or A. Berejik.
A-5948492, Berg, Roar.
A-6682339, Bertolani, Antonia Guglielmo.
A-6264272, Bileca, Vasil.
A-6264274, Bileca, Ion Traian Bileca.
A-5025807, Bistis, Stamati, or Stamatios Bistis.
A-7188170, Blanton, Helga Malwine Roedig, or Helga Maline Roedig.
A-4514510, Blocksidge, Henry.
A-5466239, Blodgett, Eva Louise (nee Eva Louise Dale Bonter).
A-5274949, Boyd, Sarah Mary, or Sally Boyd.
A-6536455, Brach, Salomon.
A-6537764, Brach, Ilona (nee Krause).
A-5507579, Braendle, Paul Ludwig.
A-2657075, Brancalione or Fiorvante, or Frank Brancalione.
A-6860348, Breck, Berte, or Berte Lomeland.
A-5408492, Bruckert, Joseph, or Joe Bruckert.
A-6404500, Bryant, Olga Greigonieva.
A-4992392, Brett, Otto Hugo.
A-4821944, Brody, Henry, or Cheskiel Berkowitz.
A-4478252, Bromberg, Henry Irving.
A-1703937, Bubader, Joseph.
A-5618465, Burack, Charles.
A-1299737, Calomeros, Nicolaos or Nicholas A.
A-9776754, Canapini, Filiberto.
A-5344853, Carlsen, Manfred Rust.
A-5344854, Carlsen, Ida Caroline Elizabeth (nee Nielsen).
A-3471034, Casa, Maria Luisa De La, or Maria Luisa Garzon Carrico.
A-6424250, Casa, Enrique Carlos Dela.
A-6042732, Castellanos, Eucaris (nee Eucaris Dominguez Carrasquero).
A-6366055, Castro, Victorina.
A-2687455, Castro, Jose Marie De.
A-1089405, Ccolaras, Antonios, or Tony Colaras or Tony Caloras or Antonios Kollaros.
A-3281573, Cerrati, Tito.
A-6171537, Christensen, Ragahild Dorthea Glumsoe.
A-6171538, Christensen, Jorgen Glumsoe.
A-4693663, Christensen, Deolinda Yvonne, or Deolinda y P. S. de Brangante or Deolinda y Quininha (nee Deolinda Pereira Silva).
A-5097998, Christodoulou, Constantinos, or Gus Christ.
A-2173685, Coffaro, Salvatore.
A-3837058, Cohen, Morris, or Moise Cohen.
A-4395617, Connolly, Kathleen Anne, or Kathleen Anne Conley (nee Kathleen Anne Clancy).
A-5987249, Constantinou, Peter, or Peter Stavros.
A-6097035, Crooke, Cecelia Ruiz (nee Cecelia Ruiz).
A-6097034, Crooke, Elvira Ruiz.
A-6097033, Crooke, Charles Ruiz.
A-6097032, Crooke, Gabriel Ruiz.
A-9722091, Cruise, Neville Theodore.
A-5680436, Dahl, Kaaj Valdemar, or Jack Dahl.
A-6172687, Danos, Helen John or Danou (nee Contozoglou).
A-6898176, DaSilva, Antonio Pedro.
A-5327462, Deinzer, Willi Egidius.
A-6491768, Deirmendjian, Vahakn Navassart, or Vachac Navassart Deirmendjian.
A-1879418, Dejana, Marcello Gaetano, or Marcello Gaetano Dejana or Mac Dejana.
A-3724192, Demchuk, John.
A-5678319, Devonetsky, Chaia (nee Glazer or Ida Dworetsky or Clara Dworetsky.
A-4421828, Diaz, Santiago James, or Santiago Diaz.
A-2005887, Dieleman, Jacob.
A-4654864, Dietl, Fritz Anton, or Friedrich Dietl.
A-7578425, Do, Da Van, or Do Van Da.
A-5035584, Doherty, Margaret.
A-5830749, Dolden, John Steen, or John Benjamin Dolden.
A-5433754, Downey, Bertha (nee Isenberg or Innis).
A-4932079, Drew, Emily Mary Ellen (nee Russell or Emily Mary Ellen Sellman).
A-4932078, Drew, John, or Patrick Galvin.
A-4893541, Dumych, John, or Jan Dumych.
A-5307350, Dykman, Magdalena Dabster.
A-6353862, Eerikaimen, Raimo Jaakko, or Raymond James Kaymen.
A-6354814, Emerson, Isabel Barbosa.
A-6920021, Emery, Valma Lorraine.
A-6553890, Englert, Vilma Aileen.
A-9280869, Eriksson, Bjorn Bertel, or Bjorn Bert Eriksson.
A-3594324, Eskenazi, Zelda, or Zelda Barouh (nee Zelda Funess).
A-5800076, Evrepiotis, Ioannis Georgiou, or John George Evrepiotis.
A-1233853, Faggio, Peter, or Pierino Faggio.
A-5256571, Faria, Francisco Da Silva, or Frank Faria.
A-5982013, Farkas, Mihial (alias Michail Farkas alias Michael or Mike Wolfe).
A-2796651, Feldman, William, or Wolf Weissbraun.
A-4901763, Ferentinós, Mehael, or Michael Ferentinos or Mike Dinos.
A-4784249, Fernandes, Joao Pedro.
A-4935465, Ferreira, Laurindo Vieira, or Albino Castro.
A-5337577, Figueiredo, Arlindo Neves, or Arlindo Neves.
A-7575726, Fong, Howard Y. T., or Fong York Tom or Howard T. Fong or Howard Took Tom Fong or Howard Tork Tom Fong.
A-2252607, Fong, Florence Hoh, or Hoh Mei Hum or Florence H. Fong or Florence Fong Hoh.
A-2533217, Fong, Helen, or Jew Fook Fung.
A-1207715, Franco, Antonio Augusto Pereira.
A-5278268, Frangos, Constantinos, or Kostas or Gus Frangos Konstantinos Jon Frangos.
A-4697254, Freire, Ildefonso Henrique.
A-4219910, French, Edward James.
A-5776825, Friedman, Louis, or Lejb Fremderman.
A-2751509, Fukunaga, Tohachi.
A-2064030, Fumisetto, Teodoro.
A-9521552, Furevik, Ragnar John Kristoffer, or Ragnar Furevik.
A-9706362, Furnes, Helge, or Helge Helland.
A-5817515, Galati, Pietro, or Peter Galati.
A-5070201, Gallucci, Francesco.
A-6320094, Galvan, Manuela.
A-6320093, Galvan, Crescencia.
A-3875141, Gambardella, Aniello.
A-6972813, Gazurian, Araksi (nee Oras).
A-4158764, Garcia, Serafin, or Serafin Garcia Alboniga.
A-4421076, Garran s, Francisco Maria Pinto, or Francisco Maria Pinto.
A-6246454, Garris, Maria Katsores, or Mary Tsingaris Garris.
A-6246453, Gavalas, Mary.
A-6905403, Georgakarakos, Theodoros.
A-6606278, Geraketis, Alithia Ignatios (nee Sarafoglou).
A-1631048, Gerow, Nicholas or Nick.
A-4623895, Ghirardi, Maria or Mary (nee Morbiani or Luicia or Louise Morbiani).
A-4359638, Giliberto, Francesco, or Frank Giliberto.
A-5154624, Ginis, Stamatios Angelos, or Dimetrios Panatazis or Tantazis Stamatius Ginis.
A-9767507, Gomes, Manuel.
A-1101998, Gonzalez, Eduardo Argibay y.
A-6697442, Graff, Yann.
A-6697443, Graff, Meriadec.

A-5018222, Gray, Alice Maud (nee Alice Maud James).
A-5097612, Gregorakos, Nicholas Theodore, or Nick Gregory.
A-2767118, Gregoriou, Nicholas, or Nicholas or Nick Pappas.
A-9782910, Grubissa, Mario.
A-9006008, Glyptis, Nickolaos Stefanou.
A-4162602, Gunn, Robert, or Robert Grant Gunn or Robert G. Gunn.
A-9825171, Gustavsen, Olav Kristoffer.
A-6200475, Hai, Ng Yeun.
A-6173609, Fong, Wong Sui.
A-6246464, Halkia, Calliope (nee Kouraouglou).
A-5204137, Hamada, Shigeichi.
A-2637851, Hashim, Abdul, or Muzafor Ali.
A-1499939, Hazanas, Paulina M. De.
A-1789616, Hazanas, Eduardo De.
A-2147387, Hazanas, Baldomero De.
A-2147386, Hazanas, Maria M. De.
A-3862141, Heiligenberg, Fred, or Fred George Heiligenberg.
A-2474613, Hermann, Marie Louise.
A-6505855, Hermann, Mary (nee Barabas).
A-7267730, Herrbach, Conrad Albert.
A-6936029, Hevia, Maria Temorio, or Maria Bolanos Perez (nee Marie Jimenez).
A-6227108, Hoare, Benjamin.
A-6208971, Hoffknecht, Mary Angela Garay.
A-1704667, Holtz-Nett, Charles Waldemar, or Charles Waldemar Holtz Sur Nett or Charles Holtz or Karl Wl Holtz or Karl Holts or Charles Waldemar Holtz Sarnet.
A-2871224, Horaites, Constantine Nicholas, or Gus Nick Horaitis.
A-1540387, Horan, William Joseph.
A-5925333, Horne, Jane Lillian, or Jeannette Lillian Le Roy.
A-4455137, Horowitz, Abraham.
A-4454944, Horowitz, Neche Rose (nee Lerner or Rose Horowitz or Nacha Lerner).
A-7021316, Horowitz, Nathan Harry, or Naftaly or Naftoly Harry Horowitz.
A-7021317, Horowitz, Helen Phyllis, or Hellen Phillis Horowitz.
A-7021315, Horowitz, Sina Lea, or Cina Lea Horowitz or Lea Sina Horowitz.
A-1909726, Hsiang, Paul S., or Shih-Tao Hsiang or Hsiang Pao Loh.
A-1813029, Hunter, Stanley.
A-6989748, Hutton, Sidney Merth or "Edwards."
A-4592404, Hvizd, Helen, or Helena Hoizt.
A-5516523, Iglesias, Manuel Alfonso Redondo, or Alfonso Redondo or Alfonso Redondo Iglesias or Jaime Mora Mora.
A-6837928, Iglio, Delores Marsillo.
A-9825146, Igrejas, Frenando Cipreste.
A-4063513, Ireland, Jenny Tanner, or Jenny Besser Von Tanner.
A-5390788, Irmejs, Juliana (formerly Karlkin).
A-4157749, Irrera, Giuseppe.
A-7112351, Jacobsen, Syvert Tobias, or San Jacobsen.
A-6669589, Jacobson, Chiena (nee Ewrebin).
A-5342450, Jacobson, Morris, or Morris Jakobson.
A-4409024, Jacono, Ameride Alberto, or Albert Aberide Jacono.
A-4685526, Jaeger, Fritz Johannes, or John Frank.
A-4815913, Jaremiszin, Michal.
A-2048810, Johansen, Konrad Leonard.
A-6802646, Johnsen, Berge Visdal, or Berge Reinart Visdal Johnsen.
A-5178341, Josey, Eva Falco (nee Shulkin).
A-6014710, Juliao, Nicholas Augusto.
A-5866836, Juretich, Frank John, or Frano Ivan or Franya Juretic.
A-4475580, Kadak, Felix Heinrich.
A-4640829, Kalfas, Nick, or Nicholas Topalogiou.
A-6836357, Kalisz, Stefan.
A-5752363, Kantrimas, Mary (nee Liaudonas).
A-1274913, Kao, Thomas (Chinese name Kao Tien Mine).
A-6357991, Kapranopoulos, Evdokia N.
A-2391816, Karamanos, John.
A-6625649, Karantzalis, Telemachos.
A-9767526, Kasidonis, Perikles or Perikles, or Pericles John Kasidonis.
A-5295609, Kasten, Emil.
A-5295608, Kasten, Martha (nee Wustenhain).
A-5060162, Kasprak, Pauline.
A-5627633, Kastening, Rudolph Wilhelm August Alexander, or Frank Carlton.
A-5933191, Katsura, Sukeichi, or Sam Katsura.
A-1821748, Katsuras, Sterios Konstantine, or Stanley K. Katsuras.
A-6444660, Kohn, Aron Binam.
A-3839553, Kokalis, Sotirios, or Sam Kokalis or John Pappas.
A-4105167, Konig, Kate, or Kate Schaffner or Katy.
A-3086901, Konig, Matthias or Matei, or Steve Konig.
A-2386263, Kontorousis, Vasilios Demetrios, or William Kontis or William Contis.
A-2602187, Koteff, Stavro, or Steve Kote or Stavro Kote or Steve Koteff.
A-3814642, Koteff, Dimitar Vasil, or James Vasil or Dimitrios Vassiliou Secoulidis or Dimitar Kotes or Kotos or James Vasiloff.
A-2933713, Koumpis, Evangelos Demetrios, or Angelos Koumpis or Copis.
A-1747910, Kozak, Max.
A-3994328, Kernohan, Alexander.
A-5520891, Khan, Wazir Dean.
A-6269694, King, Wu Ah.
A-2019372, Kissel, Susanne Lorenz.
A-2328573, Kwak, David Chungsum, or David Chung Sun Kwak.
A-6661487, Kwock, Wing Kin.
A-5112182, Kleines, Frieda (nee Brauner).
A-4476488, Kleines, Julius.
A-4666321, Kloc, Wasyl.
A-5524348, Kripfgans, Oswald Oscar, or Oswald Oscar Gans.
A-3772096, Kroussoratis, Evangelos, or Vangel Toneff or Vasili Ioannis.
A-4580732, Krushevski, Alexander Maron.
A-7028309, Krushevski, Samuel.
A-4125637, Kurpiewski, Edward.
A-1410927, Lantsas, Ioannis Achilles, or John Lantsas or John Achilles Lantsas or Ioannis or John Achilleys Lantsas or John or Ioannis or Ionnis A. Lantsas.
A-4585443, Lange, Johann Wilhelm, or John William Lange,
A-5034191, Larsen, Nils, or Niels Ehlert Plith or Edward Larsen.
A-2378014, Latella, Philip Vincent, or Filippo Vincenzo Latella or Philip V. Latello.
A-4399743, Latif, Abdul, or Jack Latif or Moranut Azim.
A-4741749, Lavin, Domingo Lavin y.
A-6445720, Lee, Beatrice Kan, or Shiu Ying Kan or Beatrice Shiu Ying Kan.
A-6008446, Lee, William Han-Chu.
A-6009174, Lee, Anna Yung-Hsin.
A-2809544, Lei, Pooi Tuen, or Beatrice Lee.
A-6207468, Lei, Wai Paak.
A-6480122, Leibell, Sane.
A-9571986, Lemonidis, Chrisostomos A., or Chris A. Lemonidis.
A-4271116, Leo, Candeloro Rosario De, or Rosario De Leo.
A-3555382, Lerman, Max.
A-6590138, Lewik, Szmul Nuchim, or Sam Lewik.
A-4513034, Lian, Hwang Yung.
A-7627950, Loh, Elsie Wan, or Elsie Wan Joe or Chou Tai Wan.
A-2989906, Loh, Roger Tse-Yee, or Loh Sse-Yse.
A-5816816, Looft, Claus Teodor, or George Christiansen.
A-6707537, Lourenco, Joao Do Jesus, or John Jesus Lourenco.
A-6707536, Lourenco, Maria Rodrigues, or Marie Lawrence.
A-6707535, Lourenco, Rosalio Do Espirito Santo.
A-5811818, Lynch, Hannah or Hannah, or Johanna Buannell.
A-5451487, Lynch, Gregory William, or William Lynch.
A-1031598, Macharko, Vassil, or Vassil Macharko or Charles Marcharko or Marcharko.
A-4416525, Macklin, Mary Zelma, or Mary Zelma Spivack.
A-7137577, Macris, Michael.
A-9669914, Madsen, Johannes Frederik Vilhelm (alias Johannes Madsen or John Madsen).
A-6779529, Malan, Ivo Roberto.
A-5234565, Mandalas, Denis, or Dionisios Mandalas.
A-4855350, Mandalas, Eva (nee Euridika Ayan).
A-2919145, Manolis, George, or George Lamprakis.
A-1615511, Marangas, Theodoros Nicolaos.
A-6524210, Margaronis, Pandelis Anast, or Pandelis A. Margaranis.
A-5375898, Margelli, Maria.
A-6063643, Martinez, Clemencio Moneo.
A-4650509, Martins, Joaquin, or Jack Martins.
A-5126203, Martrian, Heinrich Friedrich, or Henry Matrian.
A-4684907, Matsumoto, Yoneji.
A-6688804, Mcewan, Valerie Yvonne.
A-6688805, Mcewan, Pamela Ann.
A-6302135, McGrath, Blanca Luling.
A-6923990, McLaren, Hazel Mignonette, or Hazel M. McLaren (nee Delapenha).
A-2782901, Mellis, George Dimitrios, or Georgios Melis.
A-3211338, Medina, Andre Luiz, or Andrew Medina.
A-6214170, Mendoza Raul.
A-4094634, Menis, Constantinos, or Constantinos Diamantis Menis or Gust Menis or Kostis or Kostas Menis.
A-5963364, Miah, Barik.
A-4783888, Migliorati, Stella.
A-2588887, Milanese, Ernesto.
A-3114167, Millonas, John George, or Ioannis George Millonas.
A-3820458, Milicia, Giuseppe (alias Joseph Milicia).
A-4860743, Mitrovich, Andria N., or Andy Mitroff or Andrea Nanchoff.
A-6092928, Mitchell, Mary Gertrude.
A-2574785, Mitsialis, Socrates Pericles.
A-4376963, Mochevitch, Simon, or Sam Mochevitch.
A-3960871, Mock, Lum, or Lum Mow or Lum Moo or Lum Mack or Lum Mak.
A-5231944, Moeller, Walter.
A-4823759, Montes-Gonzalez, Luis, or Luis Montes.
A-6354372, Moral, Francisco Garcia.
A-5895779, Morkvenas, Ona, or Anna Mary Markvenas.
A-6624514, Moore, Dorothy Charoline.
A-6624039, Moore, William Francis.
A-7210469, Moskowitz, Marie Helen, or Maria Helena Moskowitz (formerly Maria Helena Crucenowicz, alias Monique Patricia Bohne said Terret).
A-6249439, Moutsanas, Maria.
A-5564653, Moy, Ah, or Chin Ah Moy.
A-9578213, Mpimplis, Konstantinos, or Costas Biblis.
A-2573233, Neamtu, Pavel (alias Pete Neamtu or Matri).
A-3893624, Nemaric, Sime, or Sam Nemaric or Nemerich or Anton Paholovic.
A-6238255, Newman, Helen Gertrude Doris Fry.
A-7203805, Ngow, Chin, or Fred Chin or Fred Chinn.
A-7115625, Nicolaides, Dominica.
A-5525401, Nielsen, Niels Christian, or Niels Charles Nielsen.
A-9702104, Nielsen, Knud Hemmershoj.
A-4768735, Niforatos, Haralambos, or Babe Nifos.
A-6707075, Nocera, Vincenzo Raffaele.
A-6754802, Noel, Alice Josephine, or Alice Mcivor or Alice J. Noel.
A-4492831, Norregaard, Arthur Peter.
A-3455236, Nowak, Ted J.

A-5016134, Nunes, Arturo Goncalves.
A-2491080, Nuorteva, Verner Albinus or Anderson.
A-7112907, Nussbaum, Alfonz Armand, or Alfonz (Alfonse) a Nussbaum.
A-5067950, Ohlgren, Odd Trygve Grasmo, or Ted Grasmo Ohlgren.
A-3607750, Okawauchi, Kingo.
A-3882686, Okauchi, Shizuye Kurata, or Shizue Okawauchi or Shizue Kurata.
A-2875529, Olexyncer, Sonia (Sonya), or Sonia Alex.
A-2875530, Olexyncer Isaak, or Irving Alex.
A-3120552, Olexyncer, Gussie (nee Siegel or Gussie Alex).
A-5796454, O'Neill, Joseph Anthony.
A-7276040, Oreschkina, Tamara.
A-2516852, Orfanos, Basilios, or Basilios George Orfanos.
A-5930783, Padilla, Dolores Toscano Cortada de, or Dolores Angela Toscano.
A-3151067, Pagos, Mike Christos, or Mike Christos Pecos or Pezos.
A-6249449, Paleologus, Chrysanthy, or Chrysanthi Paleologou.
A-5893010, Panilagao, Emiliana Baring, or Emiliana Antipolo or Emiliana Salaber.
A-6171964, Papasotiriou, Charilaos.
A-6171966, Papasotiriou, Eleni, or Helen Charilaos.
A-4159490, Papazian, Benjamin.
A-1223538, Paraskeva, Paraskevas, or Nick Parros.
A-5825559, Pascaris, George, or Giorgios Pasharis.
A-1451943, Penezic, John, or Ivan or Giovanni Pinezic or Pinezick.
A-6920615, Pennacchia, Vinxenzo (or Vincent).
A-6213092, Perez, Maria De Diego.
A-4767778, Perez, Maria Dolores (nee Pardo).
A-5638913, Pericao, Joao Da Cruz.
A-4917347, Peroulas, George Athanasios, or Gerog Peroulis or Peroulos.
A-9635859, Philipoom, Jacobus, or Jacobus Philipoon.
A-4128148, Pina, Sebastiano Lobo, or Leo Lobo Pina.
A-2654505, Pioli, Pietro, or Guido Taglioni.
A-9690823, Pires, Jose, or Joseph Pires.
A-3113558, Pittas, Antonios J.
A-5920208, Portolos, Alexandros, or Alex Portolos.
A-3416094, Postma, Tjibbe, or Ted Postma.
A-1327390, Potulski, Bruno Hans or Polukski.
A-2991322, Pous, Francisco Liso, or Francisco Pous.
A-5139014, Pejak, Dusas, or Dane Payock.
A-7009946, Previto, Joseph, or Joseph John Previto or Giuseppe Previto.
A-1096841, Privitera, Santo.
A-6373166, Profus, Aaron, or Aron Profus.
A-5127776, Puhar, Andre, or Andy Puhar or Andre Puhar.
A-5694835, Puzo, Carmine Filippo, or Carmine Puzo.
A-1340505, Ramnath, Lola, or Lala Rammath Jain.
A-7581989, Rapeports, Heinrich Chaikel, or Heinrich Rapeports.
A-2866349, Ratti, Ignio.
A-1944224, Rey, Daniel Tome, or Daniel Tome Raz.
A-6145160, Rey, Lucio Lopez.
A-2648624, Ribuffi, Francesco, or Frank Ribuffi.
A-3074394, Rigas, Emanuel Ioannis, or Mike Rigas.
A-7140844, Ritter, Frank, or Frank Harold Theodor Ritter or Frank Theodor Ritter.
A-3843498, Roncevic, Anti Yakov, or Tony Roneevich on Ante Roncevic or Tony Jack Roncevic or Ante Yakov Roncevic.
A-1019866, Rotase, Shaleh, or Shaleh Lahaer.
A-2522951, Roussos, Loucas Alexandros.
A-4341666, Ryecroft, Leslie (formerly William Leslie Bennett).
A-5841824, Said, Ali Mohamed, or Moahsen Furhan Said.
A-2534720, Saiki, Chika, or Chika Kasamatsu Saiki (formerly Chika Kasamatsu).
A-3497888, Sakamoto, Bunnosuke.
A-6275839, Sanz, Rosario Lourdes.
A-6275840, Sanz, Maria de los Angeles.
A-3631495, Sangadi, Christian, or Hendrik Amos or Christopher Sangadi.
A-4196785, Santos, Joao Ferreira Dos or Joas Ferreira Dos Santos, or Jose Ferreira Dos Santos or Joao Bantos.
A-4027624, Saraco, Giuseppe Antonio, or Joseph Saraco.
A-4012287, Sasaki, Takeo, or Walter T. Sasaki.
A-6268891, Sasz, Magdalena Elena, or Lena Sasz.
A-9578162, Savar, Miho, or Mike Savar or Michael Herman Savar.
A-1180778, Schatz, Olga.
A-1180777, Schatz, Zahara.
A-5909601, Schoenemann, Helmut Otto Friedrich, or Herman Schoenemann.
A-6507983, Schreiber, Estera, or Schreiberova or Ester Schreiber or E. Schreiber.
A-3865517, Schuch, Joseph.
A-4121694, Schultz, Peter.
A-2490849, Seculopulos, Atanasios Poti, or Atanas Sikuloff.
A-6665954, Seitzmeir, Ella Magdalena (nee Fehrenback).
A-6888287, Sernaque, Leonardo Aquiles, or Leonardo Aquiles Sernaque Verdesoto.
A-4771412, Severin, Richard.
A-4641680, Shapiro, Mary Libby.
A-2286082, Shee, Lo Chin, or Chun Mui Kwai.
A-5450997, Sheiko, Bazyl, or Vasily Sheiko or Bazyl or Vasily Szajko.
A-9657748, Shun, Sung.
A-1462315, Simkus, Anton, or Antonas Szimkus.
A-4164096, Simon, John Ottmar Behrendt Probst, or John Ottmar Simons.
A-4586164, Singelmann, Emma Catharina.
A-2978714, Singh, Banta, or Banta Singh Sandhu.
A-6799539, Singh, Agapita Vera de, or Agapita Vera-Mesa de Singh.
A-1662520, Sissea, John Pantilimon, or John P. Sissea or Ioan P. Sissea.
A-5046679, Skimos, John Konstantinos, or Ioannis or John Skembos.
A-9825182, Skorstad, Harold Norman, or Harald Skarstad.
A-4876899, Snoo, Johannes De, or Robert Desmew.
A-4719578, Sofariu, Alexander Dionise, or Alex Sofar.
A-3959194, Soichinoff, Sotir, or Sotirios Doichinis Carulos (alias Sotiris Doichins Coralos).
A-7203566, Soyum, Jesus, or Jesus Edmondson.
A-7203567, Soyum, Pascual, or Pascual Edmondson.
A-7203568, Soyum, Gregorio, or Gregorio Edmondson.
A-5518362, Spiers, Annie.
A-5280366, Spiers, Colman, or Colman Spierer.
A-3416037, Sprude, Edward Jakos.
A-6577001, Slawinski, Anna Jadwica.
A-6577000, Slawinski, Eugenjuz Stanislaw, or Eugene S. Slawinski.
A-6975360, Stathis, Helene Theodorou (nee Helene Theodorou Gapsanis).
A-5467398, Struck, Ferdinand Fritz, or Friedrich Steen.
A-2718405, Sullivan, Tatiana (nee Yarema or Tatiana Solovay).
A-3228816, Sze, Agnes Chi Chen (nee Lin).
PR-909850, Sze, Morgan Chuan-Yuan.
A-1188912, Tagliamonte, Ginnaro, or Gennaro Tagliamonte.
A-3457399, Tomerias, Bernard John, or Bernhard John Tomerias.
A-3739861, Tanaka, Michiko (nee Ikeda).
A-3496620, Tanaka, Tsunezo.
A-5137137, Tarino, Romeo, or Remeo Moggio Tarino.
A-1738959, Taiarkis or Michail Taxiarkis or Michael Taxiarkis.
A-6936802, Tchertafian, Agop.
A-4647207, Terrell, Sybil Elaine (nee Paterson).
A-5744001, Theodorakis, Konstantinos, or Kust Theodorakis or Gus Theodorakis.
A-6840802, Thomassen, Jacobus Johannes, or Jack Thomassen.
A-4865982, Thorstenson, Oagee.
A-4160343, Tom, Chiu-Faat Joseph.
A-6583470, Tormet, Att.
A-6542512, Tormet, Helene (nee Purits).
A-4206394, Torode, William George, or Francis Elliott Howard.
A-4159140, Toth, George.
A-1920736, Touma, Mary, or Mary Toro or Mary Tourian.
A-6713683, Touris, Georgia Nic Vardalou.
A-7044239, Trapletti, Edea (nee Billiani).
A-6508490, Tsaouse, Thomais Panajiotou, or Thomais Panajiotou Bourlessis.
A-3733189, Tsikozidos, Lazaros, or Lazaros Tzikotzidis.
A-6815412, Tsouris, Sarandos Nicolaon.
A-6445668, Valdes, Consuelo.
A-6567556, Valdes, Vicente, or Vicente Valdes y Genato.
A-6567561, Valdes, Luis Francisco, or Luis Valdec.
A-5071008, Varlomos, Antoneos Nick, or Antonios Varlomos (alias John Pappas).
A-6919963, Vartanian, Aghavni Lily (nee Melikian).
A-7083033, Ventresca, Guiseppe Ercold.
A-6169079, Ver, Anastacio Quevedo, Junior.
A-2464148, Verone, Alexis Sadi Lobel, alias Alexis S. L. Verome, alias Sade Lobel, alias Alexis Verone).
A-6660379, Vidad, Elise Bolante.
A-6934710, Villanueva, Feliciano Idioma, or Felix Villaneuva.
A-6849913, Vezer, Emil, or Emil Weisz.
A-9025392, Voiantzi, Ioannis, or Ioannis Vogiatzis or John or Jwannov Bogiantje.
A-6514877, Volodkin, John George.
A-1782036, Vukic, Mate Yerolin, or Mate Y. Vukik.
A-5821738, Walter, Andrey.
A-7092906, Ways, Israle, or Israel Wais.
A-4793441, Weber, Boris, or Boris Rodwivitch or Boris Rodsenwitsch.
A-4089854, Wehby, Malababa, or Mabel Wehby (nee Jarishe).
A-3799015, Wehby, Farhat, or Fred Wehby
A-6725069, Westfall, Forest Elgin.
A-1417320, Wever, Joseph, or Joseph Weaver.
A-3567493, Whiteman, James Carlile.
A-5008544, Wicknig, Willy Arthur, or William Wicking.
A-5621809, Wilheim, Otto Bernhard, or Otto Williams.
A-2488388, Wilson, William Barton.
A-4421512, Wing, Lee.
A-3130290, Wood, Kerttu Pohja.
A-2130263, Workun, Anton, or Tony or Anthony Workin or Workman.
A-5353860, Wright, Arthur Smedley.
A-5022006, Yaago, Anton.
A-4261547, Yip, Mary, or Yip Lum Mui.
A-2533819, Young, Mrs. Hung Sum, or Ng Ye Mui.
A-5434778, Yovanovich, Tomelco, or Temelco Yvanoff Gorgis or Tom Evans (alias Tomelco Yovanoff Corgis alias Tomerkon Georgiou).
A-3982915, Yun, Eung Pal Yun, or Eung Pal Yoon.
A-3416158, Yun, Sang Soon, or Sang Soon Kum.
A-5535882, Zabala, Rafael Basteguieta, or Rafael B. Zabala or Rafael Zabela or Ralph Zabala.
A-2701568, Zaharia, Dumitru.
A-3906860, Zampas, Charles, or Kyriakos Oroilcolou Zampas.
A-3243888, Zampas, Laura, or Dovlad Gregory Kovouk.
A-5333950, Zanikos, Demetrios, or James George.
A-2653930, Zannakis, Demetrius, or James Zanakis.
A-6394967, Zervos, Dionisios Anthony.

A-1706871, Zimmerman, John.

A-4978968, Zisimos, Sotirios, or Demetrios or James Carras.

A-4546677, Zopoulos, George.

A-2074345, Zoumpoulakas, Ioannis Paulo, or John Paul Zoompoulakis or John Zoumpoulakis.

REVISION AND PRINTING OF SENATE MANUAL

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration I report back favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 4, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 4) submitted by Mr. HAYDEN on January 8, 1951, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Rules and Administration be, and it is hereby, directed to prepare a revised edition of the Senate Rules and Manual for the use of the Eighty-second Congress, and that 1,500 additional copies shall be printed and bound, of which 1,000 copies shall be for the Senate, 200 copies for the use of the Committee on Rules and Administration, and the remaining 300 copies shall be bound in full morocco and tagged as to contents and delivered as may be directed by the committee.

EVA MALENA THOMAS

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration I report back favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 9, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 9) submitted by Mr. KNOWLAND on January 8, 1951, 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 Eva Malena Thomas, mother of Mark Poulton Thomas, late an employee of the Senate, a sum equal to 6 months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

ELECTION OF MEMBER OF SENATE TO JOINT COMMITTEE OF CONGRESS ON THE LIBRARY

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. 38) was read, considered, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That Mr. BENTON, of Connecticut, be, and he is hereby, elected a member on the part of the Senate of the Joint Committee of Congress on the Library, vice Mr. STENNIS, of Mississippi.

REPORT OF PERSONNEL AND FUNDS BY COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

Pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, the following report was received by the Secretary of the Senate:

JANUARY 15, 1951.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1950, to December 31, 1950, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Bobo, Virginia, assistant chief clerk	$4,849.61	$2,424.80
Brawley, H. W., staff director	10,846.00	5,423.00
Chrissos, Costas D., clerical assistant	4,415.10	2,207.55
Faucette, Andrew McC. (1 month, Dec. 1-31, 1950), professional staff member	10,846.00	903.85
Homan, Colette, clerical assistant	4,415.10	2,207.55
House, Linda (Mrs.), clerical assistant	3,980.59	1,990.29
Irwin, Mary, staff member (professional)	10,846.00	5,423.00
Latimer, J. Austin, chief clerk and counsel	10,846.00	5,423.00
Morgan, Ethel, clerical assistant	4,154.38	2,077.19
Shawn, E. Luise, clerical assistant	4,154.38	2,077.19

Unexpended balance S. Res. 179 (Oct. 13, 1949) and S. Res. 275 (May 13, 1950)	$3,285.53
Amount expended July 1, to Dec. 31, 1950	2,207.52
Balance unexpended returned to the contingent fund of the Senate	1,078.01
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure including S. Res. 167, Oct. 13, 1949	12,718.60
Amount previously reported	2,395.03
Amount expended July 1 to Dec. 31, 1950	1,781.65
Balance unexpended returned to the contingent fund of the Senate	8,541.92

OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
Chairman.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. O'CONOR:

S. 516. A bill to amend the act incorporating the American Legion so as to redefine (a) the powers of said corporation, (b) the right to the use of the name "The American Legion" and "American Legion"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. LEHMAN introduced Senate bill 517, to preserve the scenic beauty of the Niagara Falls and River and to authorize the construction of certain public works on that river for power and other purposes, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Public Works and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S. 518. A bill for the relief of Dr. Isac C. Goldstein;

S. 519. A bill for the relief of Moy Chin Shee;

S. 520. A bill for the relief of Wilma M. Stiehl;

S. 521. A bill for the relief of Jacob Issahar Zadeh, and Bluma Issahar Zadeh;

S. 522. A bill for the relief of Spyrodon Vlassopoulos and his wife, Theresa; and

S. 523. A bill for the relief of Walter Duschinsky; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERGUSON:

S. 524. A bill or the relief of Clorinda Cerretani; and

S. 525. A bill for the relief of Jacob Gitlin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERGUSON (for himself and Mr. VANDENBERG):

S. 526. A bill for the relief of Dr. Lorna Wan-Hsi Feng; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S. 527. A bill for the relief of Youichi Nobori; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KNOWLAND (for himself and Mr. NIXON):

S. 528. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the United States District Court for the Northern District of California to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims of the State of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMAHON:

S. 529. A bill for the relief of Humayag Dildilian and his daughter, Lucy Dildilian; and

S. 530. A bill for the relief of Gerhard H. A. Anton Bebr; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEELY (by request):

S. 531. A bill to amend section 1537 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, as amended, so as to provide for service of process on agents of a nonresident individual, partnership, association, group, organization, or foreign corporation, conducting a business in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 532. A bill to authorize the cancellation or settlement of claims of the District of Columbia against the estates of recipients of old-age assistance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself, Mr. O'CONOR, Mr. LONG, Mr. GILLETTE, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. HUNT, Mr. BENTON, Mr. TOBEY, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. THYE, Mr. HENDRICKSON, and Mr. SCHOEPPEL) introduced Senate bill 533, to create the Small Defense Plants Corporation and to preserve small-business institutions and free, competitive enterprise, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. FERGUSON:

S. 534. A bill to provide for 26 days' annual leave and 15 days' sick leave for employees in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(Mr. McCARRAN introduced Senate bill 535, to provide for the separation of mail pay from subsidies in the case of air carriers engaged in international air transportation, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. EASTLAND (for himself and Mr. STENNIS):

S. 536. A bill for the relief of the estate of Sidney Lomax, deceased; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado (by request) introduced Senate bill 537, to provide for the greater security and defense of the United States against attack, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CORDON:

S. 538. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to facilitate and simplify the work of the Forest Service, and for other purposes," approved April 24, 1950 (64 Stat. 82); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 539. A bill relating to the administrative jurisdiction of certain public lands in the State of Oregon; and

S. 540. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey to the city of Klamath Falls, Oreg., all right, title, and interest of the United States of America in certain lands in Klamath County, Oreg., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 541. A bill for the relief of Tulana Farms; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 542. A bill to authorize the construction of a dam and dike to prevent the flow of tidal waters into Oar Creek, Douglas County, Oreg.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BREWSTER (for himself and Mrs. SMITH of Maine):

S. J. Res. 18. Joint resolution authorizing the International Joint Commission to make a survey to determine the most economical and most feasible plan for the construction of the proposed Passamaquoddy tidal power project at Passamaquoddy Bay in the State of Maine and the Province of New Brunswick and authorizing the appropriation of not to exceed $3,900,000 to defray the cost thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. CORDON:

S. J. Res. 19. Joint resolution to designate the lake to be formed by the McNary lock and dam in the Columbia River, Oreg., and Wash., as Lake Umatilla; to the Committee on Public Works.

NIAGARA REDEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1951

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill entitled "Niagara Redevelopment Act of 1951" and I ask unanimous consent that a statement on the bill, prepared jointly by myself and Representative FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT, Jr., of New York, who is introducing the same bill in the House, be printed in the body of the RECORD, together with a brief memorandum pointing out the differences between the Niagara Redevelopment Act of 1950 and the proposed bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement and memorandum will be printed in the RECORD, as requested by the Senator from New York. The Chair hears no objection.

The bill (S. 517) to preserve the scenic beauty of the Niagara Falls and River and to authorize the construction of certain public works on that river for power and other purposes, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. LEHMAN, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The statement and memorandum presented by Mr. LEHMAN are as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LEHMAN

We are today introducing a bill for the redevelopment of the waters of the Niagara River for public power purposes.

This bill differs only in some technical aspects from the measure we drafted and introduced last year and on which hearings were held before the House Public Works Committee. The differences between last year's bill and the present one are described in an attached memorandum.

The present budget contains an item of $2,000,000 for a preliminary survey and for the preparation of engineering designs for this project. It is to be assumed that funds will be requested from the Congress in the appropriations bill for this purpose.

Before these funds are voted, it would be highly desirable to have formal authorization for this project on the statute books.

The needs of the national defense program and of the mobilization of our full industrial potential for the critical period ahead call for vastly expanded power. The availability of 8,000,000,000 kilowatts of power annually from the Niagara redevelopment—power which can be developed at low cost and marketed at low cost—is a mandate in itself for speedy congressional action on our bill. The Senate, in its reservation to the Niagara Treaty, specified that this power was to be developed for public use and benefit in such a manner as Congress might direct. I believe that our bill fulfills all the requisites for protecting all the interests of New York State, of the Federal Government, and of national defense. It provides against all exigencies, placing the chief emphasis on the earliest possible completion of the project and the most prompt availability of the power from this project to meet the public and national need.

If the project work is rushed by the Corps of Engineers, the first power can be coming off generators by the end of 1952, if not before. This will be at a time when national mobilization will be at its peak and when the power from the Niagara will be desperately needed.

This power will save the consumers of New York and of the surrounding area $65,000,000 annually. There will be a saving to the taxpayers, too, because the low cost of this power will be immediately reflected in the decreased cost of the defense items that must be purchased by the Government. In the case of such products as aluminum, the cost of power is the chief component of the total cost of production.

The record of last year's hearings before the House Public Works Committee furnishes a good start. We shall urge the chairman of the appropriate House and Senate committees to begin hearings on this bill at the earliest possible date.

COMPARISON BETWEEN NIAGARA REDEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1951 AND S. 3528 (H. R. 8343)

1. Language changes have been made in recognition of the fact that the Niagara Treaty has already been ratified and is now the law of the land.

2. Provision is made for submission of the plans for the remedial works (to preserve the beauty of Niagara Falls) to the International Joint Commission and for the carrying out of the remedial works under the supervision of the International Joint Commission.

3. The primary rights and interests of national defense are spelled out in terms of section 16 of the Federal Power Act, and the Department of Defense is included among the entities to be given preference in the distribution of the power from the Niagara project.

4. There has been a comprehensive change in the legislative format of section 3 for purposes of simplification. This did not involve a change in substance.

SMALL DEFENSE PLANTS CORPORATION

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], and myself, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to create the Small Defense Plants Corporation, and I ask unanimous consent that an explanatory statement of the bill by myself and Representative PATMAN be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD, as requested by the Senator from Alabama. The Chair hears no objection.

The bill (S. 533) to create the Small Defense Plants Corporation and to preserve small-business institutions and free, competitive enterprise, introduced by Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself and other Senators) was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The statement presented by Mr. SPARKMAN is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SPARKMAN AND REPRESENTATIVE PATMAN

In this period of national emergency, it has become imperative for Congress to create an agency with the power to make small business a full partner in the mobilization effort and to solve the special problems which small enterprises will face in the months ahead.

It is for this purpose that we, as chairmen of the Senate and House Small Business Committees, today have introduced legislation known as the Small Defense Plants Act of 1951. We have the unanimous backing of our committees in presenting this legislation; all the members of the Senate Small Business Committee are acting as cosponsors of the bill—Senators HERBERT R. O'CONOR, RUSSELL B. LONG, GUY M. GILLETTE, LESTER C. HUNT, WILLIAM BENTON, CHARLES W. TOBEY, LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, EDWARD J. THYE, ROBERT C. HENDRICKSON, ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL. The bill has also been endorsed unanimously by the House Small Business Committee members—Eugene J. Keogh, Mike Mansfield, Joe L. Evins, Clarence G. Burton, Charles A. Halleck, William S. Hill, R. Walter Riehlman, Franklin H. Lichtenwalter.

This legislation is similar to the Small Defense Plants Act of 1950, introduced on July 26, 1950. We cannot emphasize too strongly that its passage during this session of Congress is more urgently needed than ever before.

The necessity for the passage of such legislation arises from the critical conditions now faced by the Nation. There is no question but that small businesses could make a major contribution to the mobilization effort. Located in towns and cities of every State, our smaller industrial facilities represent great productive capacity, are flexible and capable of manufacturing hundreds of types of articles urgently needed for the defense effort.

In addition, small business is the prime source of our strength, the system of competitive free enterprise which has made us the preeminent industrial Nation of the world. It is the fount of initiative, growth, and development in the economic life of the Nation. Big business grows from small business.

Failure to give small business its adequate place during the present mobilization is fully as serious as failure to protect the Nation from foreign aggressors. Injury to small business is the equivalent of letting our system of free, competitive enterprise be riddled beyond repair.

SPECIAL SMALL-BUSINESS LEGISLATION URGENTLY NEEDED IN THE PRESENT DEFENSE PROGRAM

Small firms were facing handicaps even before the present mobilization period. Since the Korean outbreak, small-business problems have intensified, and they will increase manyfold as we enter full mobilization, unless Congress and the executive agencies are alert to preserve small business as a vital portion of our economy.

During the months ahead, the small-business man inevitably will face curtailment of civilian production. Materials will be scarce and more costly. Additional controls and restrictions on production will be imposed. The small-business man cannot face these curtailments as easily as can big business, with its backlog of materials and financial reserves.

Unless immediate action is taken, large producers almost certainly will allocate the

bulk of materials to affiliate or subsidiary fabricators, and the small, independent companies will be forced to take what, if anything, is left. The small-business man will find it almost impossible to compete with large manufacturers for defense contracts unless specific action is taken to aid him.

Small enterprises have learned through bitter experience that legislative action on their behalf is essential in periods of mobilization.

During the early years of World War II, the larger corporations were successful in mobilizing the resources of their own companies, but they made no real attempt to tap the productive reservoir of small enterprises.

Although small business could have made invaluable contributions to the war effort during the period from 1940 through 1942, for these 2 years the small-business man was forgotten and ignored. His plants lay idle. His markets vanished. His supply of materials dried up. His industrial skills were unused. His labor drifted away to other plants. During these 2 years, 16 percent of the small businesses in the United States closed their doors.

CREATION OF SMALLER WAR PLANTS CORPORATION IN 1942 WAS RECOGNITION OF SMALL-BUSINESS CRISIS

Congress finally recognized this critical situation in 1942, and remedied it by creation of the Smaller War Plants Corporation. But SWPC did not really begin to function effectively until 1944, when the peak of war production had passed. Nevertheless, Smaller War Plants assisted small firms in obtaining nearly a billion dollars in subcontracts and more than $5,500,000,000 in prime contracts. It loaned more than $550,000,000 to small business, with insignificant losses. It stimulated a recognition of the importance of small business in the national economy.

Creation of the Smaller War Plants Corporation came almost too late to save small business during World War II. The Eighty-second Congress now has the opportunity to act in time to prevent a repetition of the conditions which proved so disastrous to small business from 1940 through 1942.

The Defense Production Act (Public Law 774, 81st Cong., September 8, 1950) included small-business provisions which did not contain standards to utilize effectively the facilities of small-business enterprise in the mobilization program. No assurance was offered that small business would participate in supplying essential civilian requirements. In essence, the Defense Production Act provided no more than a declaration of policy insofar as small business was concerned.

Experience with the administration of the Smaller War Plants Corporation, which was set up as a part of the War Production Board, has convinced us of the need for a separate and distinct agency to mobilize all small business. We also are convinced that certain permissive clauses in the Smaller War Plants Act were ineffective.

These defects are rectified in the Small Business Defense Plants Act of 1951, which we have introduced today. This legislation will establish a separate agency for small business, with the permissive clauses replaced by mandatory provisions assuring that positive action will be taken in behalf of the Nation's small enterprises.

In broad terms, the Small Business Defense Plants Act of 1951 provides that small business be assisted—

1. To secure a fair share of Government contracts under the national defense program;

2. To secure a fair share of scarce materials for essential civilian production;

3. To be assured fair and equitable treatment when acting as subcontractors;

4. To obtain loans for expansion and conversion in the interests of the national defense program; and

5. To achieve full economic and industrial mobilization.

SMALL-BUSINESS DEFENSE PLANTS ACT WILL PROVIDE A POSITIVE PROGRAM FOR SMALL BUSINESS

To accomplish these objectives, the bill provides a revolving fund of a maximum of $500,000,000 to allow the Small Defense Plants Corporation to make loans and acquire property. It allows the Small Defense Plants Corporation to enter into contracts with the United States Government and to let subcontracts to small-business concerns.

Other Government agencies would be required to consult with the Corporation in determining the means by which small business can be brought most fully and effectively into the effort to produce goods for defense and for essential civilian use. The Corporation also would be empowered to make or have made a complete inventory of productive facilities of small-business concerns which can be used for such production.

The Corporation would be authorized to take appropriate action to insure that small-business subcontractors receive fair and equitable prices, conditions, and terms from prime contractors.

The bill also would provide assurance that small enterprises receive a fair share of scarce materials, equipment, and supplies which may be allocated by the Government. In addition, there are provisions assuring that small businesses shall receive a fair proportion of Government contracts.

Response of small-business men throughout the Nation to the Small Business Defense Plants Act has been enthusiastic.

Since the act first was introduced last July, the Senate and House Small Business Committees have received many communications from small-business men urging that the bill be given prompt consideration and passage.

UTILIZATION OF SMALL BUSINESS IS ESSENTIAL TO FULL MOBILIZATION PROGRAM

When the Defense Production Act first was made law there was some ground for hope that partial mobilization of our resources would be sufficient for an indefinite period.

Unfortunately for the peace and happiness of the people of the world, this has not proved to be the case. In the late fall the human pawns in the vast movement for communistic domination advanced from the inner recesses of Red China. This horde came in such numbers that the modest forces of the United Nations on the Korean Peninsula found it necessary to retire.

It was apparent instantly that partial mobilization would not suffice. It was necessary for the President of the United States on December 16 to declare a national emergency. This meant the full mobilization of the military and economic resources of the Nation.

It also means that, if we are to mobilize completely, every single unit in our industrial family must be put to work, as every man and woman is expected to share in the responsibility for a total defense. Small-business concerns cannot be neglected or unused.

Strangely enough, it is well-nigh impossible to obtain more than recognition of this necessity under present defense laws. Recognition and savory phrases will not do the job. We must have new legislation if all of the component parts of business and industry are to bear their full share of the responsibility for strengthening our Military Establishment and providing for the necessities of life for the civilian population.

SEPARATION OF MAIL PAY FROM SUBSIDIES IN CASE OF CERTAIN AIR CARRIERS

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I send to the desk for appropriate reference a bill to provide for the separation of mail pay from subsidies in the case of air carriers engaged in international air transportation.

For some time past, considerable attention has been given to the question of separating airline subsidies from airmail pay.

An investigation with respect to the domestic aspect of this problem has been made by the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce; and the report is current that a new bill on this subject, concerned with only domestic air transportation, has been agreed upon by airline representatives and others.

The further report is that the airlines are asking for another year of study, by the Civil Aeronautics Administration, concerning the problem involved in separation of subsidies from mail pay in the field of international air transportation.

I have been much interested in this question of the separation of subsidies from mail pay, as I am interested in all questions having to do with the growth and development of air transportation; and I have worked out a method of separation of mail pay from subsidies in the field of international air transportation which I believe is sound and fair and will, after study, have rather wide acceptance.

I do not wish at this time to claim for my bill any virtues which it may not have, or to enter into prolonged argument with respect to it. Therefore, I do not propose to summarize its provisions nor generalize with regard to them. I simply offer the bill for introduction, and I urge members of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, and others who are interested in this subject, to give it their careful study. I hope the bill may also have most serious and critical consideration by the air carriers whom it would affect, and by all others who are interested in this subject.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill introduced by the Senator from Nevada will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 535) to provide for the separation of mail pay from subsidies in the case of air carriers engaged in international air transportation, introduced by Mr. McCARRAN, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SECURITY AND DEFENSE OF THE UNITED STATES AGAINST ATTACK

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, by request, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for the greater security and defense of the United States against attack, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that a copy of a letter addressed to me as chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, from the office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense, signed by Marx Leva, dated January 16, 1951, explaining the purpose of the proposed legislation, be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD, as requested by the Senator from Colorado. The Chair hears no objection.

The bill (S. 537) to provide for the greater security and defense of the United States against attack, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, was read twice by its

title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado is as follows:

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D. C., January 16, 1951.

Hon. EDWIN C. JOHNSON,
Chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: There is forwarded herewith a draft of proposed legislation, "To provide for the greater security and defense of the United States against attack, and for other purposes." This proposal is a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1951, and has been approved by the Bureau of the Budget. The Department of Defense recommends that it be enacted by the Congress at an early date.

Purpose of the legislation: The purpose of the proposed legislation is to provide the necessary Executive authority to control electromagnetic radiation, not only during hostilities or a proclaimed emergency, but also during time of strained international relationships when a surprise attack on the United States is a possibility.

Current concepts of warfare and recent experience demonstrate the necessity to control electromagnetic radiation in the United States, its Territories, and possessions, during periods of critical international relationships, for the purpose of denying their use to a potential e .emy for navigation of piloted or pilotless aircraft or missiles directed toward targets in the United States. The authority of this proposed legislation must be provided now in order that further planning and preparations may be completed so that air defense plans may be implemented without delay in the event of an air attack. It is requested that further justification for the urgent necessity of this legislation be given to you in secret session.

Legislative references: Some executive authority is provided by section 606 (c) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended. However, it is believed that that authority is inadequate for the purpose stated above.

Cost and budget data: Section 3 provides for just compensation to the owner for use by a department or agency of the United States of any instrument, device, apparatus, or thing. It is impossible to estimate the extent of such compensation and the resulting cost to the Government.

Department of Defense action agency: The Department of the Air Force has been designated as the representative of the Department of Defense for this legislation.

In accordance with a long-established custom, the Depart:ment of Defense submitted to the Senate Committee on Armed Services a proposal identical with this proposal for consideration by the Eighty-first Congress. We have been informed that that earlier proposal was referred by the Committee on Armed Services to your committee. In view of the referral of that earlier proposal to your committee and in view of the urgency of this proposal, we are forwarding this proposal directly to your committee for consideration.

Sincerely yours,

MARX LEVA.

CONTINUATION OF AUTHORITY FOR STUDY AND SURVEY OF HEALTH INSURANCE PLANS BY COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

Mr. MURRAY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 39), which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Resolved, That the authority of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, under Senate Resolution 273, Eighty-first Congress, agreed to May 26, 1950 (providing for study and survey of health insurance plans in the United States, the activities of State and local governments in the field of health services, and related matters), is hereby continued until March 31, 1951.

PRINTING ADDITIONAL COPIES OF PAMPHLET ENTITLED "SELLING TO YOUR GOVERNMENT"

Mr. SPARKMAN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 40), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That there be printed 30,000 additional copies of the pamphlet entitled "Selling to Your Government," such additional copies to be for the use of the Select Committee on Small Business.

A PLAN FOR PEACE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR ROBERTSON

[Mr. STENNIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "A Plan for Peace," delivered by Senator ROBERTSON at the meeting of the Senate breakfast group on January 17, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

INAUGURAL ADDRESS OF GOV. JOHN S. FINE, OF PENNSYLVANIA

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the inaugural address delivered by Gov. John S. Fine, of Pennsylvania, on January 16, 1951, at Harrisburg, Pa., which appears in the Appendix.]

HOPE: AN AMERICAN EXPORT—ADDRESS BY THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE

[Mr. SPARKMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject, Hope: An American Export, delivered by Secretary of Agriculture Charles F. Brannan at the annual meeting of the Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities in Washington November 16, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

PRESENT POLITICAL TRENDS—EDITORIAL COMMENT ON ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES A. FARLEY

[Mr. RUSSELL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD various editorial comments regarding an address by Hon. James A. Farley on present political trends, which appear in the Appendix.]

UNIVERSAL MILITARY SERVICE—STATEMENT BY THE COMMITTEE ON THE PRESENT DANGER

[Mr. O'CONOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement regarding universal military service, issued by the Committee on the Present Danger, which appears in the Appendix.]

TACTICS—NOT A STRATEGY—OF FREEDOM—ARTICLE BY PROF. LEV E. DOBRIANSKY

[Mr. SMITH of New Jersey asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Tactics—Not a Strategy—of Freedom," written by Prof. Lev E. Dobriansky, and published in the January 1, 1951, issue of the Ukrainian Bulletin, which appears in the Appendix.]

REGULATIONS ON INDIAN COUNSEL—LETTER FROM ALDEN STEVENS

[Mr. CHAVEZ asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter on the subject of regulations on Indian counsel, written by Alden Stevens, secretary, Association of American Indian Affairs, Inc., of New York, and printed in a recent publication, which appears in the Appendix.]

ASSIGNMENT OF GROUND TROOPS FOR SERVICE IN EUROPE—ARTICLE BY JAMES RESTON

[Mr. LEHMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Congress Veto on Troops Could Cripple United States Policy," written by James Reston, and published in the New York Times of January 15, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

WHERE SHALL WE LOOK FOR LEADERSHIP?—EDITORIAL BY DAVID LAWRENCE

[Mr. McCARRAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Where Shall We Look for Leadership?" written by David Lawrence, and published in the United States News and World Report December 29, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE ROAD TO BIPARTISANSHIP—ARTICLE BY HOLMES ALEXANDER

[Mr. WATKINS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Road to Bipartisanship," written by Holmes Alexander, and published in his column entitled "Washington Affairs" in the Worcester (Mass.) Telegram of December 20, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

MONTHLY BENEFITS ASSUMING BASIC PENSION RATE OF $50 PER MONTH

[Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a tabulation prepared by him showing the monthly benefits which would be paid to those aged 65 or over under the proposal for a universal-eligibility social security, which appears in the Appendix.]

SHIPMENT OF STRATEGIC MATERIALS TO COMMUNIST-DOMINATED AREAS—STATEMENT BY SENATOR O'CONOR

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, recently there has been discussion regarding the shipping of strategic materials to Communist-dominated areas, and the Secretary of Commerce has given his version in regard to the matter. I have prepared a detailed statement based upon the findings and investigations of the Subcommittee of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, and I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the body of the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR O'CONOR

I would have preferred not to make this statement, particularly when it had been our intention to concentrate our future efforts upon a different phase of foreign trade, namely, continued shipping of strategic materials by Western European nations to Communist-dominated areas.

In fact, I had hoped that the discussion had ended about shipments from the United States to our Communist foes in China. But in the past few days the Secretary of Commerce has seen fit to reopen the controversy. In a Boston speech he invited further debate about the matter.

The Secretary charged falsification and misrepresentation to those of us who had felt obliged to reveal facts about shipments to Red China of critical materials. He further alleged unfairness in the accusations and indicated, in a thinly disguised reference, that the Senate subcommittee's statements were concocted or misinterpreted in order to create a sensation.

Under the circumstances, and in order that the record be clear and unmistakable, I think a discussion of the points raised by the Secretary is required.

COPPER SHIPMENTS

After denying that exports of copper from the United States occurred during 1950, the Secretary admitted that one transshipment of copper took place in February 1950 from Japan through this country and around the world to the Communists in China. He declares, however, that no copper has been shipped since that date.

The facts concerning the copper transshipped through the United States to Red China are as follows: (1) 658,142 pounds; left New York on the steamship *Flying Cloud* on January 5, 1950; (2) 440,923 pounds; left New York on the steamship *Flying Arrow* on March 14, 1950; (3) 731,523 pounds; left New York on the Steamship *Flying Arrow* on March 14, 1950; (4) 618,163 pounds; left New York on the steamship *Flying Arrow* on April 3, 1950; (6) 354,954 pounds; left New York on the steamship *Brooklyn Heights* on April 3, 1950; (6) 354,954 pounds, left New York on the steamship *Brooklyn Heights* on April 3, 1950; (7) 1,120,000 pounds; left New York on the steamship *Empire Glencoe* after April 3, 1950.

SILICON STEEL SHEETS

But confining attention to the Secretary's assertion that there have been no shipments of anything, strategic or otherwise, to Communist China since they entered the war in Korea, let me remind him that as late as November 16, 1950, a shipment of 24,672 pounds of silicon steel sheets was allowed to leave New York on the steamship *Igadi* destined for Taku Bar, Red China.

The Secretary stresses the fact that last February his Department learned of the subterfuge of transshipping from a foreign port to New York and thence to Communist China. Well, the fact is that other transshipments occurred after his Department was on notice of this evasion of our export control regulations. Here are the facts regarding these transshipments of steel sheets through the United States to Red China: 368,642 pounds left New York on or about July 19, 1950, on the steamship *Cape Race* destined for Taku Bar, North China; 53,635 pounds left New York on or about August 4, 1950, on the steamship *Flying Arrow* destined for Taku Bar, North China; 42,282 pounds left New York on or about July 31, 1950, on the steamship *Berghold* destined for Taku Bar, North China.

In addition, one company imported two further shipments, amounting to 55,115 pounds and 44,890 pounds, respectively, which arrived in the port of New York on November 3, 1950. However, by this time the president of the company had been served with a subpena to appear before the Senate subcommittee. He thereupon changed his plans for shipping these silicon steel sheets to China and disposed of them on the United States market. Ascertaining that the steamship *Igadi* was to touch at a Pacific port, we telegraphed the Secretary of Commerce requesting that these steel sheets and other shipments of strategic importance be removed from ships before they left United States shores, which was done.

We further called attention to the loophole in the OIT regulations which permitted transshipments of strategic materials through United States ports and by means of United States vessels, and it was not until after this complaint was made that the Department of Commerce, on December 3, 1950, established new regulations prohibiting transshipments of any goods of foreign origin through the ports of the United States or by use of American vessels.

This belated action was taken 5 months after hostilities began in Korea and after China had entered the war against us.

This was followed by additional regulations issued on December 6, revoking all licenses on shipments to Red China, Manchuria, Hong Kong, and Macao. It was not until December 8, 1950, that the Department of Commerce finally issued an order which barred the transportation or discharge by American ships and aircraft of strategic and critical materials destined for countries in the Soviet bloc, China, Hong Kong, and Macao.

PETROLATUM

The Secretary in his address claims that he stopped shipments of lubricating oil to China in 1949, and he observed that "about 2 months ago we noticed an increase in mineral-oil shipments which we had assumed would be used internally by human beings. When it appeared that this mineral oil might be used as a substitute—though a very poor substitute—for lubricating oil, we shut that off, too. He added that he personally ordered 1,250 drums taken off the docks in New York when they were about to be loaded.

Here it is pertinent to note that, at the very time a portion of the petrolatum shipment was being removed, the Federal officials gave formal consent for the remaining portion to go to China, and that shipment was delivered to our Communist foes. If it was dangerous to have allowed one portion of the load to go, why was permission given to transport the remaining drums on the very same vessel, the steamship *Flying Cloud?* This authorization was given by the Office of International Trade after we had protested and submitted data in support of our demands.

The facts are that the subcommittee called these unusually large shipments of petrolatum to the attention of the Secretary of Commerce after our staff had examined export declarations and ship manifests of boats leaving United States ports. Attention had been drawn to the fact that more than 50,000 gallons were being loaded for China on one vessel alone. When the chairman called these facts to the attention of the Department of Commerce, the Department issued a notice on November 1, 1950, effective at 10 a. m. putting petrolatum and petrolatum jelly on the positive list and prohibiting their export without a license.

It is clear that it was the Senate subcommittee which took the initiative in this matter, and it is further clear that if the Senate subcommittee had not issued its protest, all of this petrolatum would have been shipped to our enemies. It is pertinent to point out that the Department of Commerce had been very slow to perceive the enormous increase in the shipments of petrolatum, because 2,254,311 pounds of this product had been shipped since the onset of the Korean war from the port of New York alone between the months of June and October, 1950.

TIN PLATE

With reference to tin plate the Secretary of Commerce points to the fact that tin plate rejects had not been placed on the positive list, requiring license, stating that these rejects are of such low grade that the interagency committee responsible for deciding which exports are strategic saw no reason to give them such a classification. Incidentally, this interagency committee includes representatives of the defense agencies.

A review of the shipping documents filed between August and October 1950, at the port of New York alone, revealed that more than 19,381,014 pounds of tin mill waste waste had been shipped from the port of New York in this 3-month period, together with more than 4,000,000 pounds of other steel products, 2,500,000 pounds of galvanized pipe, 167,774 pounds of boiler tube, 419,171 pounds of aluminum, 669,000 pounds of silicon steel, 2,250,000 pounds of petrolatum, and 709,000 pounds of lubricating oil and grease, among other products.

Testimony given to us in executive session by experts was to the effect that the waste waste tin plate could readily be used for strategic purposes, such as making ammunition containers, and so forth. The subcommitee likewise was reliably informed by officials in the National Defense Agency that after they learned of the extremely large shipments they had taken the position that tin plate waste waste should be placed on the positive list.

Again, however, it was only after hearings were held and the enormous shipments were publicly revealed that the Secretary of Commerce announced, on December 3, 1950, that all shipments from the United States to mainland China, Hong Kong, and Macao were subject to license.

PENICILLIN

In the matter of important "miracle drugs" the Secretary has this to say in his statement regarding the shipment from this country to the Communists of antibiotics: "About the time the Chinese Communists came into the war in Korea it appeared that these drugs were being purchased in abnormal quantities for shipment to China. These shipments were thereupon stopped. We even stopped shipments on the high seas."

The facts are that in 1949 China imported 37,012,300,000 oxford units of penicillin. For the 9-month period from January to September 1950, the importations of penicillin practically tripled, to the figure of 98,092,800,000 oxford units. It is even more important to note that the imports to Hong Kong in the year 1949 from the United States totaled 3,139,607,100,000 penicillin oxford units; that in the 9-month period from January to September 1950, the amount of penicillin imported was more than doubled, and there were shipped to Hong Kong from the United States 6,735,390,400,000 oxford units.

It must be pointed out that there is no doubt in the minds of any of the experts that almost all imports to Hong Kong are virtually absorbed by China. It can safely be assumed that this enormous amount of penicillin was shipped inland to China. The fact is that it was not until mid-November 1950, after Communist China had openly entered the Korean war, that Commerce placed penicillin on the positive list.

Again the question must be raised as to why the Department of Commerce had to wait until this committee initiated its investigation and started to examine the figures on the shipments of penicillin before taking action to stop the export of this commodity. There can be no doubt that the excessive amount of penicillin exported to China was to be devoted to Communist warfare in Korea. We have been advised that military intelligence became alarmed at this large quantity going to Hong Kong and China. Here again it seems evident that our Office of International Trade was slow to take action to prevent these shipments from reaching China.

COTTON

In a statement on the Senate floor on December 21, 1950, it was pointed out that since the outbreak of the Korean war on June 25, 1950, six shipments involving almost 50,000,000 pounds of cotton are known to have been exported to Manchuria and Red China direct. These shipments from this country have been made with the full knowledge and consent of Federal officials. They were shipped from New Orleans as follows: On July 13, 1950, 13,000 bales to Dairen, Manchuria; on July 13, 1950, 1,857 bales to Darien, Manchuria: on July 17, 1950, 7,520 bales to Dairen, Manchuria; on August 7, 1950, 10,127 bales to Dairen, Manchuria; on August 7, 1950, 3,946 bales to Dairen, Manchuria; on August 21, 1950, 3,615 bales to Taku Bar, China; on August 24, 1950, 800 bales to Taku Bar, China; on August 24, 1950, 2,839 bales to Dairen, Manchuria; on August 28, 1950, 4,859 bales to Dairen, Manchuria; total, 48,563 bales.

It is extremely difficult to understand why this vast amount of highly strategic material was permitted to go to Red China and Manchuria after the outbreak of the Korean

war, particularly in view of the fact that cotton is one of the items in short supply in the United States and was put under export control on September 8, 1950.

The astounding fact is that as late as a few weeks ago shipments of highly useful materials were on the high seas being transported on United States flag ships to Communist China. The Office of International Trade had not prevented these shipments leaving our ports, as should have been done.

It is true that the Department clamped down the lid in December after recognizing the fact that these materials were susceptible of military or industrial use by the Reds. But if there was necessity for stopping them in December, why were they allowed to be shipped to the Communists over a period of months even after the war had been launched by our enemies?

It is unfortunate that the Secretary of Commerce by not too veiled an implication felt called upon to accuse the subcommittee of unfairness in its investigation and in its conclusions and statements. The documented facts quoted above speak for themselves. The successive dates on which items were added to the positive list, and other steps taken to prevent just the type of shipments which the subcommittee criticized, certainly bear out the assertion that the Office of International Trade did not act with reasonable promptness in discharging its responsibility. In fact, it had to be prodded continuingly by the subcommittee before remedial action was taken.

It must be remembered that the Congress is charged with the duty of seeing that the laws of the country are being properly administered. It is regrettable that at times it is necessary to bring the force of public opinion to bear before indicated action is taken by some of the executive departments. The facts developed by the subcommittee with regard to the shipments in question were intended to have—and, it is believed, did have—a constructive effect and did bring about—belatedly, let it be again emphasized—action to prevent shipment to our enemies of materials which they needed badly and some of which we could ill afford to spare.

I repeat, thousands of pounds of strategic materials and thousands of gallons of petroleum and other products were shipped from this country, destined for our enemies, and these practices were not stopped, in most cases, until we had developed shocking facts and had made urgent demands upon the Office of International Trade for action.

ASSIGNMENT OF GROUND TROOPS FOR SERVICE IN EUROPE—MODIFICATION OF UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unanimous-consent agreement which was entered into regarding the hour at which the Senate will proceed to vote on the resolution submitted by the Senator from Nebraska, Senate Resolution 8, be modified to the extent of changing the hour from 3 o'clock p. m. to 2 o'clock p. m., on Tuesday, January 23, 1951.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the unanimous-consent agreement is changed accordingly.

TWO HUNDRED AND FORTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF BENJAMIN FRANKLIN

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak for 5 minutes on the subject of Benjamin Franklin, the two hundred forty-fifth anniversary of whose birth falls on today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Pennsylvania may proceed.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, today is the two hundred forty-fifth anniversary of the birth of Benjamin Franklin, America's greatest master of statecraft and diplomacy, foremost champion of freedom and self-government and mighty genius of our Nation's beginnings.

We honor his memory as a patriot of American independence, as the first citizen of Pennsylvania, and as a great benefactor of mankind.

Many volumes have been written in praise of his illustrious career. His brilliant achievements as an author, philosopher, scientist, statesman, and diplomat mark him as one of the giant intellects of all time.

It is impossible to measure his vast contribution to the glory of our Republic and to the progress of humanity.

Franklin was a man of peace but he recognized the necessity of a strong defense. He was one of the earliest advocates of disciplined military training for the protection of the frontier settlements against the Indians. He organized a militia company in 1746, and through his efforts the General Assembly of Pennsylvania adopted a bill creating a volunteer militia on a permanent basis in 1755.

In the Albany Congress of 1754, called to unite the colonies against the French and Indians, he presented a Plan of Union which has been acclaimed as the forerunner of the Federal Union.

Three years later he was in England, launched upon a career in diplomacy which was to be crowned by his brilliant success in winning an alliance with France that hastened American victory in the struggle for independence.

He was the only man of the founding fathers who had the distinction of signing all four documents of our freedom: the Declaration of Independence, the treaty of alliance with France, the treaty of peace with England, and the Constitution of the United States.

In 1783 he wrote:

> At length we are in peace. God be praised, and long, very long may it continue! All wars are follies, very expensive and very mischievous ones. When will mankind be convinced of this, and agree to settle their differences by arbitration? Were they to do this, even by the cast of a die, it would be better than by destroying each other.

Another impressive quotation from Franklin, written a year later, appears on the cover of the current issue of the Saturday Evening Post.

> Let us beware—

Franklin wrote—

> of being lulled into dangerous security; and of being * * * weakened by internal contentions and divisions; * * * and of neglect in military exercises and discipline, and in providing stores of arms and munitions of war; for * * * the expenses required to prevent a war are much lighter than those that will, if not prevented, be necessary to maintain it.

Commenting on that sound advice from Benjamin Franklin, the editor of the Saturday Evening Post points out that it "is sort of hard to tell whether he is talking to the Continental Congress or the United States Eighty-second Congress."

Twenty-seven years ago in an address at a dinner of the International Benjamin Franklin Society of New York, the Honorable James M. Beck, a distinguished Pennsylvanian who was then Solicitor General of the United States, paid tribute to the memory of Dr. Franklin. Mr. Beck's remarks were eloquent and scholarly, and I should like to read a brief excerpt from them because the thoughts expressed are applicable to the problems we face today.

Referring to Benjamin Franklin, Mr. Beck said:

> Some of the acute problems of the present day could be readily solved if this generation had his spirit of toleration, his love of constructive achievement, and his genius of common sense.
>
> How wise would be his counsels in this hysterical generation when the whole world seems topsy-turvy; when many classes are in revolt against the institutions which make for stability; when the counsels of men are darkened with vain misgivings and legislators and administrators too often flee in abject cowardice before the rising dust of an advancing windstorm.
>
> To all the causes of our present discontent he would apply, if again in our midst, his well-poised judgment and unfailing humor. He would urge that many of our problems could be solved by more working and less talking.

Mr. President, every American can find patriotic inspiration in the words and deeds of Benjamin Franklin. His career should be studied for guidance in these days of perplexity and confusion in world affairs.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD, at this point in my remarks, a compilation of the principal events in the life of Benjamin Franklin, taken from the Harvard Classics.

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

BENJAMIN FRANKLIN—THE PRINCIPAL EVENTS IN HIS LIFE

Ending, as it does, with the year 1757, the autobiography leaves important facts unrecorded. It has seemed advisable, therefore, to detail the chief events in Franklin's life, from the beginning, in the following list:

1706: He is born, in Boston, and baptized in the Old South Church.

1714: At the age of 8 enters the grammar school.

1716: Becomes his father's assistant in the tallow-chandlery business.

1718: Apprenticed to his brother James, printer.

1721: Writes ballads and peddles them, in printed form in the streets; contributes, anonymously, to the New England Courant and temporarily edits that paper; becomes a free-thinker and a vegetarian.

1723: Breaks his indenture and removes to Philadelphia; obtains employment in Keimer's printing office; abandons vegetarianism.

1724: Is persuaded by Governor Keith to establish himself independently and goes to London to buy type; works at his trade there, and publishes Dissertation on Liberty and Necessity, Pleasure and Pain.

1726: Returns to Philadelphia; after serving as clerk in a drygoods store, becomes manager of Keimer's printing house.

1727: Founds the Junto, or Leathern Apron Club.

1728: With Hugh Meredith, opens a printing office.

1729: Becomes proprietor and editor of the Pennsylvania Gazette; prints, anonymously, Nature and Necessity of a Paper Currency; opens a stationer's shop.

1730: Marries Rebecca Read.

1731: Founds the Philadelphia Library.

1732: Publishes the first number of Poor Richard's Almanac under the pseudonym of "Richard Saunders." The Almanac, which continued for 25 years to contain his witty, worldlywise sayings, played a very large part in bringing together and molding the American character which was at that time made up of so many diverse and scattered types.

1733: Begins to study French, Italian, Spanish, and Latin.

1736: Chosen clerk of the general assembly; forms the Union Fire Company of Philadelphia.

1737: Elected to the assembly; appointed Deputy Postmaster General; plans a city police.

1742: Invents the open, or "Franklin," stove.

1743: Proposes a plan for an academy, which is adopted 1749 and develops into the University of Pennsylvania.

1744: Establishes the American Philosophical Society.

1746: Publishes a pamphlet, Plain Truth, on the necessity for disciplined defense, and forms a military company; begins electrical experiments.

1748: Sells out his printing business; is appointed on the Commission of the Peace, chosen to the common council, and to the assembly.

1749: Appointed a commissioner to trade with the Indians.

1751: Aids in founding a hospital.

1752: Experiments with a kite and discovers that lightning is an electrical discharge.

1753: Awarded the Copley medal for this discovery, and elected a member of the Royal Society; receives the degree of M. A. from Yale and Harvard. Appointed joint Postmaster General.

1754: Appointed one of the commissioners from Pennsylvania to the Colonial Congress at Albany; proposes a plan for the union of the colonies.

1755: Pledges his personal property in order that supplies may be raised for Braddock's army; obtains a grant from the assembly in aid of the Crown Point expedition; carries through a bill establishing a voluntary militia; is appointed colonel, and takes the field.

1757: Introduces a bill in the assembly for paving the streets of Philadelphia; publishes his famous Way to Wealth; goes to England to plead the cause of the assembly against the proprietaries; remains as agent for Pennsylvania; enjoys the friendship of the scientific and literary men of the kingdom.

1760: Secures from the Privy Council, by a compromise, a decision obliging the proprietary estates to contribute to the public revenue.

1762: Receives the degree of LL. D. from Oxford and Edinburgh; returns to America.

1763: Makes a 5 months' tour of the northern Colonies for the purpose of inspecting the post offices.

1764: Defeated by the Penn faction for reelection to the assembly; sent to England as agent for Pennsylvania.

1765: Endeavors to prevent the passage of the Stamp Act.

1766: Examined before the House of Commons relative to the passage of the Stamp Act; appointed agent of Massachusetts, New Jersey, and Georgia; visits Gottingen University.

1767: Travels in France and is presented at court.

1769: Procures a telescope for Harvard College.

1772. Elected associe etranger of the French academy.

1774: Dismissed from the office of Postmaster General; influences Thomas Paine to emigrate to America.

1775: Returns to America; chosen a delegate to the Second Continental Congress; placed on the committee of secret correspondence; appointed one of the commissioners to secure the cooperation of Canada.

1776: Placed on the committee to draft a Declaration of Independence; chosen president of the constitutional committee of Pennsylvania; sent to France as agent of the Colonies.

1778: Concludes treaties of defensive alliance, and of unity and commerce; is received at court.

1779: Appointed Minister Plenipotentiary to France.

1780: Appoints Paul Jones commander of the *Alliance*.

1782: Signs the preliminary articles of peace.

1783: Signs the definite treaty of peace.

1785: Returns to America; is chosen President of Pennsylvania; reelected 1786.

1787: Reelected President; sent as delegate to the convention for framing a Federal Constitution.

1788: Retires from public life.

1790: April 17, dies. His grave is in the churchyard at Fifth and Arch Streets, Philadelphia.

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

Mr. MARTIN. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Let me appropriately call attention to the fact that a half century after the death of Benjamin Franklin, the Congress of the United States was preparing the decoration of this Capitol, and for the Presidential Room selected for one of the murals a portrait of Benjamin Franklin as the emblem of the master of statecraft and diplomacy, exactly as the Senator from Pennsylvania today has so happily pointed out. The fact that that generation recognized Franklin's great talents, a half century after his passing, may well come home to us in the troubles of the present day.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Maine for his very fine and pertinent comment and suggestion.

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

Mr. MARTIN. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I think the entire Senate should thank the Senator from Pennsylvania for the remarks he has made. We should also appreciate that his remarks are most appropriate at the present time. The Senator from Pennsylvania holds a commission as a major general, and has spent most of his life in the Army of the United States. Now he comes onto the floor of the Senate to remind us that all of our ends cannot be attained merely by having arms, and that we must have other means in order to arrive at peace. I think it is very timely that at this hour the distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania, who speaks with such great authority because he has spent the greater part of his life in intimate association with the armed services, should bring us this message.

Mr. MARTIN. I thank the distinguished Senator from Michigan for his very kind remarks.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, during those difficult days of our Nation's early history, while Benjamin Franklin was serving as this country's representative abroad, the citizens of a small American community wrote to him asking him to donate a bell for the tower of their newly constructed town hall. Franklin replied, "Sense is better than sound. I am sending you a gift of books from London."

Born in Boston on January 17, 1706, but claimed equally and properly by the great city of Philadelphia, Benjamin Franklin stands today, as he will surely stand throughout recorded time, as the symbol of all that is good and great and wise in American history. May we today in the solving of the problems which now confront us demonstrate that same common sense, courage, and abiding faith in freedom that characterized Benjamin Franklin during all the 84 years of his illustrious life.

EDITORIAL AND OTHER RESPONSE TO FOREIGN POLICY ADDRESS BY JOHN FOSTER DULLES

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a communication which I received yesterday from Mr. John Foster Dulles, in answer to an inquiry I addressed to him, relative to the response he has had from his recent radio address.

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

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 16, 1951.*

MY DEAR SENATOR KNOWLAND: I have your letter of January 12 in which you ask what the editorial and other response has been to my foreign policy address of December 29. The short answer is that that speech attracted far more public attention and approval than any speech I have ever made. Many reprints have been made. One printing, I am told, is of 100,000 copies.

In New York City, where I spoke, the New York Times and Herald Tribune made my speech the subject of leading and favorable editorials, the Herald Tribune stating, "Mr. Dulles' address will rank with the great expressions of American statesmanship." In Washington, both the Post and the Star had leading and favorable editorials.

I do not patronize any clipping bureau, nor is any such service available to me, so I have no comprehensive, Nation-wide report. However, samplings which have come to my attention indicate that my speech was commented upon editorially by most of the press of the Nation and that the editorial comment has been generally favorable. See, for example, the Louisville Courier-Journal, St. Louis Post Dispatch, Dayton News, Toledo Blade, Kansas City Star, Arizona Daily Star, Wilmington Morning News, the State (Columbia, S. C.), Dallas Morning News, Winston-Salem Journal Sentinel, Boston Herald, Nashville Tennessean, St. Paul Pioneer Press, Des Moines Register, etc.

Unfavorable editorial comment, so far as I am aware, was largely confined to such persistent critics as the Chicago Tribune and affiliated newspapers.

Columnist approval, so far as has come to my attention, has been overwhelmingly favorable. Mr. Walter Lippmann, for example, called the speech "the most broadly conceived and the most penetrating which has

been made in this country since the Armistice."

The personal reaction in terms of mail, telegrams, telephone calls, etc., has been favorable in a ratio of about 2 to 1. Most of the disapproving letters, however, seem to have been prompted by the unauthorized and incorrect advance news report that I planned a verbal attack on former President Hoover. A considerable number of the disapproving letters were written before I spoke or merely voiced criticism of what they wrongly assumed was my intention. The unfavorable letters quickly dropped off, as the positive and constructive aspect of my address became evident. The approving letters continue to flow in.

From the political field, the indications of approval have included both Republican and Democratic Members of Congress, Senate and House, and State governors.

From the religious field approval came from many leaders. One high Protestant official, who speaks with unique authority, said, "I think I am well within my rights when I say that the leadership of our churches would go along with you 100 percent." I had strong approval from leading dignitaries of the Catholic Church. Several Jewish leaders identified with the Conference of Christians and Jews have written me in enthusiastic support.

From the educational field, I have had letters and telegrams of approval from presidents of several of our universities and colleges. The president of one leading university, for example, wrote: "I read the text with great approval and appreciation that mounted as I read. Your paragraph about a nation that sheds its allies was a masterpiece. You have driven a path that we all can follow."

Diplomats of friendly countries here told me that my address constituted an indispensable contribution to continuing unity and confidence within the free world.

Broadly speaking, those who have personally communicated with me seem to divide as they believe in:

1. Enlightened long-term interest versus immediate material satisfaction.

2. Security to be found collectively versus security to be sought in isolation.

My speech deliberately raised these issues and on the basis of responses, in terms of numbers and of influence, I would say that it is certain that the great majority of our people are willing to make present sacrifices to secure the future, and that they recognize that security cannot be had except collectively.

In this connection the National Opinion Research Center made a public-opinion survey during the first week of January immediately following my address of December 29. It showed that 65 percent of the people thought it would be best for the future of this country if we take an active part in world affairs as against 26 percent who favored our staying out of world affairs. Seventy-one percent indicated approval of sending military supplies to the countries of Western Europe now in order to strengthen them against any future attack, and 20 percent disapproved.

I sense an honest difference of opinion and some confusion as to how to apply these principles. But I have no doubt as to the direction in which our people are prepared to go under competent leadership that they trust.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN FOSTER DULLES.

EDITORIAL AND OTHER RESPONSE TO FOREIGN-POLICY ADDRESS BY HERBERT HOOVER

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a communication which I received a few days ago from former President Herbert Hoover in answer to an inquiry I addressed to him relative to the response he has had from his recent radio address.

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

NEW YORK, N. Y., *January 11, 1951.*

The Honorable WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I have your request for the figures on daily press editorial attitude on the speech I made on December 20.

As you know, I gave orders to a clipping agency to send me all daily newspaper editorials, both good and bad. They have now been classified into those who gave full support, those who gave partial support, and those opposed. The following shows the results received up to last night as measured by circulation:

Total daily press circulation covered by sample: Circulation, 46,228,000, 100 percent; full-support circulation, 31,014,000, 68 percent; part-support circulation, 3,718,000, 8 percent; opposed circulation, 11,496,000, 24 percent.

Subdivided by geographical regions, measured by circulation:

New England and Middle Atlantic: Full support, 67 percent; part support, 7 percent; opposed, 26 percent.

South and South Atlantic: Full support, 32 percent; part support, 16 percent; opposed, 52 percent.

Middle West: Full support, 71 percent; part support, 10 percent; opposed, 19 percent.

Southwest, Mountain, and Pacific: Full support, 85 percent; part support, 2 percent; opposed, 13 percent.

Of the 11,496,000 opposed, 5,279,000, or 46 percent of the total opposition, came from Atlantic seaboard cities. If we deduct this number from the opposed, the remainder would show:

Full support, 75 percent; part support, 10 percent; opposed, 15 percent.

This is an indication of the voice of hinterland America. It is noticeable from these clippings that the campaign of name calling and misrepresentation is having the opposite effect from the purpose of such people. Apparently, in consequence of it, several papers have reversed their position from opposition and part support over to full support.

Yours faithfully,

HERBERT HOOVER.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Are there further routine matters? If not, morning business is concluded.

POLICY AND FAITH FOR WORLD CONFLICT

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, there is not a Senator on this floor whose mail is not full of letters from anxious, perplexed mothers and wives. Their sons and husbands are being drafted into the Armed Forces of our country for purposes which are not always clear to the writers. Or if these purposes seem to be clear they are not thought to be of sufficient gravity to warrant the disruption of daily lives, the hardships of separation and loss of bread winners, the interruption of education, and the prospect of active warfare, wounds, and death. It would seem that there rests on the Senate of the United States a necessity to determine whether the course we are pursuing is well advised in purpose and, if so, a responsibility for seeing to it that it is carried out quickly and effectively.

A number of important statements have recently been made by men high in public life who seek to give an answer to this question, which is disturbing the hearts and minds of our citizens. Of these statements, I would refer to only two—that made by ex-President Hoover, on December 20, 1950, and that offered on this floor by the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] on January 5.

Mr. Hoover was deeply concerned with the heavy load which this Government and its citizens have taken on their shoulders in an effort to protect the whole world from Russian communism and despotism. He feels that this load is too great for us to bear. He says in brief that if we cannot get the major support in this undertaking from other countries, we must be prepared to retire within our own Gibraltar of the American hemisphere and let the rest of the world be overrun by the power of the Soviet Union.

He would include Great Britain in the Gibraltar, but without any clear indication as to how she is to escape conquest if she is surrounded by Soviet power on the other side of her narrow seas. He seems to suppose that South America would escape, though I feel that he underestimates the existing threat of infiltration in the Latin American Republics and the certainty of this infiltration bursting to active conquest. The prospect, therefore, that he offers is that of a fortified North American Continent, with no certainty that all the countries to the south of us, even on this continent, will remain free.

It is true that such a continent can subsist from its own resources, though only with trouble and sacrifice. Tin for our canned foods and kitchen pots and pans, uranium for atomic bombs, tea for our comfort are not easily dipensed with. Our standard of living would be lower than it is today. There would be, however, two catastrophes to which we could not easily accustom ourselves. The first would be a spiritual adjustment to the fact that we have been defeated in our hopes and actions in support of a free world. Defeat does not rest easily on a proud and once powerful people. It would affect us individually and governmentally in ways which cannot be foreseen, but all of these ways would be for the worse.

The other factor to which we would have difficulty in adjusting ourselves is that of being driven from the seas. Our respected ex-President expressed the belief that we could retain superiority in the air and on the sea. Except for the destruction of civilian populations by long-range bombing, our air superiority, unsupported by land bases, would have little meaning. As to the sea, we would be faced with scores of submarine nests lining the shores of Western Europe, Africa, and Asia. Most of our merchant marine would be sunk. The remainder would have nowhere to go. Again, our fresh-water estuaries would be filled with unused vessels. It would scarcely be worth while even to put them in "mothballs."

It seems clear to me, Mr. President, that we shall have to rule out the suggestions of our loved and respected ex-President, based though they are on a far clearer picture of the difficulties than is officially presented to us.

The other voice raised in constructive criticism was that of the senior Senator from Ohio on this floor. He plainly recognized the difficulties which Mr. Hoover saw so clearly, but he placed them in a broader frame. He was seeking the means of retaining a free world and retaining our own freedom in it. He did not appear to me to be hopeless of the possibility of maintaining that freedom. He was deeply concerned that the means we employ for that purpose should be effective and within the ability of our Nation to perform. What follows, Mr. President, is therefore less a criticism of the proposals made by the Senator from Ohio than it is a suggested extension of them going into more detail and pointing out hopeful lines of policy and action.

The purpose to be served is that the American people shall live as a free people and preferably in a free world, for only as we live in a free world can we be entirely free ourselves.

The purpose is one to which every patriotic American citizen will subscribe. It is the purpose of every one of us as individuals. It is a purpose sufficiently high to warrant the support and sacrifices of our people. In this purpose we are at one with our Government. It is in regard to the means of carrying out this purpose that some confusion and dissension have arisen.

The means so far have been almost entirely military, though there has been some action in the field of propaganda, particularly with reference to the Voice of America. There has been some political activity as well, though, for the most part it has been in support of the military means.

Militarily, our policy sums up in the two doctrines of "containment" and "getting tough."

As a strictly military undertaking, containment is proving to be impractical, as might have been predicted from the start. It is 20,000-odd miles around the perimeter of the homeland and the adjacent activated regions within which the Soviet Government operates. This perimeter extends from Bering Straits around to the North Cape. At any point in this 20,000 miles the interior government can at will foment discord or start military action. It can keep us rushing from one threatened point to another. It can exhaust our manpower and our resources in carrying out this unsupported policy of military containment. It not only can do so, it is doing so; and in so doing it is not as yet seriously committing its own manpower and material strength. It has us at a tremendous disadvantage. It knows how to exploit that disadvantage. We are being run ragged and know that on this basis the future holds in store nothing except an indefinite extension and expansion of this exhausting process. Containment as a military undertaking is bound to ruin us.

Getting tough is related to our policy of containment. The theory was that the Soviet Government respects only power and that a determined display of power would cause the Soviet Government to recede wherever and whenever we made our display.

This childlike faith has not worked out in practice. Not only are we limited in our physical capacity to get tough but we are restrained by moral scruples which have no effect on our Soviet opponents. For them, there is no criterion of morality except a judgment as to whether a given procedure will support the expansion of the power of the Politburo. Getting tough has its limitations, and for us the limitations are quickly reached.

Mr. President, all this is rather gloomy and would seem to indicate that we face disaster with no hope of escape. I feel, however, that that is by no means the case. There is an escape, and the route of escape has been shown us by our foes. The root lies through the use of every available means, not the military alone. A study of Soviet policy and practice also leads to the conclusion that they have developed an economy of means permitting them to carry on vast operations without corresponding commitments of their own manpower and resources. This we would do well to study and improve upon.

Our task, then, is to move in on the Politburo on all fronts at once—military, political, diplomatic, economic, spiritual, and by propaganda. We are to take the initiative. The Politburo is to be forced to the defensive. Furthermore, the full use of these associated fronts will effect that economy of means which the Soviet has devised and applied, and thus save us from the economic ruin and social disintegration on which it is counting so confidently.

Let us look first at the Asiatic sphere, in which the conflict is raging at the moment. Our criticism of the administration for its handling of this problem has been pretty severe. I think it would be well, however, if we remember that there is scarcely a Senator on this floor, on either side of the aisle, who did not applaud the decision to support by military means the people of South Korea against the aggression from the north. That decision was not primarily a military one but a political one in the broadest sense of the term "political." It was in support of the primary purpose of the United Nations, which was and is to resist aggression. We were bound to resist the invasion of South Korea. We may or may not have been wise in carrying out our obligation, but the obligation was clear to all of us if the United Nations was to survive and carry out the purposes for which it was established. It was on these grounds that the great majority of Senators, and in fact a majority of the citizens of the country, approved the action taken.

Having met with at least temporary military defeat in this undertaking, we are now faced with a decision as to whether or not we and our United Nations associates shall withdraw our forces from Korea as best we can. The considerations which rule here are the reverse of those which drew us into the conflict. The decision as to remaining or retiring is primarily a military decision and not a political one. There must be no political considerations whatsoever raised in any retirement. We must not retire for the sake of any agreement with Communist China as to membership in the United Nations, or for any other political advantage. The purity of purpose of the great undertaking incorporated in the United Nations can only be served if the question of remaining or retiring is kept completely free from political bargaining.

Korea is the Pearl Harbor of the United Nations. It represents the time and the place in which the Communist government declares itself to the world as the enemy of the principle of nonaggression. It declares itself, therefore, to be the enemy of the United Nations and of the free nations of the world which support the United Nations. That this declaration of hostility to the purposes and principles of the United Nations has so far failed of clear recognition in that body, is an astonishing fact. Day by day, week by week, we must pound home to the representatives of vacillating and self-deluded nations the significance of the attack made upon the United Nations by Communist China. The continued usefulness, the continued existence of the United Nations depends upon our doing so.

I may say, Mr. President, that I was very much disturbed when one of the leading columnists of United States journalism, on Monday, I believe, made the assertion that the United Nations should never expect to be an organization for resisting aggression, but should, on the contrary, be considered as a debating society, a forum, a place where people could talk and talk and talk. If that is all it is to be, I think we might as well decide to get out of it.

This self-revelation and self-declaration of Communist China requires action on the part of the other nations of the world. That action should come through the United Nations. It involves certainly the blockading of the coast of China. This in itself will bring no great hardship to the people of China who have always depended on their own land for the necessities of life. It can make continued aggression by Communist China much more difficult than it is at the present time. It will not be so easy to carry on large-scale aggression if the only available supplies have to come in through Russia. An active blockade will perceptibly slow down military activity in any direction—north, east, west, or south.

But the United Nations may vacillate. It may not promptly authorize a blockade. It certainly will not do so through the Council and may not do so through the Assembly. In this case, agreement must be made with the other powers principally involved, namely, England and France. England must decide whether to serve the cause of freedom or the cause of tyranny and aggression. She must decide whether to repeat her disastrous policy when faced by the Japanese invasion and seizure of Manchuria in 1931. Her commercial relations with Japan then stayed her hand and blinded her mind and her conscience. Having

submitted in that instance she was in no position effectively to protest the conquering of Ethiopia by Mussolini in 1935. She was in no position to protest the conquering of the Rhineland by Hitler and the subsequent conquering of Austria. She weakly submitted to the invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1938 and only resisted the invasion of Poland too late to stop the Second World War.

The conscience and judgment of the British people must be focused on the high issues involved in Great Britain's possession and use of the island of Hong Kong. The public opinion of the world must be focused upon and support the pressure from conscientious and intelligent citizens of Great Britain on their irresolute government. This issue must be so sharply drawn that her government shall have no alternative but to serve its own interests and the interests of its people in sacrificing the paltry millions or billions of the Hong Kong trade to the great purpose of maintaining the free world.

The next problem which has to be faced in the Asiatic area is as to whether or not use shall be made of the Nationalist forces in Formosa. This problem is not a simple one. Against a recollection of corruption in the past we have to balance a confession of misguided attempts by us to form a coalition with the Communists. We have to consider likewise the well-nigh universal report from Formosa that the Nationalist army is high in morale, reasonably well cleared of graft and that the government of the island is to a reasonable degree acceptable to its inhabitants. This seems to add up to the conclusion that the leader has learned his lesson and is able to apply it. We must not expect perfection, but it seems reasonable to expect very greatly improved performance by the Nationalists, both militarily and governmentally.

The question before us is as to whether they shall have our support in activating and supplying the guerrilla forces in mainland China, and whether as a further step we shall assist in the landing of Nationalist forces in bodies small or large on the shore of the mainland.

As a political question this would seem to be technically allowable so long as the Nationalist Government is recognized as a member of the United Nations. They should properly remain members so long as Communist China is not admitted; and Communist China cannot be admitted without destroying the United Nations so long as it maintains its aggressive status, whether recognized or unrecognized as such.

In all this we must be governed by the reactions of the Chinese people themselves. This relates not merely to willingness to make a new trial of the Nationalist Government, but particularly as to whether such action would tend to consolidate opposition to the Communist government. Most of the information coming out of China seems to indicate growing opposition to the Communist government. Should that turn out to be the case, the ground is already prepared for useful intervention on the mainland by the Nationalist armies.

But these are not the only things to be considered. To the extent that there has been real agrarian reform we must have assurances that any programs for splitting up large land holdings into peasant ownership will be maintained. We must be sure that the return of the Nationalist armies does not bring a return of the great feudal estates. The army must be one of true liberation. This must be clearly understood beforehand.

The great objection to this program is that we may find ourselves at war with Communist China. That government might conceivably declare war on us were we to support the program just described. If that meant we would have to invade them and set out for a conquest of the great Chinese Empire, by ourselves or with what allies we could scrape together, the undertaking would be ruinous. We must not make the attempt.

We must in fact make it clear that we have no designs of our own on Chinese territory or resources. We can blockade their government against outside supplies. We can support a return of Nationalist Chinese to China. But we do not have to engage in an attack of our own. In fact, we must not do so no matter how badly the Nationalist project may be going. Here we have an opportunity to firmly maintain a policy of economy of means. We will permit and will supply some of the necessary resources for an occupation of China by the Chinese. We will not waste our own manpower on the hopeless undertaking of conquering China.

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

Mr. FLANDERS. I shall be happy to yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I am very much interested in what the Senator from Vermont is now discussing. Assume that we liberated the Nationalist Chinese from Formosa and put them on the mainland. I think it is generally conceded that we would have to support them with naval and air forces, and would have to supply them.

Mr. FLANDERS. That is doubtless true.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Supposing it became difficult for us, under developing circumstances in other directions, either to maintain the blockade or to provide the supplies, thus leaving the Nationalist forces on the mainland of China in a rather precarious position, would we not be accused throughout Asia of having deserted an ally? That is the first point.

The corollary is that if the Nationalist Chinese troops landed on the mainland of China and ran into disaster, would there not be an enormous moral pressure, at least, on this country to supplement the Nationalist Chinese forces with forces of our own? If we refused to furnish such forces, would we not be accused of having run out on an ally? I should appreciate the Senator's observations on that point very much.

Mr. FLANDERS. There is much wisdom in the questions raised by the Senator from Colorado. He states certain contingencies which we must consider. In the first place, it would seem to me that our relationship to the Nationalist Government of China would have to be, not of inciting them to activity, but of supporting them on their own strong pleas. In other words, we must be in the position of having been urged to support them, instead of being in the position of urging them to move. That point must be clear on the record, and it must be clear in fact. Unless the Nationalist Government is prepared to move and is prepared to take the initiative in such an undertaking, we must stand clear of it.

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

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Even assuming that the Nationalist Chinese said, "We want only so much help from you, and not more," and supposing that fact were publicized to the ends of the earth, would the mass feeling in Asia be changed by that fact? I mean would it not be simple to point out that in our own self-interest we had stimulated the Nationalist Chinese into going to the mainland of China, but that when they had run into disaster, out of supplies, or had run out of our embargo, because we might not be able to continue it, would not the word be passed all over Asia that the United States had pushed the Nationalist Chinese into a war on the mainland and then had run out on them? I mean as a practical matter.

Mr. FLANDERS. The practical questions, it seems to me, largely hinge on whether we can make the case publicly and honestly that we are being asked and urged, instead of doing the asking and urging ourselves. There is one other thought I should like to express at this point, and that is that we must have the assurance, as I mentioned a little while ago, that the return of the Nationalists to the mainland of China will not involve a back-tracking on any agrarian reform which has been going on in China, but that the Nationalist Government will be committed to a continuance of it. That puts the question in a little different aspect than would be the case if we urged the Nationalist Chinese to return to the mainland. At least it seems so to me.

One other point is that in this respect we find ourselves sensitive in a way in which the members of the Politburo do not have to be sensitive. The Politburo has established principles which permit it to try in one place, for example, and if the effort does not succeed, to withdraw; then to try at another place, and if that effort does not succeed, to withdraw again. One of our problems is to establish the waging of the contest for freedom on something of the same basis. I must say that, because of our sensitivity and the wrong position in which we find ourselves with Asiatic nations, it is rather difficult for us to do so. However, that is one of the problems to which we must address ourselves.

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

Mr. FLANDERS. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Virginia after the Senator from Colorado has concluded his series of observations.

Mr. MILLIKIN. First, I should like to register disagreement with the proposition that, as a quid pro quo for our assistance of the type that we have been discussing we should lay down conditions as to the kind of government that should be established in China. However, that is a large subject, and I shall not plague the Senator with it at the present time.

Mr. FLANDERS. I may say to the Senator from Colorado that I shall address myself further in support of the idea in the remaining portion of my address, not with specific reference to China, but with specific reference to the part that we play in the politics of the world.

Mr. MILLIKIN. If I may be permitted to make the observation, I would rather have a corrupt and inefficient ally on our Pacific flank than a murderous, honest, and efficient enemy on our flank. However, be that as it may, that was not the reason why I intervened. Certain difficulties present themselves in our being half in and half out of a war, or in starting a war and then pulling out of it before it is finished. Our premise assumes that we are doing something which would clearly authorize Communist China to declare war on us, to wit, that we are giving naval support and air support, and furnishing supplies.

Mr. FLANDERS. That is correct.

Mr. MILLIKIN. That makes us a coadventurer with Nationalist China. Therefore I go back to my original question: Can we speculate? Can we, while maintaining our prestige, go in with Nationalist Chinese, and withdraw at will, without doing the very thing that we do not want to do, to wit, lose the respect of all of Asia and perhaps a considerable part of the rest of the world?

Mr. FLANDERS. I will say to the Senator from Colorado that the problem seems to me to be finding the means of placing ourselves in the position of doing the most effective things, whatever they may be, so long as they are not dishonorable, in support of the major undertaking of a free America in a free world. It would seem to me to be largely a matter of presenting our purposes and our means before the bar of the world, rather than trying to save face on each element of a given situation. This will involve, as I suggest and shall continue to suggest, pressure on Soviet Russia from every imaginable direction, by every imaginable means, continuously, day in and day out, week in and week out, month in and month out, and year in and year out. In other words, it is an all-out contest by every possible means. My guess is that we should be able to justify ourselves in this pragmatic approach to the problem if the total purpose is completely revealed and completely understood.

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

Mr. MILLIKIN. May I ask one more question?

Mr. FLANDERS. Yes.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The distinguished Senator has placed himself on record on what I think is a very inspiring theme, to wit, the necessity for the United Nations to act with honor, which is contrary to the way it has been acting so far as the aggression in Korea is concerned. Would we be acting in good honor, knowing in advance that the Nationalist Chinese forces in Formosa are most likely unable to wage successful war on the mainland of China out of their own strength, and knowing in advance that for them to wage a successful war on the mainland they must have our naval help, our air support, and the help of our supplies, could we, in good honor, after committing them to that kind of an adventure, pull out and say, "Well, boys, it did not work; we are going back home"?

I am not taking a position. I am trying to work this out in my own mind. Where would we be? Suppose there were a disaster on the mainland of China. Suppose they were driven back again. What would be our position of honor? What would be our moral position, so far as sustaining those troops is concerned? Could we wash our hands of the matter and say, "It is too bad. We made it clear when we went in that we might run out on you, and we are running out on you"? Where would we stand with ourselves? I am talking about saving our own face. Where would we stand with ourselves if we got into that kind of a situation? What is the criticism that we are leveling at our partners in the United Nations for doing the same sort of thing so far as our action in Korea is concerned?

Mr. FLANDERS. That, however, is a question of principles, and not of tactics or strategy. It seems to me that we can maintain our position on the basis of principles, that we can clearly state our relationship to the desire on the part of the Nationalist forces to have their chance, and clear ourselves on that score, as a practical matter, in advance.

I do not know whether that answer will satisfy the Senator from Colorado, but I am strongly of the feeling that the Russians have developed a technique which they are able to use effectively, and it seems to me that we must develop the same possibilities in our own technique, stopping short only at the barrier raised at the question of deceit or honesty. That is where we stop in following the Russians.

Mr. MILLIKIN. It may well be, I respectfully suggest, that we may have to adopt some of the tactics of our enemies. At the same time, we cannot talk about honor and morality for one part of our endeavor, and forsake honor and morality in other parts of our endeavor. Oh, we can, and we do; but I am still wondering whether we should.

Mr. FLANDERS. The question between the Senator from Colorado and the Senator from Vermont seems to me to be as to whether we can make our position clear in advance, so that our honor and morality cannot be questioned, and apply ourselves to the purely practical and pragmatic task of trying to make as much trouble for Russia as possible, with the hope and expectation that in the long run it will be good for the people of China as well.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Would we be in a defensible position if we were to encourage someone to get into a fight which he would be bound to lose without our continued help, and then withdrew our continued help? Would we be in a position of high honor and morals if we were to withdraw? What would be the effect on the one whom we had encouraged to open the fight, and whom we had forsaken; and what would be the effect on the world in general—particularly those parts of the world whose minds and hearts we wish to conquer?

Mr. FLANDERS. I will say to the Senator from Colorado that there is a great difference in my own mind between the words "help" and "encourage." We must keep that distinction in mind in connection with the Chinese Nationalist possibility.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I suggest that the Chinese Nationalists would, of course, want to go on the mainland if they knew that they had our help and encouragement. I am quite sure that they would ask us for help and encouragement. Thus we might say, "We have gone into this only because you have asked us to do so." But we also come down to the hard reality of having gone along with this plan for our own benefit. Where do we stand when we forsake our allies?

Mr. FLANDERS. That is the question between the Senator and myself. As I have previously stated, I am taking a little from the book of the Politburo, always stopping short of deceit. That involves a real understanding, both on the part of the Nationalists and on the part of the rest of the world, as to what is going on.

I wonder if the Senator from Colorado will permit me to yield to other Senators. Then, refreshed—he may even use my glass of water—he can return to the discussion.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I have not yet tired.

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

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Vermont is making an exceptionally fine speech, to which I have listened with great interest. I wish to express my approval of the striking way in which he posed the issue confronting the United Nations, when he said that Korea was the Pearl Harbor of the United Nations.

Mr. FLANDERS. May I interrupt for a moment to say that my speech gets better from here on? [Laughter.]

Mr. ROBERTSON. I shall make my observations very brief in order to hear the best part of the Senator's speech.

There is only one suggestion to which I wish to lead up. We all know—and I was a supporter of Woodrow Wilson and the League of Nations—that the League of Nations failed when confronted with the aggression of Mussolini in Ethiopia and the aggression of the Japanese war lords in Manchuria, and when Hitler violated the Versailles Treaty by fortifying the Rhine. Three times an organization formed to stay the hand of the aggressor ran out on the problem. We said, "We are not going to make the same mistake twice." The distinguished Senator from Vermont has very clearly stated that if the United Nations had run out on this problem it would have been only a debating society.

I agree with him that it was a political decision. I agree with him that the question of whether or not we should now withdrawn from Korea is a military decision. The Senator from Vermont did not see fit to discuss—and I shall not inject it into his speech—the question of whether or not, as intimated by the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], our allies provided the measure of help which we anticipated when they voted for us to make a stand under the United Nations flag. In my opinion, many of them gave us only token help.

This is the point I am coming to: If I correctly understood the distinguished Senator from Vermont, he was proceeding to analyze the pros and cons of our giving active support to the Nationalists in Formosa in making an attack upon the mainland of China. I did not understand him to say that after reviewing all the pros and cons he is now advocating that step, but he has mentioned it. At that point the distinguished Senator from Colorado referred to some hazards which would be involved. Has the distinguished Senator from Vermont fully reflected upon those hazards?

I did not understand the Senator from Vermont or the Senator from Colorado to mention another hazard which I think would be involved, and that is what I understand to be the defensive alliance between the Soviet Union and the Chinese Government, in accordance with the terms of which the Soviet Union would render military support to China if attacked. I wish to ask the distinguished Senator from Vermont, therefore, before he comes to the very fine part of his speech, which I await with great interest, if he will not include a discussion of the question whether or not we would be then and there at war with Russia, not only in China, but on the continent of Europe, or wherever she might see fit to wage such a war. If we send our Navy and our Air Force in support of the Nationalists of China against the Reds of China, and the Russians come in with their air force, their submarines, and whatever else they may choose to send into the conflict, are we not then at war with Russia?

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I wish to say only a word or two in response to the question of the Senator from Virginia. What he suggests is, of course, one of the possibilities which we face. There is one axiom which I think we can have reason to believe is firmly fixed in the minds of the Politburo, that is, not to wage war on two fronts. Their interior position perhaps gives them advantages in doing that. But I think we can be quite sure that they will not wage serious war both in Asia and in Europe. If they are going to war, they will take those fronts seriatim instead of together.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point, because I think there should be mentioned a bit of information which has come over the wires since the able Senator from Vermont started his address, to which we have been listening with great interest. According to both the Associated Press and the United Press, the Peking radio is at the present time or was at the time they picked it up, broadcasting Communist China's answer to the latest UN cease-fire proposal, and according to the two wire services, as it appears on the ticker in the anteroom, Chou en-Lai, Chinese Foreign Ambassador, has rejected the proposal. Whether they have offered counterproposals or not has not come in over the wire.

I might merely point out to the able Senator, who in his discussion with the Senator from Colorado has raised some very pertinent points, that there are certain things to be considered. Number one: It seems to me that in connection with any policy which the Government of the United States might develop we should have as much factual information as is possible. It was for that reason that the Senator from California some time ago suggested that it would be wise if a competent American mission—and I merely suggested a man of the caliber of General Wedemeyer, who is thoroughly familiar with the Far East and is, I think, one of the ablest strategists in the American Army—were sent to Formosa personally to go over the condition of the troops there, and to secure accurate information which I think we should always have before embarking upon a policy. I can say without fear of contradiction that I am sure the government of the Republic of China on Formosa would welcome such a mission; would throw open to him all the facilities so that he could get not only the information as to the morale and the training of their more than 500,000 troops on that island, but also the condition of their supplies and their munitions and so forth, which means help to answer some of the questions raised by the Senator from Colorado.

The second thing it seems to me we should constantly keep in mind is that, as of today at least, the government of the Republic of China is a member of the United Nations—this point has been brought out by the Senator from Vermont—it is a permanent member of the Security Council, and of the 60 members of the United Nations, all but 17 recognize it as the legal government of the country. So that it would appear to me that in international law and otherwise, in view of the fact that the Chinese Communist regime is making war upon the United Nations in Korea by an act of aggression, we would be on sound ground if we furnished supplies to the legal government of the country, not only for the defense of Formosa but also for such raids upon the Chinese coast as the quality and quantity of their troops would permit. That would furnish diversionary action, and would not permit the concentration of Chinese troops for the purpose of throwing the United States Eighth Army and the United Nations forces in Korea back into the sea.

Mr. FLANDERS. I thank the Senator from California for his observation.

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

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should like to associate myself with the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON]——

Mr. FLANDERS. Physically he has run out on the Senator.

Mr. MILLIKIN. What happened to him? As I started to say, I should like to associate myself with the distinguished Senator from Virginia in his praise of the Senator's remarks regarding the attitude of the United Nations toward the cease-fire proposition. I think it represents an act of degradation, and I feel that it may be the beginning of the end of the United Nations. It does not help the case any to say that we figured the proposal would not be accepted. The boys who are dying in Korea deserve better than that kind of a silly diplomatic minuet.

Mr. FLANDERS. I associate myself with the Senator from Colorado in that sentiment.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I thank the Senator very much. I wish to say that I am not arguing any position here, but I am very much concerned about the possible benefits and dangers of intervention of Nationalist China, and I am trying to get the facts upon which to reach a conclusion.

I wish also to congratulate the Senator from Vermont upon being willing to engage in debate upon the subject. We talk about this as "a great debate." In the main part, this consists of a series of great affirmations undisturbed and uninfluenced by debate. May I congratulate the Senator on his being willing to interrupt the consecutive quality of his speech for the sake of throwing light around this Chamber?

Mr. FLANDERS. I express my appreciation both of the sentiments of the Senator from Colorado and of the language in which he expresses them.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so I may give some information to the Senate, and also, perhaps, throw more light on the debate and discussion which is taking place?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I have in my hand some matter which came over the ticker subsequent to the earlier dispatch which I mentioned. It says:

Chou—

The Chinese Foreign Minister—

offered a counterproposal. He said he would take part in a seven-nation conference to discuss Korea and all far eastern problems. He stipulated that the conference should be held in China. Participating would be Communist China, Russia, Britain, the United States, France, India, and Egypt.

But first, he said, all foreign troops must be withdrawn from Korea.

Chou made these demands:

1. Withdrawal of all foreign troops from Korea and settlement of the problem of Korea's international administration by the Korean people as the premise upon which the countries concerned would confer and endeavor to bring an early end to the Korean war.

2. That withdrawal of United States Armed Forces from Formosa and the Straits of Formosa and problems concerning the Far East will be included in the conference.

3. The countries to take part in the conference will be the Peoples Republic of China, Soviet Russia, England, the United States, France, India, and Egypt.

I might say parenthetically at that point, my recollection is, of course, that the Soviet Union has constantly urged that Red China be seated in the United Nations, and that Formosa be turned over to Red China. Of course, Communist China itself subscribes to that point of view. Great Britain has already urged that the Chinese Communists be seated in the United Nations, and, as a matter of fact, has been one of the leading nations that has prevented the United Nations from declaring Communist China to be the aggressor. India has constantly not only recognized but also urged that Red China be admitted into the United Nations. Accordingly, so far as I can see on the face of it, of the seven nations mentioned, four of them have definitely stated in advance that practically all the demands which Communist China has been making should be acceded to before she even enters the conference. That is the end of the parenthetical discussion on that point.

4. That the legal status of the Peoples Republic of China in the United Nations will be decided by the seven-nation conference.

Again going back to the fact that of the seven nations at least four are already committed, and perhaps they have some secret understandings with some of the others.

Mr. FLANDERS. The Senator did not mention Egypt.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Pardon me. The Peoples Republic of China, Soviet Russia, England, the United States, France, India, and Egypt.

Mr. FLANDERS. I think we can count Egypt in.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes. So at least four, and possibly five, of the seven already are fairly well determined as to their position in regard to Communist China's admission into the United Nations and, probably, the turning over of the 7,500,000 free people of Formosa to the tender mercies of the Chinese Communists.

I already have read, I believe, this portion of the dispatch:

4. That the legal status of the Peoples Republic of China in the United Nations will be decided by the seven-nation conference.

In other words, it will be taken out of the hands of the 60 members of the United Nations, and will be decided by a conference of seven nations, at least a majority of whom already have expressed their opinion on the subject. So the "jury" will be "packed," even before the conference begins.

The dispatch concludes with the following:

5. That the seven-nation conference will be held in China.

So the representatives of those nations will, in an abject way, with their hats in their hands, go to that conference, and will wish to give the Communist China aggressors all they have sought for; and they want those assurances before they will consider the latest United Nation's proposal.

Mr. FLANDERS. I will say to the Senator from California that it would seem that that proposal is so preposterous that our representative in the United Nations would not touch it at all, not even with a 10-foot pole.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to the Senator from Vermont that up until the time when the representative of the United States in the United Nations voted recently, I would have agreed with the Senator from Vermont. However, it seems to me the proposal then agreed to is so preposterous and such a great weakening of our moral position, that I greatly fear the later proposal may also be agreed to. I join with the Senator from Vermont in hoping that that will not be so; but I say to him that if these proposals were accepted, they would, in fact, be an instrument of surrender which the government of the Communist regime in China had presented to the nations of the free world, so that they could make an abject surrender, at gun's point, to the aggression which the Communist regime already has conducted.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, we have had debate. I hope we shall continue to have debate, as suggested by the Senator from Colorado, because on this question what we need is debate, rather than simple oratory. I am grateful to the Senator from Colorado for having introduced a real element which has to be considered.

Mr. President, I am not quite clear in my mind just where I stopped reading my prepared manuscript, so I shall ask the Official Reporter to correct any hiatus or any overlapping, as the case may be, when I resume with the presentation of my prepared remarks.

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

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The Senator from Vermont was just about to come to the gems which he had thus far withheld from us.

Mr. FLANDERS. Yes; my presentation becomes "gemier" as it proceeds.

Mr. President, a few words more may be said with regard to other threatened areas in Asia.

While the fortunes of guerrilla warfare go up and down in Indochina, for the moment the Communist forces there seem to be in retreat. Militarily speaking, those forces can be weakened by the engagement of the forces of Communist China with Nationalist infiltration. The engagement of those forces will help the situation there, as well as the situation in Korea.

We must recognize that in Indochina, as in other parts of Asia, the great desire of the people is for freedom. We must not oppose this idea; we must support it. In Indochina, as in Indonesia, there is needed the same recognition of the aspirations of the people which was brought about by the mediation between the Netherlands Government and the Indonesians which was carried to so successful a conclusion by our own former associate on this floor, Senator Frank Graham, of North Carolina. In the establishment of the Indonesian Republic he has a living monument to his devotion. There is needed a similar undertaking as between the French and the people of Indochina.

While I am not familiar with all that is going on politically in that disturbed area, there are many indications that recent successes of the French may be due to a decision on their part that freedom for their former colony is desirable and necessary. Economically there will never be any hope that France can draw a net profit from its possession of Indochina. As a free nation trading with a free nation, there is every hope that their long experience may lead to commercial relationships which are mutually profitable. The dealings of free people with each other benefit all. That is one of the ideals toward which our world policy must persist in leading the world.

To assist in the stabilizing of a free Asia, we have the resources of a point-4 program available to them and to us. This program, wisely carried out, can lead to satisfied social conditions in southeast Asia and retain that great area, rich in natural resources, within the boundaries of the free world. Economic and spiritual forces can pay off where military expenditures alone and unsupported are hopeless. This is the dollars-and-cents balance-sheet expression of the advantages of morally right policies. Our self-interest, if of sufficiently long range, will be found to be in parallel with, rather than in opposition to, policies determined on a profound moral basis.

In this brief résumé of the problems of the Pacific area, Mr. President, they have been treated as though they were self-contained and could be considered without reference to the threatening aspects of Soviet policy in other parts of the world. This is only partly true. It is true only to the extent that certain special problems which have to be specially considered are involved here. The relationships with threatened aggression in southern and western Asia and in Europe are real and they are clear. They relate, first of all, to the status and usefulness of the United Nations. This point has already been covered. They relate almost as obviously to making sure that the Soviet Government cannot stir up trouble anywhere in the world without herself becoming involved. She has been starting trouble and getting away with it. She must not be allowed to set fires without getting scorched. If we can make sure that this is done, we can make sure that her own involvement may be at least as embarrassing to her as it is to the rest of us. That is the advantage of the general policy I am suggesting, namely, of moving in on her on all fronts, leaving the military front as a last resource in case of open war. We can put continuous and exhausting pressure on her before final military attack, as I shall endeavor further to show.

Trouble has really broken out in Eastern Asia. We see it. We feel it. We know it. There are a large number of other places in which it may break out, as the judgment of the Politburo may decide. These men determine the program. We respond to their call. There are some signs that the next point of attack may be in Iran. There certainly is uncertainty at the present moment in our relations with that country. The foreign experts sent to help them, with their 5-year plan have resigned and are coming home. A trade treaty, which has

been negotiated by Iran with the Soviet Republic, may be harmless in itself, but more probably contains the seeds of future strife and disaffection.

Mr. President, I am not going to prescribe for this trouble in Iran. I make no claim to omniscience. I do not have access to the same amount of information, nor have I thought as long on that information, in the case of Iran as I have in the case of China and the Far East.

Only one thing seems clear, and that is that we must not permit the oil of Iran, Iraq, or any other part of the Near East to go to Russia. This is not because in times of peace we should deny to anyone access on equal commercial terms to any source of supply the world over. It is only that Russia is a determined aggressor; and, as such, it should be the object of all peace-loving nations, including ourselves, to handicap her in her military operations. A peaceful Russia would have quite other treatment at our hands.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, may I take the great liberty of asking the Senator from Vermont to yield?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. It might be helpful to point out that in Iran, any opposition that might come would be directly against the arms of Russia, and the satellite process would not be involved there.

Mr. FLANDERS. Yes. So far as it was done by military pressure, it would come directly from Russia. I think that might lead us to expect that it would be done by other means. Unless Russia is ready to start a major armed conflict, a peaceful Russia would have quite other treatment at our hands.

As to Europe, Mr. Hoover and the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] sounded a much needed warning. We cannot carry on our own shoulders the burden of protecting the cradle and seat of western civilization. The countries of Europe must really want to be protected from invasion and tyranny and must be willing to do their utmost. When they are doing their part, our part can assure them of safety which neither they nor we, working alone, would be able to provide.

But let us not cry over milk which has not yet been spilled. Particularly, let us not neglect the several other things which can be done while the nations of Europe go through the political and economic throes which must be endured as they are building up their forces of defense.

Take, for instance, the question of German rearmament. That is a question difficult to solve in an effective way without arousing the fears of nations like France, who have been more than once conquered and overrun by that warlike nation. If, however, we remember that Hitler in the years subsequent to World War I made his great conquests by infiltration and used his armies mainly as the visible symbol of a conquest already made—if we remember these things, we can find a useful service for Western Germany to perform, while the knotty problem of rearming her is being worked out.

For hundreds of miles stretches the barrier and boundary between free West Germany and subjugated East Germany. The peoples on the two sides of that boundary speak the same language. They have a common history. They have, or had until modified by the Russians, common social and political institutions.

On the other hand, some of these same Germans or their predecessors were exceedingly adept under the Hitler regime in crossing boundary lines, infiltrating populations, making the position of the rulers of the countries, particularly Austria and Czechoslovakia, very difficult to maintain, and ultimately arriving at the time when these areas could be occupied by the triumphant armies of Hitler.

Have the Germans lost all knowledge of the art of infiltration? Can they revive it? If so, without masses of arms and years of training for her soldiers, the West Germans can make the position of the Russians in East Germany quite untenable. Without a mighty army, the Germans themselves can unite Germany if the impulse to do so comes from West Germany. This is the task to which these words of ours must address themselves. For this undertaking they should have complete freedom. They should have such necessary backing of funds and equipment as may be necessary. The cost will not be large. Here, indeed, is an opportunity for economy of means. Let the Germans reunite Germany, and in so doing push the area of combat far to the east of the Rhine.

Since writing this address, Mr. President, my attention has been called to an article in the February Reader's Digest, by Mr. O. K. ARMSTRONG, who is a newly elected Representative from Missouri, and who had the very valuable experience of spending some months in Germany. He came into intimate contact with the Bundestag, and even addressed it. In this copy of the Reader's Digest, there is a condensation from the New Leader of an article entitled, "The Man the Russians Fear Most in Germany." It is a description of the work done by a certain Rainer Hildebrandt, leader of an organization which calls itself The Fighters for Humanity. I shall not undertake to describe what he was doing, but I ask that every Senator obtain a copy of the latest issue of the Reader's Digest and read the article. I may say that Mr. Hildebrandt appeared in my office a few days ago, and that I was tremendously impressed with the possibilities of what he is doing. It is exactly along the lines which I had already suggested in my manuscript. I see no reason why it cannot be multiplied and intensified, and I feel very strongly indeed that it should be a major undertaking of our State Department in Western Germany.

Again, while complaining that our allies do not build up their armed strength, suppose we cast our eyes on the hundreds of thousands of displaced people in West Germany whose numbers are being augmented daily by those who escape across the boundary from the captured countries. I understand, by the way, that there has been, for some reason, a little thinning of that stream of escapees. The junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] has endeavored to get these possibilities explored and exploited. Why not do so? Instead of moaning and complaining about the inadequacy of the armies of Western Europe let us free this great mass of unemployed men to positions of trust and responsibility in guarding western civilization. We can furnish the arms and equipment.

Here again we have an economy of means by using a great human asset which we are now disregarding.

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

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Some time ago, I believe there occurred on the Senate floor a discussion regarding the possibility of bringing into our own Army acceptable material from displaced persons. There was much talk at the time, which certainly had a great deal of surface appeal. Does the Senator know what has happened to that suggestion?

Mr. FLANDERS. I have tried to find out from the junior Senator from Massachusetts. I do not want to quote him, but I came to the conclusion that he was as much puzzled as the Senator from Colorado and I are.

Mr. MILLIKIN. As I recall, as of that time there were large numbers of Poles who had demonstrated fighting ability. There were large numbers of displaced Germans who, in return for admission into our military forces and the ultimate reward of citizenship, might make very fine soldiers and, ultimately, very fine citizens for us. I have been wondering what happened to the suggestion regarding them. Perhaps there might be 150,000 or 200,000 available recruits in those categories, and thus our own manpower burdens here at home would be lessened, while aiding our own military strength.

Mr. FLANDERS. I say to the Senator from Colorado that I join him in wonder, and I hope that we can find out something about that proposal.

Mr. MILLIKIN. There may be some good reason why action along that line has not been taken, but no one, so far as I know, has come forth with the reason or at least exposed it publicly.

Mr. FLANDERS. There is, of course, the question as to whether these men should be incorporated into the United States Army, which raises the question of standards of pay, and so on, and without citizenship. There could be, however, an agreement among members of the Northern Atlantic Pact that such might be used in an army, not a national army, but one directly under the command of the Commander in Chief. That is another possibility.

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

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I was not thinking so much of the latter type of army, because that involves some very deep questions. So far as Germany is concerned, it involves military participation without Germany at the same time securing full sovereignty. That is a very distasteful thing to many Germans. I am thinking of holding out citizenship, the high-pay and American standards of living for recruiting acceptable material from displaced persons in Europe.

Mr. FLANDERS. Would the Senator reject the notion of an army which is a volunteer army—not an armed force in any way—which has not been promised citizenship and which is directly under the command of the commanding general of the western forces?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I do not reject it. I would want to do some thinking about it. But I already know in advance that there would be a great deal of opposition to it. The Germans have already indicated very clearly that they do not favor that kind of a scheme. They want to trade, and it is very natural for them to want to do so, and they want the restoration of full sovereignty.

Mr. FLANDERS. Would they feel the same way about the enlistment of Poles, Czechs, Hungarians, and Russians?

Mr. MILLIKIN. That I do not know.

Mr. FLANDERS. It would seem to me there is an area there to be explored and considered.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The real basis of my question is my wonderment that we have not been given more information pro or con on the subject.

Mr. FLANDERS. Proposals such as these die a death from mysterious causes, and there is no coroner's jury that sits on the cause of the death. I think the Senate may as well constitute itself a coroner's jury on this project. Of course, we are in a new Congress, and if the Senator from Massachusetts will reintroduce his measure, perhaps we can have it considered under more favorable conditions than was the case in the Eighty-first Congress.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I am not prepared to advocate it. I simply want to know what is the matter with it, if there is anything the matter with it.

Mr. FLANDERS. Perhaps we can get a real debate on that subject.

Mr. President, I am now referring to a matter which has already been touched on in the colloquy with the Senator from Colorado.

Here again we have an "economy of means" by using a great human asset which we are not disregarding. That economy goes further than simple numbers of men because these soldiers can be well equipped and well paid on the basis of European standards without having to have the money spent on them that we spend on our American soldiers. The standards are different. The colloquy we have just had indicates that the subject is one to which further thought may well be given.

I mention only one other recourse for getting manpower. Both Sweden and Switzerland should be approached and reasoned with continuously, with the hope of persuading them to join with the other nations of Western Europe. They will ultimately have to join or be destroyed should there be a third world war. There can be no neutrals in that war as there have been in the past.

Many hundreds of thousands of effective forces would be added if these two nations would join their neighbors in this matter. There are problems of detail in the case of Switzerland since in peacetime that country has no national army—only a series of provincial armies. But this problem could be overcome by specific legislation.

So here we have a reactivated and finally, perhaps, a rearmed Germany, a displaced-persons army, and new allies. While we are getting these things going, our older associates in the North Atlantic Pact should have worked out their fiscal and personnel problems.

Yugoslavia presents another problem. I suppose we could pay too high a price for arming Yugoslavia's resistance to attack from the satellites or from Russia itself. We certainly do not pay too high a price when we appropriate money for feeding the famished inhabitants of that region. Anything we do which brings us into favorable contact with people we will find to be worth doing. Wisdom in negotiation will keep the price of maintaining resistance in Yugoslavia within the limits of an economy of means, particularly since she will furnish her own manpower.

The results to be accomplished are exceedingly great. It needs but a glance at the map of the Mediterranean to see what free access to the shore line of Yugoslavia would do in providing the Soviet with submarine nests to harry and destroy the sea traffic of the Mediterranean. It must not have this shore. We have kept the Soviet from Greece. We are keeping it from Yugoslavia. It is true that there are already installations in Albania, but that country, surrounded as it is by Yugoslavia and Greece, cannot be effectively used so long as these two nations remain within the orbit of the Western World.

As to ourselves, the indications are clear from what has been said earlier. We should send a limited force to Western Europe to maintain the principle of our unity with them, at least in the 6-to-1 ratio suggested by Senators LODGE and KNOWLAND. We should send them a profusion of planes and other ordnance and equipment. So much for military plans.

An economic offensive offers many advantages. We should agree with our European allies that the blockade of the countries behind the curtain shall be absolute so far as anything we may send them is useful in preparing for or waging war. We can consider a normal peacetime interchange, such as of food from the Danube Valley, in exchange for purely consumer goods such as textiles and bicycles, for example. But nothing must get through the curtain that is applicable to the manufacture of wartime goods.

During the Second World War we developed the term and practiced preclusive buying to prevent goods of strategic value from falling into the hands of the enemy. This means that we outbid the enemy for the world supply of such things as industrial diamonds. It may be necessary to reinstitute this procedure on our part to a more complete extent than it is now operated. Nothing which supports warfare must get through the curtain. When we say nothing we must mean nothing. Our North Atlantic allies clear down the line must be as firm as we are in this matter, for it is a matter of life and death from the military standpoint. A Germany engaged in reuniting itself and recovering its old sources of food supply will understand the necessity for this. The two historically neutral countries must be dealt with continuously and strongly.

With them we may perhaps have to invent a new practice, that of preclusive selling. We may, for instance, have to offer them as good terms on fuel and on coarse grains as they can get from the Soviet sphere. We must not permit the Soviet to demand in trade agreements goods which will have military use.

This economic offensive offers great returns for moderate expenditures. In keeping Italy and France to date out of the orbit of the Politburo, the Marshall plan produced results which 10 to 20 times the expenditure for military offense or defense would not have accomplished. The Marshall plan principle must still be maintained. It is a prime factor in the maintenance of peace with an economy of means.

All of this deals with measures to be taken on this side of the curtain. On the other side there are indications that the Soviet colossus may have feet of clay. She is weaker in her western satellites than in Asia, for they have felt the full force of her tyranny. Even in Russia itself the power of the Politburo comes by compulsion, not consent. Should the Red army start to hove westward, even that mighty force might show seams and cracks.

These weaknesses we must exploit by every means—as the war is in progress if it comes, while it is in preparation if it is delayed. We must reach satellites and Russians by every means—over, under, and through the iron curtain. Let us not forget that balloons can go where men cannot. Let us make sure that that westward march will be no summer's day picnic.

Let us now, Mr. President, see what can be done in the United Nations. In this forum, in this arena, we must not for a moment let down our attack on aggressors. However much the peoples of some misinformed or uninformed or timid nations may accept the belief that we are the aggressors, those who sit in the Council and the Assembly of the United Nations know that this is not so. They know that North Korea was the unprovoked aggressor on June 25, 1950. They know that that aggression was followed up by a massive aggression on the part of Communist China. They know that these aggressions were organized by the Soviet Government. We must never for a moment allow them to forget that we know this, that they know it, and that we know that they know it.

At the same time, Mr. President, we must continuously display the shining side of this dark shield. The United Nations has peacetime possibilities which we should be earnestly working to develop and which we hope will in time prevail. Some of these peacetime possibilities relate to the very questions which are at issue in the world-wide conflict which the Soviet Government has reinitiated. One of them is access to oil.

It is true that Russia lacks a supply of oil adequate to the size of its population and its requirements for industrial growth. It is true that there are within easy reach of its borders such abundant supplies of this precious substance as are found in Saudi Arabia, in Iran, and in Iraq. It is true that we will endeavor to cut them off from these supplies. But it is also true that should a Russian Government join the peace-loving nations, it will be possible to work out arrangements whereby commercial access to these supplies is available to the people of Russia on the same terms that it is available to the peoples of Western Europe and America. We must be tireless in presenting these possibilities. We must make it seem foolish to other nations that any nation would fight for opportunities which could be granted freely in a free world.

Another of the ancient grievances of the Russian people has been the fact that they have been completely hemmed in on their whole perimeter from access to the sea by ice on the north and by the narrow seas on the east, west, and south, which were and are in the hands of nations which seek to prevent Russian control of these valuable passages.

Here again, should we not enunciate the principle that in a peaceful world and in a United Nations made up of nations who are truly peace loving, it should be possible to solve this age-old problem? It should be possible to put the Dardanelles, the narrow passages of Scandanavia, Gibraltar, the Suez Canal, and even the Panama Canal under the protection and control of a United Nations force and a United Nations administration, so that all the nations of the world had equality and freedom of access. Of course this could be done only with a United Nations made up of peace-loving nations. It is another shining hope to be held out through good times and bad, through sun and cloud, by ourselves and other peace-loving members of that organization.

There must also be held out the possibility of disarmament. This would mean disarmament not merely in atomic or hydrogen bombs, but in all the categories of heavy armament and high-powered explosives. It is necessarily only that the nations agree to do this and willingly submit to inspection and control by United Nations officials. To refuse such inspection and control is plainly to indicate to the rest of the world that things are going on which one does not wish the rest of the world to see. Our Nation and the other nations of the western world can open themselves freely, frankly, and fully on this matter. The same freedom, frankness, and fullness of inspection and control on the part of Russia can free her people from any fear of destruction and sudden death by military action from the skies above, the land beneath, or the waters which surround the earth. Peace is here for the asking and for the responsible acceptance of it. This must be said over and over and over.

This offer of peace involves the establishment of United Nations forces and of a freedom of communication which is one of the essentials of freedom in life and institutions. To attain this freedom of communication and freedom from fear is, after all, a simple thing to do. We must always be ready to discuss it and to negotiate for it. The United Nations must be an institution of doors open at all times and under all circumstances for the discussion of the means for attaining peaceful relations between its members.

Along with this must go a continued and intense campaign, world-wide, for getting people in communication with people. Such communication, honestly established, would reveal to each nation that there are no people of its sister nations who desire to make war upon it, who desire to seize territory or natural wealth which properly belongs to it. The great desire in the hearts of all men is to do away with war and fighting. If men can get in contact with men, the forces which drive us toward war will be weakened and diminished.

We need a great movement among the peoples not for peace alone, for real peace cannot exist in the presence of slavery and injustice; we need a movement of all the peoples of the earth for a peace which is based on freedom and justice.

To say all this is not to deal in abstractions. The Russians were not dealing in abstractions when they sold Communist ideals to the people of China. They had ideas to sell and they sold them. It mattered not that they had never practiced those ideals themselves. It mattered not that in the countries which they rule those ideals were betrayed. Ideals were set up which were attractive to the people, and the people followed them as the children followed the Pied Piper of Hamelin into the cave of oblivion.

We have something more powerful to sell. We have to sell a real appreciation of and reliance upon the brotherhood of man under the fatherland of God. If we can display the spirit of this doctrine in practice, if we can keep it in the forefront of our thoughts and actions, we will find the ultimate in the "economy of means." That ultimate is the continuous preaching and practice not of the "big lie" but of the great truth.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to commend the distinguished Senator from Vermont for his very able presentation. I listened to a portion of his address, and I have read the rest of it. I congratulate him on his common-sense approach, and on the idealism and spiritual faith with which he speaks.

PRICING PRACTICES

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on Monday, January 8, the Supreme Court handed down its decision in the case of the Standard Oil Co. versus the Federal Trade Commission. The Court divided five to three, with Mr. Justice Minton taking no part in the consideration or decision of the case, in view of the fact that he had written the opinion in the court below, when he was a judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

Mr. Justice Reed wrote the dissent for the three-judge minority, being joined by the Chief Justice and Mr. Justice Black.

The opinion of the Court was delivered by Mr. Justice Burton.

This decision is a matter of interest, I am sure, to many of my colleagues, particularly those who participated in the so-called basing-point pricing controversy.

Actually, of course, the point at issue was not basing-point pricing at all; the real question was whether it was lawful to sell at a reduced price to a particular buyer in order to meet in good faith the legal price of a competitor.

The Supreme Court has decided that it is lawful.

Also involved, of course, was the question of whether a seller might quote and sell at delivered prices or absorb freight, acting independently and in good faith, for the purpose of meeting competition.

This is the decision of the Supreme Court which we were told Congress must await before it could take any action to clarify the confusion and uncertainty existing with respect to the interpretation of section 2 (b) of the Clayton Act, as amended by the Robinson-Patman Act.

We were told that if Congress acted in the way proposed we should be coercing the Supreme Court.

Congress did act; and the President vetoed the bill. Now we have a decision of the Supreme Court which follows the view taken by those of us who supported the bill which Congress passed.

But, Mr. President, the fact that the Court divided five to three, and that the Justice who did not participate would undoubtedly have joined the minority if he had participated, making the decision five to four in that instance, is the most convincing evidence possible, if any evidence is needed, that there is still confusion and uncertainty and difference of opinion with respect to the proper interpretation of section 2 (b) of the Clayton Act.

I repeat, therefore, Mr. President, what I said on this floor more than a year ago: The record is so clear with regard to this confusion that I cannot see how there can be any doubt of the obligation of the Congress to speak on this question.

If Congress acts now to affirm and by statute confirm this decision of the Supreme Court, then uncertainty will be ended and there need be no fear that a change of one Justice, or a change in the mind of one Justice, might change the law. I earnestly hope, therefore, that Congress will, at this session, again grapple with this question, and again take appropriate action with the hope that this time the action which the Congress takes will not be nullified by a veto.

Mr. President, I do not wish to take the time of the Senate to discuss in any great detail the opinion of the court in the Standard Oil case; but, since I am referring to it at all, I believe it is only right I should express here my opinion that this is a well-seasoned decision, a well-written decision, a sound and salutary decision from all standpoints. We would expect no less from our former colleague, Mr. Justice Burton. We

learned while he was yet among us, to have the highest regard for the clarity of his mind and the depth of his legal knowledge; and his record on the Supreme Court bench has added new luster to his reputation.

I have said I do not wish to take the time of the Senate to discuss this decision in great detail; but if I may be permitted just a few moments more, there are one or two comments which I feel should be made.

The whole effect of the Court's decision is summed up by Mr. Justice Burton in one paragraph, which is so cogent that I wish to read it.

Speaking of subsection 2 (b) of the Clayton Act, as amended by the Robinson-Patman Act, the Court says:

> The defense in subsection (b), now before us, is limited to a price reduction made to meet in good faith an equally low price of a competitor. It thus eliminates certain difficulties which arose under the original Clayton Act. For example, it omits reference to discriminations in price in the same or different communities * * * and it thus restricts the proviso to price differentials occurring in actual competition. It also excludes reductions which undercut the lower price of a competitor. None of these changes, however, cut into the actual core of the defense. That still consists of the provision that wherever a lawful lower price of a competitor threatens to deprive a seller of a customer, the seller, to retain that customer, may in good faith meet that lower price. Actual competition, at least in this elemental form, is thus preserved.

I was extremely glad that the Court pointed out that in both the Corn Products case and the Staley case the right of a seller, under section 2 (b) of the Clayton Act, as amended, to meet in good faith an equally low price of a competitor, was considered.

As the Court said:

> While this Court did not sustain the seller's defense in either case, it did unquestionably recognize the relevance of the evidence in support of that defense. The decision in each case was based upon the insufficiency of the seller's evidence to establish its defense, not upon the inadequacy of its defense as a matter of law.

That statement should dispose of a great deal of loose thinking and general foolishness with regard to the decisions in question, such as found considerable currency hereabout during the first half of 1950, and which even crept, all too often, into debate on the floor of the Senate.

This decision of the Court, and the minority opinion, serve to bring very sharply into focus the basic policy question which was at the heart of all the controversy over the so-called basing-point pricing legislation. The Court—that is, the majority of the Court, in the decision delivered by Mr. Justice Burton—takes the same position taken by those of us who supported the bill S. 1008 in the Eightieth Congress, and phrases that position, I think, more clearly perhaps than any of us did here on the Senate floor. The Court says:

> It is enough to say that Congress did not seek by the Robinson-Patman Act either to abolish competition or so radically to curtail it that a seller would have no substantial right of self-defense against a price raid by a competitor * * * There is, on the other hand, plain language and established practice which permits a seller, through section 2 (b), to retain a customer by realistically meeting in good faith the price offered to that customer, without necessarily changing the seller's price to its other customers.
>
> In a case where a seller sustains the burden of proof placed upon it to establish its defense under section 2 (b), we find no reason to destroy that defense indirectly, merely because it also appears that the beneficiaries of the seller's price reductions may derive a competitive advantage from them or may, in a natural course of events, reduce their own resale prices to their customers.

The opposite view is clearly stated in Mr. Justice Reed's dissent, as follows:

> We believe that good faith meeting of a competitor's price only rebuts the prima facie case of violation established by showing the price discrimination. Whether the proven price discrimination is of a character that violates section 2 (a) then becomes a matter for the determination of the commission on a showing that there may be injury to competition.

Borrowing once more from the language of the court, in the opinion delivered by Mr. Justice Burton, we see that the defense contained in the proviso in section 2 (b), if so interpreted, "Would not be available when there was or might be an injury to competition at a resale level. So interpreted, the proviso would have such little, if any, applicability as to be practically meaningless."

That is the controversy which, unless the Congress acts to settle it once and for all, will remain in doubt, probably for many years, and, at least, so long as there is a possibility that what is presently the minority of the Court may become the majority through the change in mind or in person of a single Justice.

Mr. President, I ask that the complete text of the decision to which I have referred, together with the minority opinion delivered by Mr. Justice Reed, may be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the majority and dissenting opinions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES—No. 1, OCTOBER TERM, 1950—STANDARD OIL CO., PETITIONER, VERSUS FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION—ON WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SEVENTH CIRCUIT

(January 8, 1951)

Mr. Justice Burton delivered the opinion of the Court.

In this case the Federal Trade Commission challenged the right of the Standard Oil Co., under the Robinson-Patman Act,[1] to sell gasoline to four comparatively large jobber customers in Detroit at a less price per gallon than it sold like gasoline to many comparatively small service-station customers in the same area. The company's defenses were that (1) the sales involved were not in interstate commerce and (2) its lower price to the jobbers was justified because they were made to retain them as customers and in good faith to meet an equally low price of a competitor.[2] The Commission, with one member dissenting, ordered the company to cease and desist from making such a price differential (43 FTC 56). The court of appeals slightly modified the order and required its enforcement as modified (173 F. 2d 210). We granted certiorari on petition of the company because the case presents an important issue under the Robinson-Patman Act, which has not been settled by this Court (338 U. S. 865). The case was argued at our October term, 1949, and reargued at this term (339 U. S. 975).

For the reasons hereinafter stated, we agree with the court below that the sales were made in interstate commerce but we agree with petitioner that, under the act, the lower price to the jobbers was justified if it was made to retain each of them as a customer and in good faith to meet an equally low price of a competitor.

I. FACTS

Reserving for separate consideration the facts determining the issue of interstate commerce, the other material facts are summarized here on the basis of the Commission's findings. The sales described are those of Red Crown gasoline because those sales raise all of the material issues and constitute about 90 percent of petitioner's sales in the Detroit area.

Since the effective date of the Robinson-Patman Act, June 19, 1936, petitioner has sold its Red Crown gasoline to its jobber customers at its tank-car prices. Those prices have been 1½ cents per gallon less than its tank-wagon prices to service station customers for identical gasoline in the same area. In practice, the service stations have resold the gasoline at the pervailing retail service station prices.[3] Each of petitioner's so-called jobber customers has been free to resell its gasoline at retail or wholesale. Each, at some time, has resold some of it at retail. One now resells it only at retail. The others now resell it largely at wholesale As to resale prices, two of the jobbers have resold their gasoline only at the prevailing wholesale or retail rates. The other two, however, have reflected, in varying degrees, petitioner's reductions in the cost of the gasoline to them by reducing their resale prices of that gasoline below the prevailing rates.

The effect of these reductions has thus reached competing retail service stations in part through retail stations operated by the jobbers and in part through retail stations which purchased gasoline from the jobbers at less than the prevailing tank-wagon prices. The Commission found that such reduced resale prices have resulted in injuring, destroying, and preventing competition between said favored dealers and retail dealers in respondent's (petitioner's) gasoline and other major brands of gasoline" (41 FTC 263, 283). The distinctive characteristics of these jobbers are that each (1) maintains sufficient bulk storage to take delivery of gasoline in tank-car quantities (of 8,000 to 12,000 gallons) rather than in tank-wagon quantities (of 700 to 800 gallons) as is customary for service stations; (2) owns and operates tank wagons and other facilities for delivery of gasoline to service stations; (3) has an established business sufficient to in-

[1] Specifically under sec. 2 of the Clayton Act, as amended by the Robinson-Patman Act (49 Stat. 1526, 15 U. S. C., sec. 13). For the material text of sec. 2 (a) and (b) see pp. 9–10, infra.

[2] The company contended before the Commission that the price differential allowed by it to the jobbers made only due allowance for differences in the cost of sale and delivery of gasoline to them. It did not, however, pursue this defense in the court below and does not do so here.

[3] About 150 of these stations are owned or leased by the customer independently of petitioner. Their operators buy all of their gasoline from petitioner under short-term agreements. Its other 208 stations are leased or subleased from petitioner for short terms.

sure purchases of from one to two million gallons a year; and (4) has adequate credit responsibility.[4] While the cost of petitioner's sales and deliveries of gasoline to each of these four jobbers is no doubt less, per gallon, than the cost of its sales and deliveries of like gasoline to its service station customers in the same area, there is no finding that such difference accounts for the entire reduction in price made by petitioner to these jobbers, and we proceed on the assumption that it does not entirely account for that difference.

Petitioner placed its reliance upon evidence offered to show that its lower price to each jobber was made in order to retain that jobber as a customer and in good faith to meet an equally low price offered by one or more competitors. The Commission, however, treated such evidence as not relevant.

II. THE SALES WERE MADE IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE

In order for the sales here involved to come under the Clayton Act, as amended by the Robinson-Patman Act, they must have been made in interstate commerce.[5] The Commission and the court below agree that the sales were so made. (41 F. T. C. 263, 271, 173 F. 2d 210, 213–214.)

Facts determining this were found by the Commission as follows: Petitioner is an Indiana corporation, whose principal office is in Chicago. Its gasoline is obtained from fields in Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas, and Wyoming. Its refining plant is at Whiting, Ind. It distributes its products in 14 middle western States, including Michigan. The gasoline sold by it in the Detroit, Mich., area, and involved in this case, is carried for petitioner by tankers on the Great Lakes from Indiana to petitioner's marine terminal at River Rouge, Mich. Enough gasoline is accumulated there during each navigation season so that a winter's supply is available from the terminal. The gasoline remains for varying periods at the terminal or in nearby bulk storage stations, and while there it is under the ownership of petitioner and en route from petitioner's refinery in Indiana to its market in Michigan. "Although the gasoline was not brought to River Rouge pursuant to orders already taken, the demands of the Michigan territory are fairly constant, and petitioner's customers' demands could be accurately estimated, so the flow of the stream of commerce kept surging from Whiting to Detroit" (173 F. 2d at 213–214). Gasoline delivered to customers in Detroit, upon individual orders for it, is taken from the gasoline at the terminal in interstate commerce en route for delivery in that area. Such sales are well within the jurisdictional requirements of the act. Any other conclusion would fall short of the recognized purpose of the Robinson-Patman Act to reach the operations of large interstate businesses in competition with small local concerns. Such temporary storage of the gasoline as occurs within the Detroit area does not deprive the gasoline of its interstate character (*Stafford* v. *Wallace* (258 U. S. 495). Compare *Walling* v. *Jacksonville Paper Co.* (317 U. S. 564 570), with *Atlantic Coast Line R. Co.* v. *Standard Oil Co.* (275 U. S. 257, 268)).[6]

III. THERE SHOULD BE A FINDING AS TO WHETHER OR NOT PETITIONER'S PRICE REDUCTION WAS MADE IN GOOD FAITH TO MEET A LAWFUL, EQUALLY LOW PRICE OF A COMPETITOR

Petitioner presented evidence tending to prove that its tank-car price was made to each jobber in order to retain that jobber as a customer and in good faith to meet a lawful and equally low price of a competitor. Petitioner sought to show that it succeeded in retaining these customers, although the tank-car price which it offered them merely approached or matched, and did not undercut, the lower prices offered them by several competitors of petitioner. The trial examiner made findings on the point,[7] but the Commission declined to do so, saying:

"Based on the record in this case the Commission concludes as a matter of law that it is not material whether the discriminations in price granted by the respondent to the said four dealers were made to meet equally low prices of competitors. The Commission further concludes as a matter of law that it is unnecessary for the Commission to determine whether the alleged competitive prices were in fact available or involved gasoline of like grade or quality or of equal public acceptance. Accordingly the Commission does not attempt to find the facts regarding those matters because, even though the lower prices in question may have been made by respondent in good faith to meet the lower prices of competitors, this does not constitute a defense in the face of affirmative proof that the effect of the discrimination was to injure, destroy, and prevent competition with the retail stations operated by the said named dealers and with stations operated by their retailer-customers" (41 FTC 263, 281–282).

The court below affirmed the Commission's position.[8]

There is no doubt that under the Clayton Act, before its amendment by the Robinson-Patman Act, this evidence would have been material and, if accepted, would have established a complete defense to the charge of unlawful discrimination. At that time the material provisions of section 2 were as follows:

"SEC. 2. That it shall be unlawful for any person engaged in commerce, in the course of such commerce, either directly or indirectly to discriminate in price between different purchasers of commodities * * * where the effect of such discrimination may be to substantially lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly in any line of commerce: *Provided,* That nothing herein contained shall prevent discrimination in price between purchasers of commodities on account of differences in the grade, quality, or quantity of the commodity sold, or that makes only due allowance for difference in the cost of selling or transportation, or discrimination in price in the same or different communities made in good faith to meet competition: *And provided further,* That nothing herein contained shall prevent persons engaged in selling goods, wares, or merchandise in commerce from selecting their own customers in bona fide transactions and not in restraint of trade" (38 Stat. 730–731, 15 U. S. C. (1934 ed.), sec. 13).

The question before us, therefore, is whether the amendments made by the Robinson-Patman Act deprived those facts of their previously recognized effectiveness as a defense. The material provisions of section 2, as amended, are quoted below, showing in brackets those clauses which bear upon the proviso before us. The modified provisions are distributed between the newly created subsections (a) and (b). These must be read together and in relation to the provisions they supersede. The original phrase "that nothing herein contained shall prevent" is still used to introduce each of the defenses. The defense relating to the meeting of the price of a competitor appears only in subsection (b). There it is applied to discriminations in services or facilities as well as to discriminations in price, which alone are expressly condemned in subsection (a). In its opinion in the instant case, the Commission recognizes that it is an absolute defense to a charge of price discrimination for a seller to prove, under section 2 (a), that its price differential makes only due allowances for differences in cost or for price changes made in response to changing market conditions (41 F. T. C. at 283). Each of these three defenses is introduced by the same phrase "nothing * * * shall prevent," and all are embraced in the same word "justification" in the first sentence of section 2 (b). It is natural, therefore, to conclude that each of these defenses is entitled to the same effect, without regard to whether there also appears an affirmative showing of actual or potential injury to competition at the same or a lower level traceable to the

[4] Not denying the established industry practice of recognizing such dealers as a distinctive group for operational convenience, the Commission held that petitioner's classification of these four dealers as jobbers was arbitrary because it made no requirement that said jobbers should sell only at wholesale" (41 FTC at 273). We use the term "jobber" in this opinion merely as one of convenience and identification, because the result here is the same whether these four dealers are wholesalers or retailers.

[5] Sec. 2 (a) of the Clayton Act, as amended, relates only to persons "engaged in commerce, in the course of such commerce * * where either or any of the purchases involved * * * are in commerce" (49 Stat. 1526, 15 U. S. C., sec. 13 (a)). "Commerce" is defined in sec. 1 of the Clayton Act as including "trade or commerce among the several states" (38 Stat. 730, 15 U. S. C., sec. 12).

[6] The Fair Labor Standards Act cases relied on by petitioner are not inconsistent with this result. They hold that, for the purposes of that statute, interstate commerce ceased on delivery to a local distributor (*Higgins* v. *Carr Bros.* (317 U. S. 572); *Walling* v. *Jacksonville Paper Co.,* supra. The sales involved here, on the other hand, are those of an interstate producer and refiner to a local distributor.

[7] The trial examiner concluded: "The recognition by respondent [petitioner] of Ned's Auto Supply Co. as a jobber or wholesaler [which carried with it the tank-car price for gasoline] was a forced recognition given to retain that company's business. Ned's Co. at the time of recognition, and ever since, has possessed all qualifications required by respondent [petitioner] for recognition as a jobber and the recognition was given and has ever since been continued in transactions between the parties, believed by them to be bona fide in all respects." Conclusion of Fact 2, under sec. IX, R. 5098–5099.) "The differentials on its branded gasolines respondent [petitioner] granted Ned's Auto Supply Co., at all times subsequent to March 7, 1938, and Stikeman Oil Co., Citrin-Kolb Oil Co., and the Wayne Co. [the four jobbers], at all times subsequent to June 19, 1936, were granted to meet equally low prices offered by competitors on branded gasolines of comparable grade and quality." (Conclusion of fact, under sec. X, R. 5104.)

[8] "Now as to the contention that the discriminatory prices here complained of were made in good faith to meet a lower price of a competitor. While the Commission made no finding on this point, it assumed its existence but held, contrary to the petitioner's contention, that this was not a defense. * * * We agree with the Commission that the showing of the petitioner that it made the discriminatory price in good faith to meet competition is not controlling in view of the very substantial evidence that its discrimination was used to affect and lessen competition at the retail level" (173 F. (2d) at 214, 217).

price differential made by the seller. The Commission says, however, that the proviso in section 2 (b) as to a seller meeting in good faith a lower competitive price is not an absolute defense if an injury to competition may result from such price reduction. We find no basis for such a distinction between the defenses in sections 2 (a) and (b).

The defense in subsection (b), now before us, is limited to a price reduction made to meet in good faith an equally low price of a competitor. It thus eliminates certain difficulties which arose under the original Clayton Act. For example, it omits reference to discriminations in price "in the same or different communities * * *" and it thus restricts the proviso to price differentials occurring in actual competition. It also excludes reductions which undercut the lower price of a competitor. None of these changes, however, cut into the actual core of the defense. That still consists of the provision that wherever a lawful lower price of a competitor threatens to deprive a seller of a customer, the seller, to retain that customer, may in good faith meet that lower price. Actual competition, at least in this elemental form, is thus preserved.

Subsections 2 (a) and (b), as amended, are as follows:

"SEC. 2. (a) That is shall be unlawful for any person engaged in commerce, in the course of such commerce, either directly or indirectly, to discriminate in price between different purchasers of commodities of like grade and quality * * * where the effect of such discrimination may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly in any line of commerce, or to injure, destroy, or prevent competition with any person who either grants or knowingly receives the benefit of such discrimination, or with customers of either of them: *Provided,* [That nothing herein contained shall prevent] differentials which make only due allowance for differences in the cost of manufacture, sale, or delivery resulting from the differing methods or quantities in which such commodities are to such purchasers sold or delivered: * * * And *provided further,* [That nothing herein contained shall prevent] price changes from time to time * * * in response to changing conditions affecting the market for or the marketability of the goods concerned. * * *

"(b) Upon proof being made, at any hearing on a complaint under this section, that there has been discrimination in price or services or facilities furnished, [the burden of rebutting the prima-facie case thus made by showing justification] shall be upon the person charged with a violation of this section, and [unless justification shall be affirmatively shown,] the Commission is authorized to issue an order terminating the discrimination: *Provided, however,* [That nothing herein contained shall prevent] a seller rebutting the prima-facie case thus made by [showing that his lower price or the furnishing of services or facilities to any purchaser or purchasers was made in good faith to meet an equally low price of a competitor, or the services or facilities furnished by a competitor]" (49 Stat. 1526, 15 U. S. C., secs. 13 (a) and (b)).

This right of a seller, under section 2 (b), to meet in good faith an equally low price of a competitor has been considered here before. Both in *Corn Products Refining Co.* v. *Federal Trade Commission* (324 U. S. 726) and in *Federal Trade Commission* v. *Staley Manufacturing Co.* (324 U. S. 746) evidence in support of this defense was reviewed at length. There would have been no occasion thus to review it under the theory now contended for by the Commission. While this court did not sustain the seller's defense in either case, it did unquestionably recognize the relevance of the evidence in support of that defense. The decision in each case was based upon the insufficiency of the seller's evidence to establish its defense, not upon the inadequacy of its defense as a matter of law.[9]

In the Corn Products case, supra, after recognizing that the seller had allowed differentials in price in favor of certain customers, this court examined the evidence presented by the seller to show that such differentials were justified because made in good faith to meet equally low prices of a competitor. It then said:

"Examination of the testimony satisfies us, as it did the court below, that it was insufficient to sustain a finding that the lower prices allowed to favored customers were in fact made to meet competition. Hence petitioners failed to sustained the burden of showing that the price discriminations were granted for the purpose of meeting competition" (324 U. S. at 741).[10]

In the Staley case, supra, most of the Court's opinion is devoted to the consideration of the evidence introduced in support of the seller's defense under section 2 (b). The discussion proceeds upon the assumption, applicable here, that if a competitor's lower price is a lawful individual price offered to any of the seller's customers, then the seller is protected, under section 2 (b), in making a counteroffer, provided the seller proves that its counteroffer is made to meet in good faith its competitor's equally low price. On the record in the Staley case, a majority of the court of appeals, in fact, declined to accept the findings of the Commission and decided in favor of the accused seller.[11] This court, on review, reversed that judgment but emphatically recognized the availability of the seller's defense under section 2 (b) and the obligation of the Commission to make findings upon issues material to that defense. It said:

"Congress has left to the Commission the determination of fact in each case whether the person, charged with making discriminatory prices, acted in good faith to meet a competitor's equally low prices. The determination of this fact from the evidence is for the Commission. (See *Federal Trade Commission* v. *Pacific States Paper Trade Assn.* (273 U. S. 52, 63); *Federal Trade Commission* v. *Algoma Lumber Co.* (291 U. S. 67, 73).) In the present case, the Commission's finding that respondents' price discriminations were not made to meet a lower price and consequently were not in good faith, is amply supported by the record, and we think the court of appeals erred in setting aside this portion of the Commission's order to cease and desist.

* * * * * *

"In appraising the evidence, the Commission recognized that the statute does not place an impossible burden upon sellers, but it emphasized the good faith requirement of the statute, which places the burden of proving good faith on the seller, who has made the discriminatory prices. * * *

"We agree with the Commission that the statute at least requires the seller, who has knowingly discriminated in price, to show the existence of facts which would lead a reasonable and prudent person to believe that the granting of a lower price would in fact meet the equally low price of a competitor. Nor was the Commission wrong in holding that respondents failed to meet this burden" (324 U. S. at 758, 759-760).

See also, *Federal Trade Comm'n* v. *Cement Institute* (333 U. S. 683, 721-726); *Federal Trade Comm'n* v. *Morton Salt Co.* (334 U. S. 37, 43); and *United States* v. *United States Gypsum Co.* (340 U. S. 76, 92). All that petitioner asks in the instant case is that its evidence be considered and that findings be made by the Commission as to the sufficiency of that evidence to support petitioner's defense under section 2 (b).

In addition, there has been widespread understanding that under the Robinson-Patman Act, it is a complete defense to a charge of price discrimination for the seller to show that its price differential has been made a good faith to meet a lawful and equally low price of a competitor. This understanding is reflected in actions and statements of members and counsel of the Federal Trade Commission.[12] Representa-

[9] In contrast to that factual situation, the trial examiner for the Commission in the instant case has found the necessary facts to sustain the seller's defense (see note 7, supra), and yet the Commission refuses, as a matter of law, to give them consideration.

[10] In the Corn Products case, the same point of view was expressed by the court of appeals below: "We think the evidence is insufficient to sustain this affirmative defense" (144 F. 2d 211, 217 (C. A. 7th Cir.)). The court of appeals also indicated that, to sustain this defense, it must appear not only that the competitor's lower price was met in good faith but that such price was lawful.

[11] The Staley case was twice before the court of appeals for the seventh circuit. In 1943 the case was remanded by that court to the Commission for findings as to wherein the discriminations occurred and how they substantially lessened competition and promoted monopoly and also "for consideration of the defense [under sec. 2 (b)] urged by the petitioners, and for findings in relation thereto" (135 F. 2d 453, 456). In 1944, a majority of the court decided in favor of the seller (144 F. 2d 221). One judge held that the complaint was insufficient under sec. 2 (a) and that, therefore, he need not reach the seller's defense under sec. 2 (b). He expressly stated, however, that he did not take issue with the basis for the conclusion that the seller's price was made in good faith to meet an equally low price of a competitor (Id., at 227-231). His colleague held squarely that the seller's defense of meeting competition in good faith under section 2 (b) had been established (Id., at 221-225). The third judge found against the seller both under sec. 2 (a) and (b) (Id., at 225-227). The important point for us is that the court of appeals, as well as this court, unanimously recognized in that case the materiality of the seller's evidence in support of its defense under sec. 2 (b), even though the "discriminations 'have resulted, and do result, in substantial injury to competition among purchasers'" (Id., at 222).

[12] In cease-and-desist orders, issued both before and after the order in the instant case, the Commission has inserted saving clauses which recognize the propriety of a seller making a price reduction in good faith to meet an equally low price of a competitor, even though the seller's discrimination may have the effect of injuring competition at a lower level. (See *In re Ferro-Enamel Corp.* (42 F. T. C. 36); *In re Anheuser-Busch, Inc.* (31 F. T. C. 986); *In re Bausch & Lomb Optical Co.* (28 F. T. C. 186).) See also, the statement filed by Walter B. Wooden, Assistant Chief Counsel, and by Hugh E. White, examiner for the Commission, with the Temporary National Economic Committee in 1941: "The amended act now safeguards the right of a seller to discriminate in price in good faith to meet an equally low price of a competitor, but he has the burden of proof on that question. This right is guaranteed by statute and could not be curtailed by any mandate or order of the Commission * * * The right of self-defense against competitive price attack is as vital in a competitive economy as the right of self-defense against personal attack." The Basing Point Problem 139 (TNEC Monograph 42, 1941). In regard to the Commission's position on sec. 2 (b), urged in the instant case, Allen C. Phelps, assistant chief trial counsel and Chief of the Export Trade Division of the Commission, testified before the Subcommittee on Trade Policies of the Sen-

tives of the Department of Justice have testified to the effectiveness and value of the defense under the Robinson-Patman Act.[13] We see no reason to depart now from that interpretation.[14]

The heart of our national economic policy long has been faith in the value of competition. In the Sherman and Clayton Acts, as well as in the Robinson-Patman Act, "Congress was dealing with competition, which it sought to protect, and monopoly, which it sought to prevent" (*Staley Mfg. Co.* v. *Federal Trade Comm'n* (135 F. 2d 453, 455)). We need not now reconcile, in its entirety, the economic theory which underlies the Robinson-Patman Act with that of the Sherman and Clayton Acts.[15] It is enough to say that Congress did not seek by the Robinson-Patman Act either to abolish competition or so radically to curtail it that a seller would have no substantial right of self-defense against a price raid by a competitor. For example, if a large customer requests his seller to meet a temptingly lower price offered to him by one of his seller's competitors, the seller may well find it essential, as a matter of business survival, to meet that price rather than to lose the customer. It might be that this customer is the seller's only available market for the major portion of the seller's product, and that the loss of this customer would result in forcing a much higher unit cost and higher sales price upon the seller's other customers. There is nothing to show a congressional purpose, in such a situation, to compel the seller to choose only between ruinously cutting its prices to all its customers to match the price offered to one, or refusing to meet the competition and then ruinously raising its prices to its remaining customers to cover increased unit costs. There is, on the other hand, plain language and established practice which permits a seller, through section 2 (b), to retain a customer by realistically meeting in good faith the price offered to that customer, without necessarily changing the seller's price to its other customers.

In a case where a seller sustains the burden of proof placed upon it to establish its defense under section 2 (b), we find no reason to destroy that defense indirectly, merely because it also appears that the beneficiaries of the seller's price reductions may derive a competitive advantage from them or may, in a natural course of events, reduce their own resale prices to their customers. It must have been obvious to Congress that any price reduction to any dealer may always affect competition at that dealer's level as well as at the dealer's resale level, whether or not the reduction to the dealer is discriminatory. Likewise, it must have been obvious to Congress that any price reductions initiated by a seller's competitor would, if not met by the seller, affect competition at the beneficiary's level or among the beneficiary's customers just as much as if those reductions had been met by the seller. The proviso in section 2 (b), as interpreted by the Commission, would not be available when there was or might be an injury to competition at a resale level. So interpreted, the proviso would have such title, if any, applicability as to be practically meaningless. We may, therefore, conclude that Congress meant to permit the natural consequences to follow the seller's action in meeting in good faith a lawful and equally low price of its competitor.

In its argument here, the Commission suggests that there may be some situations in which it might recognize the proviso in section 2 (b) as a complete defense, even though the seller's differential in price did injure competition. In support of this, the Commission indicates that in each case it must weigh the potentially injurious effect of a seller's price reduction upon competition at all lower levels against its beneficial effect in permitting the seller to meet competition at its own level. In the absence of more explicit requirements and more specific standards of comparison than we have here, it is difficult to see how an injury to competition at a level below that of the seller can thus be balanced fairly against a justification for meeting the competition at the seller's level. We hesitate to accept section 2 (b) as establishing such a dubious defense. On the other hand, the proviso is readily understandable as simply continuing in effect a defense which is equally absolute, but more limited in scope than that which existed under section 2 of the original Clayton Act.

The judgment of the court of appeals, accordingly, is reversed and the case is remanded to that court with instructions to remand it to the Federal Trade Commission to make findings in conformity with this opinion.

It is so ordered.

Mr. Justice Minton took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

---

ate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in June 1949, that "This position, if upheld in the courts, in my judgment will effectively and completely erase sec. 2 (b) from the Robinson-Patman Act." Hearings before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on S. 236, 81st Cong., 1st sess., 66 (see also, pp. 274–275).

[13] Herbert A. Bergson, then Assistant Attorney General, testifying for the Department, January 25, 1949, said: "The section [2 (b)] presently permits sellers to justify otherwise forbidden price discriminations on the ground that the lower prices to one set of buyers were made in good faith to meet the equally low prices of a competitor. Hearings before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on S. 236, 81st Cong., 1st sess., 77. (See also, report on S. 236 by Peyton Ford, Assistant to the Attorney General, to the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce (Id., at 320).) Mr. Bergson added the following in June 1949: "While we recognize the competitive problem which arises when one purchaser obtains advantages denied to other purchasers, we do not believe the solution to this problem lies in denying to sellers the opportunity to make sales in good faith competition with other sellers." Hearings before Subcommittee No. 1 of the House Committee on the Judiciary on S. 1008, 81st Cong., 1st sess., 12.

[14] Attention has been directed again to the legislative history of the proviso. This was considered in the Corn Products and Staley cases. (See especially, 324 U. S. at 722–753.) We find that the legislative history, at best, is inconclusive. It indicates that it was the purpose of Congress to limit, but not to abolish, the essence of the defense recognized as absolute in sec. 2 of the original Clayton Act (38 Stat. 730) where a seller's reduction in price had been made "in good faith to meet competition." For example, the legislative history recognizes that the Robinson-Patman Act limits that defense to price differentials that do not undercut the competitor's price, and the amendments fail to protect differentials between prices in different communities where those prices are not actually competitive. There is also a suggestion in the debates, as well as in the remarks of this Court in the Staley case, supra, that a competitor's lower price, which may be met by a seller under the protection of sec. 2 (b), must be a lawful price. And see, S. Res. 224, 70th Cong., 1st sess., directing the Federal Trade Commission to investigate and report to it on chain-store operators and FTC final report on the chain-store investigation (S. Doc. No. 4, 74th Cong., 1st sess.). In the report of the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives, which drafted the clause which became sec. 2 (b), there appears the following explanation of it: "This proviso represents a contraction of an exemption now contained in section 2 of the Clayton Act which permits discriminations without limit where made in good faith to meet competition. It should be noted that while the seller is permitted to meet local competition, it does not permit him to cut local prices until his competitor has first offered lower prices, and then he can go no further than to meet those prices. If he goes further, he must do so likewise with all his other customers, or make himself liable to all of the penalties of the act, including treble damages. In other words, the proviso permits the seller to meet the price actually previously offered by a local competitor. It permits him to go no further." H. Rept. No. 2287, 74th Cong., 2d sess., 16. (See also, 80 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 6426, 6431–6436, 8229, 8235.) Somewhat changing this emphasis, there was a statement made by the managers on the part of the House of Representatives, accompanying the conference report, which said that the new clause was a "provision relating to the question of meeting competition, intended to operate only as a rule of evidence in a proceeding before the Federal Trade Commission" (H. Rept. No. 2951, 74th Cong., 2d sess., 7). The chairman of the House conferees also received permission to print in the RECORD an explanation of the proviso (80 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 9418). This explanation emphasizes the same interpretation as that put on the proviso in the *Staley* case to the effect that the lower price which lawfully may be met by a seller must be a lawful price. That statement, however, neither justifies disregarding the proviso nor failing to make findings of fact where evidence is offered that the prices met by the seller are lawful prices and that the meeting of them is in good faith.

[15] It has been suggested that, in theory, the Robinson-Patman Act as a whole is inconsistent with the Sherman and Clayton Acts. See Adelman, Effective Competition and the Antitrust Laws (61 Harv. L. Rev. 1289, 1327–1350); Burns, the Anti-Trust Laws and the Regulation of Price Competition (4 Law & Contemp. Prob. 301); Learned & Isaacs, the Robinson-Patman Law: Some Assumptions and Expectations (15 Harv. Bus. Rev. 137); McAllister, Price Control by Law in the United States: a Survey (4 Law & Contemp. Prob. 273).

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES—No. 1, OCTOBER TERM, 1950—STANDARD OIL COMPANY, PETITIONER, VERSUS FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION—ON WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SEVENTH CIRCUIT

(January 8, 1951)

Mr. Justice Reed, dissenting.

The Federal Trade Commission investigated practices of the Standard Oil Co. of Indiana in selling its gasoline in the Detroit area at different prices to competing local distributors, in alleged violation of the Robinson-Patman (antiprice discrimination) Act. Standard's defense is not a denial of that discriminatory practice but a complete justification, said to be allowed by the Robinson-Patman Act, on the ground of trade necessity in order to meet an equally low price in Detroit of other gasoline refiners. On concluding the practice violated Federal prohibitions against discriminatory sale prices, the Commission entered a cease-and-desist order against Standard's sale system. The order was enforced by the court of appeals after a minor modification (43 F. T. C. 56; 173 F. 2d 210).

The need to allow sellers to meet competition in price from other sellers while protecting the competitors of the buyers against

the buyers' advantages gained from the price discrimination was a major cause of the enactment of the 1936 Robinson-Patman Act. The Clayton Act of 1914 had failed to solve the problem. The impossibility of drafting fixed words of a statute so as to allow sufficient flexibility to meet the myriad situations of national commerce, we think led Congress in the Robinson-Patman Act to put authority in the Federal Trade Commission to determine when a seller's discriminatory sales price violated the prohibitions of the antimonopoly statute, section 2 (a), 49 Stat. 1526, and when it was justified by a competitor's legal price.[1] The disadvantage to business of this choice was that the seller could not be positive before the Commission acted as to precisely how far he might go in price discrimination to meet and beat his competition. The Commission acted on its interpretation of the act.[2] Believing it important to support the purpose of Congress and the Commission's interpretation of the act, with which we agree, we state our reasons.

The Court first condemns the Commission's position that meeting in good faith a competitor's price merely rebuts the prima facie establishment of discrimination based on forbidden differences in sales price, so as to require an affirmative finding by the Commission that nevertheless there may be enjoinable injury under the Robinson-Patman Act to the favored buyer's competitors. The Court then decides that good faith in meeting competition was an absolute defense for price discrimination, saying:

"On the other hand, the proviso is readily understandable as simply continuing in effect an equally absolute, but more limited defense than that which existed under section 2 of the original Clayton Act."

Such a conclusion seems erroneous. What follows in this dissent demonstrates, we think, that Congress intended so to amend the Clayton Act that the avenue of escape given price discriminators by its meeting competition clause should be narrowed. The Court's interpretation leaves what the seller can do almost as wide open as before (see p. 12 et seq., infra). It seems clear to us that the interpretation put upon the clause of the Robinson-Patman Act by the Court means that no real change has been brought about by the amendment.

The public policy of the United States fosters the free-enterprise system of unfettered competition among producers and distributors of goods as the accepted method to put those goods into the hands of all consumers at the least expense.[3] There are, however, statutory exceptions to such unlimited competition.[4] Nondiscriminatory pricing tends to weaken competition in that a seller, while otherwise maintaining his prices, cannot meet his antagonist's price to get a single order or customer. But Congress obviously concluded that the greater advantage would acrue by fostering equal access to supplies by competing merchants or other purchasers in the course of business.[5]

The first enactment to put limits on discriminatory selling prices was the Clayton Act in 1914 (38 Stat. 730, sec. 2). Section 11 enabled the Commission to use its investigatory and regulatory authority to handle price discrimination. Section 2 provided for the maintenance of competition by protecting the ability of business rivals to obtain commodities on equal terms. The Robinson-Patman Act moved further toward this objective. In the margin appear the applicable words of the Clayton Act followed by those of the Robinson-Patman Act. Phrased summarily for this case, it may be said that the italicized words in the Clayton Act were the source of the difficulties in enforcement that Congress undertook to avoid by the italicized words of the Robinson-Patman Act.[6]

It will be noted that unless the effect is given the Robinson-Patman amendment contended for by the Federal Trade Commission, there is little done to overcome the difficulties arising from the meeting competition clause of the Clayton Act. Formerly "discrimination in price in the same or different communities made in good faith to meet competition" was allowed as a complete defense.

Now it is "made in good faith to meet an equally low price of a competitor." The Court says:

"It thus eliminates certain difficulties which arose under the original Clayton Act. For example, it omits reference to discriminations in price 'in the same or different communities' and it thus restricts the proviso to price differentials occurring in actual competition. It also excludes reductions which undercut the 'lower price' of a competitor. None of these changes, however, cut into the actual core of the defense. That still consists of the provision that wherever a lawful lower price of a competitor threatens to deprive a seller of a customer, the seller, to retain that customer, may in good faith meet that lower price."

We see little difference. The seller still, under the Court's interpretation, discriminate in sales of goods of like quantity and quality between buyers on opposite corners, so long as one gets a lower delivered-price offer from another seller, no matter where located. The "actual core of the defense" remains intact.

I

Legislative history: Upon the interpretation of the words and purpose of this last addition by the Robinson-Patman Act to curbs on discrimination in trade, the narrow statutory issues in this case turn. Though narrow, they are important if trade is to have the benefit of careful investigation before regulation, attainable under the Federal Trade Commission Act but so difficult when attempted by prosecutions in courts with the limitations of judicial procedure. As an aid to the interpretation of section 2 (b), we set out applicable parts of its legislative history.

The Clayton Act created a broad exception from control for prices made in good faith to meet competition. This raised problems of which Congress was aware. In reporting on a redrafted version of S. 3154, the Senate's companion bill to the House bill that became the Robinson-Patman Act, the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, February 3, 1936, pointed out the weakness of section 2 of the Clayton Act in permitting discrimination to meet competition, and suggested a harsh remedy, the elimination of its italicized proviso in note 6 supra, without the mollifying words of section 2 (b) of the Robinson-Patman Act.[7]

---

[1] The difficulties of any other approach are illustrated by the attempt of Congress to clarify the Robinson-Patman Act. See President's veto message on S. 1008, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 16, 1950, pp. 8721–8723, and conference reports, House of Representatives, 81st Cong., 1st sess, No. 1422, October 13, 1949, and 2d sess., No. 1730, March 3, 1950.

[2] Hearings before Subcommittee No. 1 of the House Committee on the Judiciary on S. 1008, 81st Cong., 1st sess., June 8 and 14, 1949; p. 61.

[3] *Associated Press* v. *United States* (326 U. S. 1, 13); *United States* v. *Line Material Co.* (333 U. S. 287, 309).

[4] *E. g.*, Interstate Commerce Act (sec. 5, 49 U. S. C., sec. 5); Communications Act of 1934 (sec. 221, 47 U. S. C. sec. 221); Miller-Tydings Act (15 U. S. C. sec. 1). And see Mason, The Curent Status of the Monopoly Problem in the United States (62 Harv. L. Rev. 1265).

[5] For a discussion of the merits of the legislation, see Adelman, Effective Competition and the Antitrust Laws (61 Harv. L. Rev. 1289).

[6] Clayton Act: "SEC. 2. That it shall be unlawful for any person engaged in commerce * * * to discriminate in price between different purchasers of commodities, * * * where the effect of such discrimination may be to substantially lessen competition, or tend to create a monopoly in any line of commerce: *Provided*, That nothing herein contained shall prevent * * * discrimination in price in the same or different communities made in good faith to meet competition * * *." Robinston-Patman Act: "SEC. 2. (a) That it shall be unlawful for any person engaged in commerce, * * * to discriminate in price between different purchasers of commodities * * * where the effect of such discrimination may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly in any line of commerce, or to injure, destroy, or prevent competition with any person who either grants or knowingly receives the benefit of such discrimination, or with customers of either of them. * * * (b) Upon proof being made, at any hearing on a complaint under this section, that there has been discrimination in price or services or facilities furnished, the burden of rebutting the prima-facie case thus made by showing justification shall be upon the person charged with a violation of this section, and unless justification shall be affirmatively shown, the Commission is authorized to issue an order terminating the discrimination. *Provided, however*, That nothing herein contained shall prevent a seller rebutting the prima facie case thus made by showing that his lower price or the furnishing of services or facilities to any purchaser or purchasers was made in good faith to meet an equally low price of a competitor, or the services or facilities furnished by a competitor."

[7] S. Rept. No. 1502, 74th Cong., 2d sess., p. 4: "The weakness of present section 2 lies principally in the fact that: (1) It places no limit upon differentials permissible on account of differences in quantity; and (2) it permits discriminations to meet competition, and thus tends to substitute the remedies of retaliation for those of law, with destructive consequences to the central object of the bill. Liberty to meet competition which can be met only by price cuts at the expense of customers elsewhere, is in its unmasked effect the liberty to destroy competition by selling locally below cost, a weapon progressively the more destructive in the hands of the more powerful, and most deadly to the competitor of limited resources, whatever his merit and efficiency. While the bill as now reported closes these dangerous loopholes, it leaves the fields of competition free and open to the most efficient, and thus in fact protects them the more securely against inundations of mere power and size. Specific phrases of section 2 (a), as now reported, may be noted as follows: One: '* * * where either or any of the purchases involved in such discrimination are in commerce.' Section 2 (a) attaches to competitive relations between a given seller and his several customers, and this clause is designed to extend its scope to discriminations between interstate and intrastate customers, as well as between those purely interstate. Discriminations in excess of sound economic differences involve generally an element of loss, whether only of the necessary minimum of profits or of actual costs, that must be recouped from the business of customers not granted them. When granted by a given seller to his customers in other States, and denied to those within the State, they involve the use of that interstate commerce to the burden and injury of the latter. When granted to those within the State and denied to those beyond, they involve conversely a directly resulting burden upon interstate commerce with the latter. Both are within the proper and well-recognized power of Congress to suppress."

In March the House Committee on the Judiciary made its report on the bill that became the act. Section 2 (b) was then in substantially its present form. The report pointed out the draftsmen's purpose to strengthen the laws against price discrimination, directly or indirectly, through brokerage or other allowances, services, or absorptions of costs.[8] It commented that the subsection that became section 2 (b) let a seller "meet the price actually previously offered by a local competitor."[9]

The language used in regard to competition in the bills and in the act seems to have been based on a recommendation of the Federal Trade Commission.[10] The Commission had been unable to restore the desired competition under the Clayton Act, and Congress evidently sought to open the way for effective action.[11]

Events in the course of the proposed legislation in the Senate and House have pertinence. The Senate inserted the original ineffective language of the Clayton Act in its exact form in the Senate bill. In the same draft it adopted an amendment similar to the proviso ultimately enacted (80 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 6426, 6435). In the House, Representative PATMAN explained his view of the dangers in the original proviso.[12]

It was taken out in conference.[13] The chairman of the House managers, Mr. Utterback, before the conference report was agreed to by the House, received permission to print an explanation of his understanding of the proviso. He explained that the proviso "does not set up the meeting of competition as an absolute bar to a charge of discrimination under the bill. It merely permits it to be shown in evidence. * * * It leaves it a question of fact to be determined in each case, whether the competition to be met was such as to justify the discrimination given." The pertinent parts of the statement appear in the margin.[14]

---

[8] H. Rept. No. 2287, 74th Cong., 2d sess., p. 3: "The purpose of this proposed legislation is to restore, so far as possible, equality of opportunity in business by strengthening antitrust laws and by protecting trade and commerce against unfair trade practices and unlawful price discrimination, and also against restraint and monopoly for the better protection of consumers, workers, and independent producers, manufacturers, merchants, and other businessmen. To accomplish its purpose, the bill amends and strengthens the Clayton Act by prohibiting discriminations in price between purchasers where such discriminations cannot be shown to be justified by differences in the cost of manufacture, sale, or delivery resulting from different methods or quantities in which such commodities are to such purchasers sold and delivered. It also prohibits brokerage allowances except for services actually rendered, and advertising and other service allowances unless such allowances or services are made available to all purchasers on proportionally equal terms. It strikes at the basing-point method of sale, which lessens competition and tends to create a monopoly."

[9] Id., p. 16: "This proviso represents a contraction of an exemption now contained in section 2 of the Clayton Act which permits discriminations without limit where made in good faith to meet competition. It should be noted that while the seller is permitted to meet local competition it does not permit him to cut local prices until his competitor has first offered lower prices, and then he can go no further than to meet those prices. If he goes further he must do so likewise with all his other customers, or make himself liable to all of the penalties of the act, including treble damages. In other words, the proviso permits the seller to meet the price actually previously offered by a local competitor. It permits him to go no further."

[10] Final Report on the Chain-Store Investigation, S. Doc. No. 4, 74th Cong., 1st sess., p. 96: "A simple solution for the uncertainties and difficulties of enforcement would be to prohibit unfair and unjust discrimination in price and leave it to the enforcement agency, subject to review by the courts, to apply that principle to particular cases and situations. The soundness of and extent to which the present provisos would constitute valid defenses would thus become a judicial and not a legislative matter. The Commission therefore recommends that section 2 of the Clayton Act be amended to read as follows: 'It shall be unlawful for any person engaged in commerce, in any transaction in or affecting such commerce, either directly or indirectly to discriminate unfairly or unjustly in price between different purchasers of commodities, which commodities are sold for use, consumption, or resale within the United States or any Territory thereof or the District of Columbia or any insular possession or other place under the jurisdiction of the United States.'" This report was utilized by the House committee dealing with the proposed Robinson-Patman legislation. H. Rept. No. 2287, 74th Cong., 2d sess., pp. 3, 7.

[11] Id., p. 64: "If the discrimination is 'on account of differences in the grade, quality, or quantity of the commodity sold,' or makes 'only due allowance for difference in the cost of selling or transportation,' or is 'made in good faith to meet competition,' it is not unlawful, even though the effect 'may be to substantially lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly in any line of commerce.' Discriminatory price concessions given to prevent the loss of a chain-store's business to a competing manufacturer, to prevent it manufacturing its own goods, or to prevent it from discouraging in its stores the sale of a given manufacturer's goods, may be strongly urged by the manufacturer as 'made in good faith to meet competition'" (see p. 90, id.). Attention was called to this need. H. Rept. No. 2287, 74th Cong., 2d sess., p. 7: "Some of the difficulties of enforcement of this section as it stands are pointed out in the [final report] of the Federal Trade Commission above referred to, at pages 63 and following."

[12] 80 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 8235: "Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask a question of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]. A great many of the industries in Ohio were very much in favor of the proviso in the Senate bill, appearing on page 4, and reading as follows: "*And provided further*, That nothing herein contained shall prevent discrimination in price in the same or different commodities made in good faith to meet competition.' I find that on page 9 of the Patman bill, beginning in line 14, there appear these words: '*Provided, however*, That nothing herein contained shall prevent a seller rebutting the prima facie case thus made by showing that his lower price to any purchaser or purchasers was made in good faith to meet an equally low price of a competitor.' Will the gentleman explain the difference between these two proposals?

"Mr. PATMAN. If the Senate amendment should be adopted it would really destroy the bill. It would permit the corporate chains to go into a local market, cut the price down so low that it would destroy local competitors and make up for their losses in other places where they had already destroyed their competitors. One of the objects of the bill is to get around that phrase and prevent the large corporate chains from selling below cost in certain localities, thus destroying the independent merchants, and making it up at other places where their competitors have already been destroyed. I hope the gentleman will not insist on the Senate amendment, because it would be very destructive of the bill. The phrase 'equally low price' means the corporate chain will have the right to compete with the local merchants. They may meet competition, which is all right, but they cannot cut down the price below cost for the purpose of destroying the local man.

"Mr. COOPER of Ohio. What does the gentleman's proviso mean?

"Mr. PATMAN. It means they may meet competition, but not cut down the price below cost. It means an equally low price but not below that. It permits competition, but it does not permit them to cut the price below cost in order to destroy their competitors. I hope the gentleman will not insist on the Senate amendment." (But see pp. 15 and 16, infra).

[13] H. Rept. No. 2951, 74th Cong., 2d sess., pp. 6-7: "The Senate bill contained a further proviso 'That nothing herein contained shall prevent discrimination in price in the same or different communities made in good faith to meet competition.' This language is found in existing law, and in the opinion of the conferees is one of the obstacles to enforcement of the present Clayton Act. The Senate receded, and the language is stricken. A provision relating to the question of meeting competition, intended to operate only as a rule of evidence in a proceeding before the Federal Trade Commission, is included in subsection (b) in the conference text as follows: '*Provided, however*, That nothing herein contained shall prevent a seller rebutting the prima facie case thus made by showing that his lower price or the furnishing of services or facilities to any purchaser or purchasers was made in good faith to meet an equally low price of a competitor, or the services or facilites furnished by a competitor.'"

[14] 80 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 9418: "In connection with the above rule as to burden of proof, it is also provided that a seller may show that his lower price was made in good faith to meet an equally low price of a competitor, or that his furnishing of services or facilities was made in good faith to meet those furnished by a competitor. It is to be noted, however, that this does not set up the meeting of competition as an absolute bar to a charge of discrimination under the bill. It merely permits it to be shown in evidence. This provision is entirely procedural. It does not determine substantive rights, liabilities, and duties. They are fixed in the other provisions of the bill. It leaves it a question of fact to be determined in each case, whether the competition to be met was such as to justify the discrimination given, as one lying within the limitations laid down by the bill, and whether the way in which the competition was met lies within the latitude allowed by those limitations. This procedural provision cannot be construed as a carte blanche exemption to violate the bill so long as a competitor can be shown to have violated it first, nor so long as that competition cannot be met without the use of oppressive discriminations in violation of the obvious intent of the bill. * * * If this proviso were construed to permit the showing of a competing offer as an absolute bar to liability for discrimination, then it would nullify the act entirely at the very inception of its enforcement, for in nearly every case mass buyers receive similar discriminations from competing sellers of the same product. One violation of law cannot be permitted to justify another. As in any case of self-defense, while the attack against which the defense is claimed may be shown in evidence, its competency as a bar depends also upon whether it was a legal or illegal attack. A discrimination in violation of this bill is in practical effect a commercial bribe to lure the business of the favored customer away from the competitor, and if one bribe were permitted to justify another the bill would be futile to achieve its plainly intended purposes."

II

Statutory interpretation: This résumé of the origin and purpose of the original section 2 of the Clayton Act and the amendments of the Robinson-Patman Act gives a basis for determining the effect of this section in a hearing before the Commission where the charge, as here, that a seller during the same period of time has sold the same commodities to various purchasers at different prices, is admitted and the defense, the elements of which are likewise admitted, is that the discrimination was made in good faith to meet an equally low price of a competitor. Does meeting in good faith a competitor's price constitute a complete defense under the proviso to section 2 (b)? Or does the fact of good faith reduction in price to a purchaser to meet a competitor's price merely rebut the prima facie establishment of discrimination, arising under the statute from proof of forbidden differences in price,[15] so as to require under section 2 (a) affirmative finding by the Commission that there may be injury to competition? Petitioner asserts that good faith meeing of a competitor's price is a complete defense. The Commission and the Court of Appeals take the opposite position, with which we concur.

This is our reason. The statutory development and the information before Congress concerning the need for strengthening the competitive price provision of the Clayton Act, make clear that the evil dealt with by the proviso of section 2 (b) was the easy avoidance of the prohibition against price-discrimination. The control of that evil was an important objective of the Robinson-Patman Act. The debates, the Commission's report and recommendation and statutory changes show this. The conference report and the explanation by one of the managers, Mr. Utterback, are quite definitive upon the point. Because of experience under the Clayton Act, Congress refused to continue its competitive price proviso. Yet adoption of petitioner's position would permit a seller of nationally distributed goods to discriminate in favor of large chain retailers, for the seller could give to the large retailer a price lower than that charged to small retailers, and could then completely justify its discrimination by showing that the large retailer had first obtained the same low price from a local low-cost producer of competitive goods. This is the very type of competition that Congress sought to remedy. To permit this would not seem consonant with the other provisions of the Robinson-Patman Act, strengthening regulatory powers of the Commission in quantity sales, special allowances, and changing economic conditions.

The structure and wording of the Robinson-Patman amendment to the Clayton Act also conduce to our conclusion. In the original Clayton Act, section 2 was not divided into subsections. In that statute, section 2 stated the body of the substantive offense, and then listed, in a series of provisos, various circumstances under which discriminations in price were permissible. Thus, the statute provided that discriminations were not illegal if made on account of differences in the grade of the commodity sold or differences in selling or transportation costs. Listed among these absolute justifications of the Clayton Act appeared the provision that "nothing herein contained shall prevent discrimination in price * * * made in good faith to meet competition." The Robinson-Patman Act, however, made two changes in respect of the meeting-competition provision—one as to its location, the other in the phrasing. Unlike the original statute, section 2 of the Robinson-Patman Act is divided into two subsections. The first, section 2 (a), retained the statement of substantive offense and the series of provisos treated by the Commission as affording full justifications for price discriminations; section 2 (b) was created to deal with procedural problems in Federal Trade Commission proceedings—specifically to treat the question of burden of proof. In the process of this division, the meeting-competition provision was separated from the other provisos, set off from the substantive provisions of section 2 (a), and relegated to the position of a proviso to the procedural subsection, section 2 (b). Unless it is believed that this change of position was fortuitous, it can be inferred that Congress meant to curtail the defense of meeting competition when it banished this proviso from the substantive division to the procedural. In the same way, the language changes made by section 2 (b) of the Robinson-Patman Act reflect an intent to diminish the effectiveness of the sweeping defense offered by the Clayton Act's meeting-of-competition proviso. The original provisos in the Clayton Act, and the provisos now appearing in section 2 (a), are worded to make it clear that nothing shall prevent certain price practices, such as "price differentials * * * [making] * * * due allowance for differences in the cost of manufacture," or "price changes * * * in response to changing conditions affecting the market for * * * the goods concerned." But in contrast to these provisions, the proviso to section 2 (b) does not provide that nothing "shall prevent" a certain price practice; it provides only that "nothing shall prevent a seller rebutting * * * [a] * * * prima facie case by showing" a certain price practice—meeting a competitive price. The language thus shifts the focus of the proviso from a matter of substantive defense to a matter of proof. Consistent with each other, these modifications made by the Robinson-Patman Act are also consistent with the intent of Congress expressed in the legislative history.

The Court suggests that former Federal Trade Commission cases decided here have treated the meeting-competition clause of the Robinson-Patman Act as being an absolute defense, not merely a rebuttal of the discrimination charge requiring further finding by the Commission. Reference is made to *Corn Products Refining Co.* v. *Federal Trade Comm'n* (324 U. S. 726) and *Federal Trade Comm'n* v. *Staley Mfg. Co.* (324 U. S. 746). In the Corn Products case, dealing with a basing-point scheme for delivered prices, this Court merely said at page 741:

"The only evidence said to rebut the prima facie case made by proof of the price discriminations was given by witnesses who had no personal knowledge of the transactions, and was limited to statements of each witness' assumption or conclusion that the price discriminations were justified by competition."

And then went on to use the language quoted at page 12 of the Court's opinion. There was no occasion to consider the effect of a successful rebuttal. As authority for its statement, we there cited the Staley case (at 324 U. S. 746).

That citation included these words at pages 752–753:

"Prior to the Robinson-Patman amendments, section 2 of the Clayton Act provided that nothing contained in it 'shall prevent' discrimination in price 'made in good faith to meet competition.' The change in language of this exception was for the purpose of making the defense a matter of evidence in each case, raising a question of fact as to whether the competition justified the discrimination. See the conference report, House Report No. 2951, Seventy-fourth Congress, second session, pages 6–7; see also the statement of Representative Utterback, the chairman of the House conference committee, 80 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 9418."

After that statement, which it should be noted relies upon Mr. Utterback's interpretation quoted at note 14 of this opinion, the Court in the *Staley* case goes on to say that there was no evidence to show that Staley adopted a lower price to meet an equally low price of a competitor. Again there was no occasion for this court to meet the present issue. We think our citation in Staley quoted above, shows the then position of this Court.[16]

There are aguments available to support the contrary position. No definite statement appears in the committee reports that meeting competition is henceforth to be only a rebuttal of a prima facie case and not a full justification for discrimination in price. The proviso of section 2 (b) can be read as having the same substantive effect as the provisos of section 2 (a). The earlier provisos are treated by the Commission as complete defenses. Perhaps there is an implication favorable to the petitioner's position in Representative PATMAN's omission to state the Federal Trade Commission interpretation on the floor. See note 12, supra.

The underlying congressional purpose to curtail methods of avoiding limitations on price discriminations, however, considered with the more specific matters discussed herein, satisfies us that we should adopt the conclusion of the Commission and the court of appeals.[17] We believe that good faith meeting of a competitor's price only rebuts the prima facie case of violation established by showing the price discrimination. Whether the proven price discrimination is of a character that violates section 2 (a) then becomes a matter for the determination of the Commission on a showing that there may be injury to competition.

III

Conclusion: In view of the Court's ruling, we will not enlarge this dissent by discussing other problems raised by the case. We have said enough to show that we would affirm the decree below in principle, even though we should conclude some amendment might be required in the wording of the order.

The Chief Justice and Mr. Justice Black join in this dissent.

---

[15] See note 6, supra.

[16] The Court's opinion in this case refers, page 12, notes 12 and 13, to the opinions of the Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit in *Staley* and *Corn Products* (144 F. 2d and 221). But that court reversed its position in the opinion below (173 F. 2d 210, 216). It is fair to assume that reversal was because of our opinions in Corn Products and Staley.

[17] It is hardly necessary to note that the wisdom of the enactment is not for the Commission nor the courts in enforcing the act. The Commission recently has advised Congress that while "on balance it would be preferable to make the good faith meeting of competition a complete defense," it "does not strongly urge either view upon the Congress." Hearings before Subcommittee No. 1 of the House Committee on the Judiciary on S. 1008, 81st Cong., 1st sess., June 8 and 14, 1949, p. 61. Compare *Standard Oil Co.* v. *United States* (337 U. S. 293, 311). This statement confirmed the Commission's position taken in this case. There were other officials of the Commission who have taken the view adopted by the Court.

PROGRAM FOR ACQUISITION OF WOOL AND INCREASING GROWTH OF THE GUAYULE SHRUB

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, as chairman of the Preparedness Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Armed Services I want my colleagues to know that we are as ready to commend as we are to criticize. When we find something in the defense mobilization program that deserves praise we are as willing and anxious to point out that fact as we are to comment upon deficiencies in that program.

Vigorous action to correct deficiencies and omissions in defense mobilization as soon as they have been ascertained is praiseworthy indeed.

The new Chairman of the Munitions Board, Mr. John D. Small, has shown that the Board can and will take prompt action. As the committee has recently recommended, wool and guayule seed and seedlings have now been placed on the strategic and critical materials' list for stockpiling. This action is definitely a substantial step in the right direction. By taking this step Chairman Small has corrected serious omissions of his predecessors, and I hope that aggresive programs for acquiring wool and preparing to grow natural rubber in the United States will finally repair the damage resulting from inaction over the past 3 years.

The Preparedness Subcommittee's first and second reports stressed the need for growing, or preparing to grow, natural rubber from guayule within the boundaries of the United States. The President's rubber program as reported to the subcommittee by Mr. Stuart Symington, chairman of the National Security Resources Board, included the planning and studies on preliminary actions that should be taken to grow natural rubber in this country. I am happy to report that an active program to increase the available seed needed to grow guayule shrub is under way. In addition, test acreages of guayule shrub will be set out in various parts of the country believed adapted to its growth in order to give farmers experience in growing this crop and to make certain what areas and what soils are best suited for large production should our supplies of natural rubber from the Far East be curtailed or cut off.

My esteemed and hard-working fellow committee member, the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT] developed for the Senate Armed Services Committee, long before formation of the Preparedness Subcommittee, the lamentable and distressing shortage of wool. His early efforts, along with the recent study by the Preparedness Subcommittee set forth in the third report, have been notable contributions which have finally moved the defense agencies.

I hope we have time to obtain the wool we need. I am sure we are on the right road in actively planning to grow natural rubber in this country if we have to. The actions announced recently by Chairman Small of the Munitions Board are definitely steps in the right direction. He deserves commendation for it. Other agencies could learn from his example.

Mr. President, I desire now to refer to another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas has the floor.

IMPRACTICABILITY OF VOLUNTARY PRICE CONTROLS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, on August 12 of last year, I pointed out that it would be useless to increase taxes if prices were permitted to rise to such a point that the tax gain would be erased through the necessity of paying continually advancing prices for war materials.

On September 12, I placed in the RECORD a tabulation showing how prices had advanced out of all proportion on hundreds of essential items.

On September 22, I cited in the RECORD a few of the more flagrant instances: The increase by 111 percent in the price of crude rubber since the attack on Korea; the increase by more than 30 percent, over a period of only a few months, in the price of aviation gasoline; an increase from 22 to 42 percent, between April and September, in the price of the cloth from which uniforms are made.

On December 12, I asked the Senate once more "What are we waiting for?" and pointed out the alarming fact that on November 28 the wholesale price index reached an all-time record high of 171.7.

At that time I quoted certain figures demonstrating that since April 1950 the price of burlap had increased 75.6 percent; the price of copper was up 32.6 percent; the price of hides was up 50.8 percent; the price of wool had been boosted 67.6 percent; and the price of crude rubber had increased an unbelievable 209.5 percent.

In line with my promise to show again and again, through facts and figures, the impracticability of voluntary controls during wartime, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD a statement entitled "Military Procurement Price Trends," and a tabulation of "Military Procurement Prices Before and After the Attack on Korea," both prepared by the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

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

MILITARY PROCUREMENT PRICE TRENDS

Since the spring of 1950, prices have risen markedly, particularly after the start of the conflict in Korea. The Bureau of Labor Statistics wholesale-price index is now at an all-time high, reaching a level of 171.7 on November 28, a rise of 12.3 percent since April 1950 and an increase of 2.5 percent during the past 2 months. Many basic raw materials have increased in price to an even greater extent than have finished commodities, including a number of key commodities used in the manufacture of items required by the armed services, as shown by the following table:

Commodity	Unit	Price			Percent increase		
		April 1950	Sept. 8, 1950	Dec. 4, 1950	April to September	April to December	September to December
Burlap	Yard	$0.172	$0.242	$0.302	40.7	75.6	24.8
Copper	Pound	.184	.234	.244	27.2	32.6	4.3
Cotton	do	.320	.407	.412	27.2	28.8	1.2
Crude rubber	do	.210	.550	.650	161.9	209.5	18.2
Hides	do	.242	.330	.365	36.4	50.8	10.6
Lead	do	.105	.160	.170	52.4	61.9	6.2
Print cloth, cotton	Yard	.140	.210	.225	50.0	60.7	7.1
Steel scrap (Philadelphia)	Ton	24.000	38.000	38.500	58.3	60.4	1.3
Tin	Pound	.750	.990	1.390	32.0	85.3	40.4
Wool tops	do	1.870	3.020	3.135	61.5	67.6	3.8
Zinc	do	.112	.182	.182	62.5	62.5	

Due to the existence of fixed price contracts for many items, the rise in basic commodity prices was not fully and immediately reflected in procurement prices paid by the armed services. However, the increase in general price level is being felt more and more by the armed services. With the exception of meats, the price of which has dropped seasonally during the past 2 months, and a few other scattered items, higher prices are being encountered in an ever increasing number of items. These price rises are becoming increasingly widespread despite efforts to reduce costs wherever feasible by simplification of specifications and substitution of materials. The recent steel industry wage and price increases will undoubtedly lead to further increases in the prices of many military procurement items.

One of the key commodities affected by the Korean conflict has been aviation gasoline. Preliminary screening of offers for delivery of aviation gasoline starting in January 1951 indicates the following price increases per gallon for normal production:

	July 1, 1950, average	November 1950 average quotation for January 1951 delivery	Percent increase
Grade 115/145 Avgas:			
United States Gulf	$0.1675	$0.1725	3.0
West coast	.1565	.1775	13.4
Grade 100/130 Avgas:			
United States Gulf	.155	.16	3.2
West coast	.144	.165	14.6

However, normal production is not adequate to meet current armed services' needs for aviation gasoline. Consequently, part of the aviation gasoline supplies of the armed services are being derived from marginal

production, utilizing materials, plant facilities, and transportation practices that are not economical under normal conditions. As a result, premiums of varying amounts are being paid for the supply increments furnished from marginal sources, ranging from 5 to 45 percent, depending upon the particular circumstances involved.

It must be recognized that it is difficult to compare prices at different times for much of the matériel procured by the armed services because of changes in quantities involved, changes in specifications, changes in manufacturing methods and processing techniques, resort to marginal producers or methods, existence of price redetermination clauses in contracts, etc. Direct price comparisons can best be made on relatively standard-type items that are subject to little change in specifications. Such a list of representative items, indicating procurement prices applicable to each of the services and to the Armed Services Petroleum Purchasing Agency, is contained in the attached table:

Military procurement prices before and after the attack on Korea (April 1950, August–September 1950, and October–November 1950)

Commodity	Price				Percent increase or decrease (−)		
	Unit	April 1950	August–September 1950	October–November 1950	April to August–September	April to October–November	August–September to October–November
A. S. P. P. A.:							
Fuel oil, f. o. b. tanker:							
West coast	Barrel	$0.99	$1.53	[1] $2.10	54.5	112.1	37.3
Caribbean	do	1.70	1.83	[1] 1.92	7.6	12.9	4.9
Motor gasoline, f. o. b. tanker:							
West coast	do	3.90	4.38	[1] 4.59	12.3	17.7	4.8
United States Gulf	do	3.59	3.82	[1] 4.30	6.4	19.8	12.6
Diesel fuel, f. o. b. tanker:							
West coast	do	3.33	3.28	[1] 3.65	−1.5	9.6	11.3
United States Gulf	do	2.92	3.36	[1] 3.36	15.1	15.1	
Army:							
Ambulance, metropolitan, ¾-ton, 4 by 2	Each	3,774.20	(2)	4,224.20		11.9	
Automobile, sedan, light	do	1,132.00	1,284.00	(2)	13.4		
Truck, pick-up, ½-ton, 4 by 2	do	952.62	(2)	1,014.87		6.5	
Truck, stake and platform, 1½-ton, 4 by 2	do	1,471.77	(2)	1,697.13		15.3	
Water tank trailer, 1-ton	do	793.17	914.76	(2)	15.3		
Battery:							
2E	do	9.15	11.53	(2)	26.0		
2H	do	12.55	14.58	(2)	16.2		
3H	do	11.21	15.84	(2)	14.3		
Tire:							
6.50 by 20, 8-ply	do	16.14	20.46	(2)	26.8		
7.50 by 20	do	23.99	28.93	33.18	20.6	38.3	14.7
Bearing bushing	do	.79	1.38	(2)	74.7		
Gasket set	do	.0849	.12757	(2)	50.3		
Wiring harness	do	3.12	4.14	(2)	32.7		
Fuel tank	do	9.15	12.75	(2)	39.3		
Sprocket	do	15.00	18.45	(2)	23.0		
Nut	do	.01265	.0146	(2)	15.4		
Battery assembly hanger	do	2.95	3.43	(2)	16.3		
Flange transfer brace drum	do	1.72	1.99	(2)	15.7		
Filter oil breather	do	1.80	1.95	(2)	8.3		
Carriage bolts	do	.0135	.01533	(2)	13.6		
Steering knuckle assembly	do	15.84	19.9368	(2)	25.9		
Shaft (automotive)	do	22.77	24.74	(2)	8.7		
Hood support	do	.77	.83	(2)	7.8		
Roller bearing	do	11.80	12.39	(2)	5.0		
Carburetor assembly	do	22.709	23.7115	(2)	4.4		
Steering arm	do	7.8178	8.316	(2)	6.4		
Generator	do	52.63	55.75	(2)	5.9		
Lumber:							
Southern pine, No. 2 common	M board feet	66.00	97.00	72.00	47.0	9.1	−25.8
Douglas fir	do	67.50	82.50	[3] 82.50	22.2	22.2	
Bailey bridges	Each	37,796.00	51,792.00	[3] 51,792.00	37.0	37.0	
Fire hose, cotton, rubber-lined	50 feet	20.64	23.10	[3] 23.10	11.9	11.9	
Astrolabe	Each	1,200.00	1,311.00	[3] 1,311.00	9.2	9.2	
Beach tractor	do	10,188.00	10,840.00	[3] 10,840.00	6.4	6.4	
Storage battery	do	9.07	10.74	[3] 10.74	18.4	18.4	
Wire rope	Foot	.1329	.164	[3] .164	23.4	23.4	
20-ton trailer	Each	3,287.00	3,540.00	[3] 3,540.00	8.0	8.0	
Shop bench	do	215.00	270.00	[3] 270.00	25.6	25.6	
Road roller	do	5,345.00	5,735.00	[3] 5,735.00	7.3	7.3	
Motor lead cable	Foot	.044	.057	[3] .057	29.5	29.5	
Barbed wire	Spool	6.39	7.25	[3] 7.25	13.4	13.4	
Sisal rope	Foot	.03841	.0456	[3] .0456	18.7	18.7	
Cable, 3-conductor	do	.0355	(2)	.063		77.7	
Chest drafting set No. 8	Each	68.50	(2)	95.00		38.7	
Wire, magnet:							
No. 28 AWG	Pound	.47	(2)	.625		33.0	
No. 27 AWG	do	.45	(2)	.63		40.0	
No. 25 AWG	do	.42	(2)	.57		35.8	
Fire extinguisher	Each	36.86	37.98	[3] 37.98	3.0	3.0	
Antenna equipment, RC-292	do	134.88	144.88	(2)	7.4		
Switchbox, BC-658	do	10.05	12.04	(2)	19.8		
Field wire, WD-1/TT	Mile	58.02	68.17	74.03	17.5	27.6	8.6
Communications equipment, AN/GRC-26	Each	11,353.91	(2)	12,364.03			8.9
Radio set:							
AN/PRC-10	do	263.88	(2)	382.50		45.0	
SCR-399	do	5,080.92	(2)	5,901.66		16.2	
Battery, BA-70	do	5.01	(2)	5.66		13.0	
Broom, corn	Dozen	11.25	12.53	12.53	11.4	11.4	
Steel wool	Pound	.218	.265	.3407	21.6	56.3	28.6
Soap powder, hand scouring	do	.090	.1201	.1235	33.4	37.2	2.8
Mop, cotton	Each	.4675	.5875	[3] .750	25.7	60.4	27.7
Burlap, jute, 40-inch	Yard	.1711	.2325	[3] .310	35.9	81.2	33.3
Sack, burlap, 57 by 50 inches	Each	.4170	.5823	[3] .756	39.6	81.3	29.8
Dishwashing, machine model 180DA	do	1,454.52	1,554.00	[3] 1,629.06	6.8	12.0	4.8
Paper, typewriter, bond	Ream	6.435	8.36	[3] 9.65	29.9	50.0	15.4
Barrier, waterproof:							
Type C-1	Roll	4.16	4.90	[3] 5.22	17.8	25.5	6.5
Type L-2	do	11.06	11.80	[3] 13.88	6.7	25.5	17.6
Type M	do	7.45	8.53	[3] 9.35	14.5	25.5	9.6
Box, fiber, shipping	Each	.82771	1.241	[3] 1.283	49.9	55.0	33.4
Drawers, cotton, shorts, white	Pair	.4233	.5246	[3] .555	23.9	31.1	5.8
Cut, make, and trim:							
Trousers, cotton, khaki	do	.740	.860	[3] .968	16.2	30.8	12.6
Shirt, stand-up collar	Each	.588	(2)	.769		30.8	
Socks, wool, cushion sole	Pair	[3] .575	.635	.681	10.4	18.6	7.2

Military procurement prices before and after the attack on Korea (April 1950, August–September 1950, and October–November 1950)—Con.

Commodity	Unit	Price: April 1950	Price: August–September 1950	Price: October–November 1950	Percent increase or decrease (−): April to August–September	Percent increase or decrease (−): April to October–November	Percent increase or decrease (−): August–September to October–November
Army—Continued							
Cloth:							
Cotton, twill, 5-ounce	Yard	$1.27	$1.555	$1.64222	22.4	29.3	5.6
Cotton, chambray, 3-ounce	do	.39	.44	.4697	12.8	20.4	6.8
Wool, lining, 12-ounce	do	1.65	2.05	[3] 2.307	24.2	39.8	12.5
Wool, serge, 15-ounce	do	3.595	4.555	[3] 5.026	26.7	39.8	10.3
Wool, serge, 12-ounce	do	3.63	4.463	[3] 5.075	22.9	39.8	13.7
Wool, lining, 15-ounce	do	1.78	2.247	[3] 2.488	26.2	39.8	10.7
Wool, serge, 18-ounce	do	3.8176	4.890	[3] 5.337	28.1	39.8	10.0
Wool, pile	do	4.90	6.274	[3] 6.850	28.0	39.8	9.2
Webbing, cotton, 1-inch	do	.0413	.059	.0598	42.9	44.8	1.4
Shoes, low quarter	Pair	3.7364	(2)	4.910		31.4	
Boots, service, combat	do	5.720	(2)	8.148		42.4	
Drawers, winter, M-40	do	3.020	(2)	3.577		18.4	
Undershirts, winter, M-50	Each	2.740	(2)	3.291		20.1	
Box & Sleeve, shipping, fiber	Set	1.5996	1.6794	[3] 1.90	13.3	18.8	13.1
Gasoline drum, 5-gallon	Each	1.7891	1.9791	[4] 1.79	10.6	0.1	−9.6
Bacon, smoked	Pound	.38	.4875	[5] .4352	28.3	14.5	−10.7
Beef, boneless	do	.6438	.6718	[5] .6209	4.3	−3.6	−7.6
Beef, carcass	do	.4602	.4741	[5] .4651	3.0	1.1	−1.9
Ham, smoked	do	.5367	.5323	[5] .4734	−.8	−11.8	−11.1
Lard	do	.1329	.1802	[5] .1581	35.6	19.0	−12.3
Sausage	do	.3650	.4738	[5] .4152	29.8	13.8	−12.4
Pork	do	.4245	.5523	[5] .4350	30.1	2.5	−21.2
Chicken, dressed	do	.3835	.4150	[5] .3942	8.2	2.8	−5.0
Eggs, shell	Dozen	.3746	.5163	[5] .5715	37.8	52.6	10.7
Milk, frozen	Quart	.1357	.1765	[5] .1909	30.1	40.7	8.2
Navy:							
Space heater, 50,000 B. t. u	Each	38.00	45.00	53.00	18.4	39.5	17.8
Steam tables, MC std	do	2,800.00	3,200.00	3,547.00	14.3	26.7	10.8
Briggs & Stratton carburetor	do	2.64	(2)	4.40		66.7	
Dorman kit exp. plug	do	6.25	(2)	9.94		59.0	
Grease-fitting kits	do	6.40	(2)	21.80		240.6	
Crane, T/A-8121	do	244.00	(2)	426.00		74.6	
Connector, cable 17-C-29865-500	do	.195	.2539		30.2		
Tester, voltage 17-T-5555	do	.275	.35		27.3		
Rope, wire, 9/16-inch 22-R-2268-135	Foot	.119	(2)	.238		100.0	
Crane, truck, ½-yard 78-C-33600	Each	18,380.00	(2)	21,000.00		14.3	
Differential shaft 4-B2007	do	36.41	(2)	58.02		59.4	
Dry battery:							
BA-44	do	1.7572	(2)	2.30		30.9	
BA-202/U	do	.0704	(2)	.125		77.6	
BA-205/U	do	.3360	(2)	.50		48.8	
BA-37	do	.1575	(2)	.33		109.5	
BA-152	do	.2730	(2)	.48		75.8	
Lights, timing 41-L-1440	do	2.42	[3] 2.42	3.87		59.9	59.9
Mattresses	do	(2)	8.00	13.23			65.4
Sheets	do	(2)	1.50	2.26			50.7
Enamel, semigloss	Gallon	1.68	2.75	[3] 2.75	63.7	63.7	
Mount, trailer, multiple MG, M55	Each	5,000.00	9,500.00	9,500.00	90.0	90.0	
Shell, smoke, M313, w/f PD, M57	do	23.89	37.22	37.22	55.8	55.8	
Actuator	do	.28	.70	.70	150.0	150.0	
Bearing, flash hider	do	.92	2.30	2.30	150.0	150.0	
Screw, forearm	do	.15	.38	.38	153.3	153.3	
Sight, rear assembly	do	6.00	15.00	15.00	150.0	150.0	
Adhesive tape, 3 inches by 5 yards	Roll	.26	.30	.314	15.4	20.8	4.7
Surgical gloves, rubber	Pair	.178	.22	.256	23.6	43.8	16.4
Glycerin	Pound	.35	.75	.85	114.3	142.9	13.3
Instrument and medicine cabinet	Each	195.00	220.00	210.00	12.8	7.7	−4.5
Vitamin A in oil	50 cubic centimeters.	.364	.436	.470	19.8	29.1	7.8
Sedan, 5-passenger	Each	1,128.00	(2)	1,284.00		13.8	
Crane:							
10-ton, truck mounted	do	15,390.00	16,884.00	21,392.00	9.7	39.0	26.7
15-ton, truck mounted	do	16,000.00	17,529.00	24,500.00	9.6	53.1	39.8
20-ton, truck mounted	do	19,700.00	22,500.00	28,250.00	14.2	43.4	25.6
¾ cubic yard, crawler	do	17,940.00	18,559.00	23,000.00	3.4	28.2	23.9
1½ cubic yard, crawler	do	32,855.00	42,945.00	46,345.00	30.7	41.1	9.2
Tractors, 130 to 160 design brake horsepower	do	15,363.00	15,579.00	16,500.00	1.4	7.4	5.9
Oscilloscope OS-8/U	do	139.00	219.00	219.00	57.6	57.6	
Air Force:							
Height finder:							
AN/TPS-10D	do	35,880.00	43,587.00	[3] 49,822.00	21.5	38.9	14.3
AN/MPS-4	do	67,000.00	77,050.00	(2)	15.0		
Compound carbon removal	Gallon	1.07	(2)	1.50		40.2	
Paint remover	do	1.29	(2)	1.55		20.2	
Aluminum alloy sheet	Pound	.369	(2)	.384		4.1	
A-5 inspection light	Each	3.20	(2)	4.75		48.4	
Electric cable	Foot	.072	(2)	.080		11.1	
Jacket, flying type B-15B	Each	16.50	(2)	25.00		51.5	
Suit, flying nylon K-2	do	9.47	(2)	14.00		47.8	
Shirt, flying wool type A-1	do	7.84	(2)	10.00		27.6	
Protective helmet	do	20.20	(2)	26.84		32.9	
Sun glasses	Pair	2.29	(2)	3.00		31.0	
T-7A parachute assembly with reserve canopy	Each	198.30	(2)	300.77		51.7	
G-11 100-foot cargo chute	do	1,287.00	(2)	1,798.66		39.8	

[1] Represents estimated average of offers received in November for deliveries to start January 1951.
[2] No procurement during this period.
[3] Estimated.
[4] Gasoline, drum, 5-gallon procurement during November 1950 was for large quantity (1,000,000 units), awarded to a single company.
[5] October 1950 prices.

Source: Progress Reports and Statistics, Office of Secretary of Defense, Dec. 4, 1950.

LEAKAGE OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE MILITARY MESSAGES

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I wish to take a few minutes of the time of the Senate to compliment the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] for the patriotic service he has rendered the Nation in exposing the leakage of Department of Defense military messages.

For some time administration apologists have been searching for a way to escape responsibility for the disaster in Korea. The administration and its apologists seem to have settled on Gen. Douglas MacArthur as the scapegoat.

In reference to that campaign, I wish to point out that Gen. Douglas MacArthur was not present at Tehran,

Yalta, or Potsdam when the foundations for the present disaster in Asia were laid. Douglas MacArthur had no part in pulling the rug from under Nationalist China and in setting the stage for Russian domination of Asia.

Douglas MacArthur went into Korea, not on his own initiative, but on orders of the President of the United States. It was on orders from the President that Douglas MacArthur went into Korea with inadequately armed and green troops.

When Douglas MacArthur and his fighting men had the Communists on the run, and could have destroyed them, he stopped his troops at the thirty-eighth parallel, on orders from Washington. This gave the Reds time to catch their breath and reform their disorganized forces.

Douglas MacArthur refrained from ordering his airmen to bomb enemy troop concentrations at the Korean border, on orders from Washington. This allowed the enemy to marshal its forces and build up its strength without annoyance.

Gen. Douglas MacArthur has not been allowed to accept the proffered assistance of several hundred thousand Chinese Nationalist fighting men who are willing and anxious to go into battle against communism. This, too, is on orders from Washington.

All these things have been done by Washington, from which originates the campaign to shift to General MacArthur the blame for the military disaster in Korea.

General MacArthur is a field commander whose hands are tied by political strings reaching from his headquarters to the White House, in Washington, to Lake Success.

The junior Senator from Wisconsin, in his exposure of the source of the information which has formed the principal basis for the MacArthur smear, is pulling up and exposing the very taproot of the campaign to discredit MacArthur. In doing this, the junior Senator from Wisconsin has had the courage to go to the mat with one of the Nation's most powerful columnists. He has found that this columnist had access to, and quoted excerpts from, classified military communications from our commander in the field to his superiors at the Pentagon. Those messages concern the strength of the forces now overwhelming our troops in Korea. After their leakage those classified military messages were largely used as the basis for the smear campaign against MacArthur.

Both General MacArthur and his staff were held up to ridicule and censure on the allegation that their intelligence services were inaccurate and otherwise faulty.

Thus it was insinuated that General MacArthur and many of his closest advisers were uninformed and incompetent. It was insidiously hinted that MacArthur and his aides were confused as to the exact number of the opposing forces, and that because of this confusion our troops were led into defeat in Korea.

I have information to the effect that it is standard practice to attach to classified documents the following or similar warning, which is notice of the consequences of violations of security:

This document contains information affecting the national defense of the United States within the meaning of the espionage laws, title 18, United States Code, sections 793 and 794. Transmission or revelation of its contents in any manner to an unauthorized person is prohibited by law; it is imperative that the material contained in it be treated with the utmost discretion. Under no circumstances shall possession thereof, or the information therein, be given to any personnel other than those whose duties specifically require knowledge thereof. When not in use this document is chargeable to the custody of an officer.

Along with other Members of the United States Senate, I am anxiously awaiting the outcome of the active investigation the Army says it is conducting. It is my hope that the inquiry will lead to a court martial and the subsequent punishment of such military personnel as may have had a hand in the affair, if a violation of the law has occurred. If it should develop that the information leak was perpetrated by a civilian employee of the Defense Department, that civilian should be punished to the full extent of the law.

I also hope that this incident will tend to bring into disrepute the kind of "inside story" reporting which is all too prevalent these days. That kind of reporting too often finds origin in the privileged status of certain types of writers, who in reality are not reporters, but propagandists.

These alleged reporters have access in many of our Federal Government buildings, to private dining rooms, and other hide-aways which are not generally accessible to the working press. In return for this privileged status they too often lend themselves to opinion peddling, rather than news reporting.

Mr. President, it seems to me that this episode is a proper subject of investigation by either the Judiciary Committee, which has jurisdiction of espionage matters, or by the Armed Services Committee.

I request unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, the Associated Press story about this matter. The account is taken from the Saturday, January 13, 1951, issue of the New York Herald Tribune.

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

ARMY INQUIRES INTO SOURCE OF PEARSON'S DATA—PACE, ANSWERING MCCARTHY, SAYS COLUMNIST QUOTED FROM SECRET MESSAGES

WASHINGTON, January 12.—The Army said today the Drew Pearson column of December 30 contained "quoted excerpts from classified (secret) messages," and an investigation is being made.

In a letter to Senator JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY, Republican, Wisconsin, Secretary of the Army Frank Pace also said the matter is being submitted to the Judge Advocate General, the Army's top legal officer.

Mr. Pace made the letter public. It was in response to a demand from Senator MCCARTHY to know whether material in the Pearson column was in fact quoted from secret messages, as Mr. Pearson said. Senator MCCARTHY said in a Senate speech last week that if Mr. Pearson had quoted secret messages he had given aid to foreign countries in efforts to break United States codes.

SAID HE HAD PERMISSION

Mr. Pearson replied in a statement at the time that he had been told by the Pentagon that it was all right for him to use the messages if he changed dates and altered a few words.

Mr. Pace told the Senator the whole matter is being actively investigated. He said the Army had not given Mr. Pearson any secret messages or any messages at all from General of the Army Douglas MacArthur's headquarters.

Mr. Pace said the Army "did not give Mr. Pearson permission to publish the secret military messages you referred to nor any other classified information."

Mr. Pearson's December 30 column said in effect that reports from General MacArthur's headquarters and his intelligence chief showed the Chinese Red strength in Korea was considerably weaker than the general's published statements indicated.

Mr. Pace's letter was in reply to one Senator MCCARTHY sent him Monday. One question Senator MCCARTHY asked was whether publication of the texts of coded messages, even with the change of a few words and the date, would not "materially help enemy experts to break United States military codes."

SAYS CODE IS NOT BROKEN

Mr. Pace told Senator MCCARTHY that "in this instance it has been established that cryptographic security has not been violated," but said he was unable for security reasons to explain why.

Mr. Pace said the specific matter submitted to the Judge Advocate General was this question from Senator MCCARTHY: "Was not whoever handed Pearson those messages guilty of a violation of our espionage laws?"

After Mr. Pace released his letter Mr. Pearson issued a statement which said the basic fact is that General MacArthur's press communiques in early December reported the Chinese to be 1,000,000 strong, but his cables to the Pentagon gave the Chinese strength as only about 100,000. He added:

"Publication 3 weeks after the retreat obviously could violate no security nor endanger American forces.

"Senator MCCARTHY seems much more interested in getting at me than in getting the true facts to the country."

PRESIDENTIAL POWER TO DEPLOY TROOPS ABROAD

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I shall today detain the Senate but briefly, but I should like to call attention to the fact that while we are engaged in what the country generally considers and accepts as a great debate on foreign policy, it is unfortunately true that considerable amounts of time and attention and study have had to be devoted in the United States Senate to a collateral issue not directly connected with foreign policy; that is, the determination of a constitutional question concerning the right or propriety of the President, as Commander in Chief, to send forces abroad without consultation with Congress and consent by Congress.

It occurs to me, since we hear almost every day impassioned appeals from the Democratic side of the aisle and from the officers uptown that we should have national unity and national cooperation, that the one man in the United States who is prepared today and equipped to strike a tremendous blow for unity is President Harry S. Truman, in his posi-

tion as Commander in Chief. He alone can put an end to this collateral debate, which is consuming so much time that actually we have had very little opportunity as yet to get down to the very important matter of building a constructive, positive foreign policy.

Most of our time has been devoted to a determination of what we are going to fight with, rather than what we are going to fight for. It seems to me that until and unless we determine what we are going to fight for and what our outline of foreign policy might properly be, we cannot very well determine what is going to be required to fight with. One precedes the other and, once we have determined what we are going to fight for, we then come to the problem of how we are going to raise and equip the army, and of how it is to be commanded.

Only the President, I submit, Mr. President, has the power to put an end to this debate. I think it could be argued rather persuasively from the President's point of view, as some of his friends are endeavoring to argue, that the Commander in Chief under the Constitution of the United States has a considerable degree of power to order the troops of the country to serve where he thinks their service is important and necessary. That constitutional reference or right has been argued almost since the beginning of time in the United States; and some Presidents, having been a little more high-handed and headstrong than others, have taken more advantage of it than others. Some Presidents, more interested in national unity and considering the position of Congress more adequately, have refrained from acting in any way that might be construed as a defiance of Congress.

I submit that it can also be argued very persuasively from the congressional point of view that the Constitution imposes upon us, as a Congress, certain very significant controls as to where troops are to be sent and as to how they are to be deployed, because we, and we alone, are charged by the Constitution with the right to raise and equip and supply the military forces and to appropriate the essential money. So if we have on the one hand a high-handed, headstrong President, looking constantly for increasing personal power and trying to decrease steadily the importance of the Congress, it is possible, of course, to stymie and stalemate the entire foreign policy debate, while the constitutional question is argued till the cows come home, or to the end of the congressional session.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator be good enough to yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The Senator has already touched on it in part. The powers of Congress are not limited to a single control over the subject matter. There are four or five specific controls over our military establishments provided by the Constitution. One is the power to provide for the common defense. That has no limits. It is our responsibility. It is our grant of unlimited power.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator is exactly correct.

Mr. MILLIKIN. It says so in exact words. We do not have to draw implications. It also says we have the power to declare war. This carries its own implications of very wide scope, inclusive and exclusive. We also have the power to raise and support armies. We also have the power to provide and maintain a navy, and we also have the power to provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia, and for governing such parts of it as may be employed in the service of the United States. While the President has a vast field of implied power, arising out of the fact that the Constitution makes him our Chief Executive and our Commander in Chief, the Congress also by the express terms and implication of the Constitution, which I have mentioned, is not without armor in this debate or in action to be proposed or taken.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the Senator very much for his contribution, and I think it should be clear to all students of the Constitution that the constitutional founders were much more meticulous and much more comprehensive in reposing in the Congress those specific controls we have in connection with the Army and our military forces than they were in regard to the implications they made in the direction of the power of the Commander in Chief.

Mr. WATKINS and Mr. FERGUSON addressed the Chair.

Mr. MUNDT. I yield first to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. I note the Senator said the Congress would have power to curtail these operations, by the control of the purse in providing for the Army. Is it not a fact, however, that such control means very little, if the President goes ahead and orders our troops into situations in a manner which brings on a war?

Mr. MUNDT. That certainly is true, of course, because in such situations as the one we have now in Korea, it is unthinkable that any Congress will refuse to appropriate the money required to complete the task in which we are engaged and to protect our troops in the fighting theater.

Mr. WATKINS. In other words, if our troops are actually engaged in combat, if our boys are on the battlefield fighting, or even our Navy and our Air Force, it is unlikely then that the Congress would reverse itself and try to control the President in his actions by denying appropriations to furnish our troops, our Air Force, and our Navy with necessary equipment for the fighting, and the additional troops to support them in whatever action they are undertaking or are compelled to undertake in order to save their lives, and to save, so to speak, the face of the United States.

Mr. MUNDT. Under such conditions, I would say it is not only unlikely, but unthinkable that Congress would take such action.

I now yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it not true that the framers of the Constitution had in mind that both Houses of the Congress were to have something to say about the use of the Army and the size of the Army when they included the 2-year limitation upon appropriations for the Army of the United States? By that provision the chief executive, who is the Commander in Chief and treated really as a part of the Army, was precluded from obtaining sufficient funds in advance to enable him to use the Army in any way he desired.

Mr. MUNDT. The junior Senator from Michigan has put his finger on a very pertinent point. Unquestionably that was one of the facts which motivated our constitutional father in establishing that provision.

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

Mr. MUNDT. I am happy to yield to my distinguished colleague.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I take a rather liberal view of the President's powers. I would not for a moment try to circumscribe them. But, by the same token, we are also entitled to a rather liberal view as to our express and implied powers under the Constitution. I have made a rather careful study of the Constitution and have found nothing in it which contains any prohibition against the use of common sense or of constructive cooperation between the so-called independent branches of the Government. I thought it was a shocking and a very foolish thing when the President said that he was willing to go to the people on this issue. The issue went to the people last November. But if he wishes it that way, he may go again to the people, but I think the result will be the same, or even worse for him. I hope the President will come to realize that there is no prohibition against his acting in honest cooperation with the Congress, so that we can work these things out without any conflict of constitutional jurisdiction, or assuming——

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator is anticipating precisely why I took the floor this afternoon. That is exactly the thing I am recommending to the President, that instead of taking this headstrong attitude, this royal and superior attitude of utterly defying the Congress, of registering his contempt therefor and saying that he will carry the issue to the people, there is a simple, respectable, logical, and persuasive course he can take by employing the rule of common sense and saying, "We are working together as a Government comprised of coordinate branches, and the President and the Congress must move forward together, rather than fighting and quibbling about constitutional powers."

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

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan did not have in mind that Congress had the power to designate where the Armed Forces would fight and exactly when they would fight. Rather, in view of these provisions of the Constitution relative to the limitation upon the term of appropriations for the military, he had in mind that certain limitations do exist in this field which apply to both the Congress and the Executive.

As a result of those limitations the President and Congress, in effect, would have to work as a team in using the Armed Forces of the Nation. Such cooperation overcomes any inherent danger of any one man, connected with the military, as the President is by reason of his status as Commander in Chief, obtaining from the people large appropriations in order that he might use the military in the future in any way he saw fit.

By placing these provisions in the Constitution, the framers were reminding the President and the Congress of their accountability to the people of America in whom the sovereign power actually resides. Neither the President nor Congress has the right to take from the people the powers bestowed upon them in recognition of certain inalienable rights. When both the Congress and the President recognize those rights as the keystone of our liberties in America, there will be no trouble between Congress and the President. We will do the things that are morally right for the people of America and we will take the advice of the people in connection with what the people think is actually morally right.

Mr. MUNDT. That is correct. I rather think that if we could bring out of the archives of the past, spokesmen from the days of the writing of the Constitution they would be amazed and appalled to find this country, in this hazardous time, concentrating on a debate as to whether the President or Congress alone is to have the control of the armies of the United States. I think, by the very manner in which the framers of the Constitution approached the problem, they expected Congress and the President to work, in the words of the junior Senator from Michigan, as a team. Certainly I see no basis for the White House and the State Department calling upon the Nation for unity and upon Congress for cooperation, in one breath, if, in the next breath, the President at a press conference says, "We propose to defy Congress. We have the power to send troops anywhere we want to, and at any time, and we are going to exercise that power. If Congress tries to exercise any power to the contrary I will carry the issue to the country."

I think that would be an amazing spectacle to the men who wrote the Constitution.

If the President proposes to adhere to that viewpoint, we can continue such a debate throughout the session of the Congress. We in Congress have certain inalienable rights, and we would be derelict in our responsibility to the people who sent us here unless we maintain control over the purse strings and unless we maintain the right to declare war, and the right we possess in connection with the recruiting and supplying of troops.

So I suggest an easy answer to the predicament in which we find ourselves. I propose that President Truman, between now and the time we intend to vote upon this issue next week, proclaim to the country that the constitutional debate is over, that he, as the President, is not going to involve the United States and its troops in foreign actions abroad without conferring with Congress and securing its prior consent; that before making commitment to send American troops to Europe to implement the Atlantic Pact or to patrol the boundaries of Europe he will seek and secure approval by Congress.

Then there would be no cause for this constitutional debate, Mr. President. Then we can move forward as a team. Then we can move forward, each trusting the other.

If, on the other hand, by the verdict to be recorded in the Senate next week the President's side wins—suppose that by cracking the whiplash over the backs of Democratic Members he should have enough votes to send the Wherry measure to the Committee on Foreign Relations, where it will be as dead as Banquo—is that going to satisfy the country? Is that going to satisfy those of us who vote in opposition? Is that going to allay any fear or dissipate any suspicion? Or will it be simply a red warning sign to the country that here is a man who is determined to rule by Executive fiat, that here is a man who wants to defy Congress, who was able to pigeonhole the resolution so that we cannot move forward, and so he can send the boys now being recruited any place, anywhere, at any time, by Executive fiat, and with a royal wave of his hand? Is that going to give us national unity? I think not, Mr. President.

Suppose, on the other hand, those of us who support the resolution win; suppose we are able to influence enough supporters from the other side and among reluctant associates on our side, to win by a narrow margin. What does that accomplish? Where does that leave us in the public viewpoint? We have the satisfaction, I suppose, of defeating the President in a proposal which he should never have made. We have cautioned him that the Congress is still on the job, and even more on the job than it was 2 years ago at this time. But I think that is not a very happy answer, either, because we do not know whether he is going to follow that resolution. Suppose he should ignore it? Then what would happen?

Does anyone think the Congress of the United States is going to impeach the President while Congress is comprised of a majority of his own party members? If we should, would that strengthen us in the eyes of foreign nations? I think not.

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

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should like to suggest that I think the President will be duty bound to maintain his own constitutional powers and that he would not, and I think he should not, make any kind of a statement that would perpetually limit his own constitutional powers. But he certainly could say that so far as implementation of the North Atlantic Pact is concerned, in connection with which we were told, in debate, that there would be congressional control over the subject, he could certainly go so far as to say that, as a matter of policy if not of constitutional law, he would not move without the instructions of Congress.

Mr. MUNDT. Precisely. That is the point at issue today.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I voted for the North Atlantic Pact.

Mr. MUNDT. So did I.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I never would have dreamed of voting for it had we not received assurance that Congress would retain control over the size and general use of the forces.

Mr. MUNDT. We sought and received clear-cut assurances then that we would be consulted now.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I think we should be careful not to press the President to where he can rightfully take the position that "I, as the trustee of Presidential powers, have no right to yield my own powers, and you should not ask me to do so, while at the same time asking that I respect your constitutional powers." But if we limit it to the North Atlantic Pact we are on sound ground, and he should be the first to recognize it.

Mr. MUNDT. That is correct. If he initiates that kind of move toward national harmony and unity and the restoration of public confidence, it is much better than being compelled to do it by some kind of congressional resolution.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I believe the Senator has made a very valuable contribution to the debate.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the Senator. I conclude with the statement that under present conditions the only court of competent jurisdiction for rendering a satisfactory and enduring verdict as to whether or not the President's position with regard to troops and their movement is correct, or whether the congressional position is correct, is the court of public opinion. That court does not convene until November 1952. In the meantime we have conditions to meet and we have problems to solve. We should be debating in all sincerity the formulation and proclamation of a foreign policy which our fellow citizens and our friends abroad can understand. Certainly we have no such policy as of today. We have no such proclamation. I venture to say that no Senator could stand on the floor of the Senate and explain in a 1-minute speech or in a 10-hour speech what our American foreign policy is toward Asia. We do not have any policy toward over half the people in the world. We have a day-to-day, catch-as-catch-can series of frightened and frightening reactions to something that the Russians are saying or that the Russians are doing. What the world needs and what America needs is a clear American foreign policy, brought about by a meeting of minds in honest debate, which foreign policy, when it is proclaimed, will be as easily understood as the Monroe Doctrine was understood in its day. It should be as clear, precise, cogent, positive, and courageous. We should have such a foreign policy, instead of continually and perpetually being bound by the kind of policy we have today, which is little more than a series

of belated reactions to something which the Kremlin initiates, what Pravda or Izvestia says, or what the Communist conspirators and transgressors do or say.

Certainly somewhere in the world there is an American position. We ought to be able to arrive at an American foreign policy. As Americans we have responsibilities. We have a responsibility in this world as Americans, as members of a global community, and as believers in freedom, which we should be willing to develop, and to the development of which we should be willing to devote our time and talents, free from the controversy of whether the President of the United States can get by with defying Congress, or whether Congress, on the other hand, can get by with defying the President through its hold on the purse strings.

If the President will speak out and remove the problem from present consideration by making a plain and definite declaration that he will not move into this Atlantic community with any proposal with respect to American troops without consultation with Congress in advance, and without first securing approval of Congress for his actions, we can devote ourselves to these tremendous and urgent problems of writing, preparing, developing, and supporting a foreign policy which the world, the people at home, and the boys fighting in Korea can understand.

Then we can start talking about how to raise an army, at what age boys shall be called up for service, under what methods they are to be called up, how to train them, where to send them, and how to equip them. Then we can start talking about the problem of financing our effort, how to get the money, and how to raise the taxes. Then we can start talking about the immediately important problems of how to mobilize our economy, and how to get ready. That is what we should be doing, instead of constantly acting as though the President were waging war on Congress, or Congress waging war on the President. It is a situation for which the President must assume full responsibility, having told the country, "I will defy the Congress, if need be, and send troops to any place at any time I choose." Having declared this forensic war, he is the man to call it off. We would then be able to settle down to a consideration of much more urgent business if the President were to make the declaration I suggest. Then the public would have confidence that we are moving forward as a team, and that we are moving forward as a government of coordinate branches, instead of competitive branches. Were we to do so, certainly we would present a stronger front to the enemies of freedom, regardless of what foreign policy we eventually decided upon.

PRECEPTS OF OTHER DAYS AS A GUIDE FOR ACTION—LETTER FROM JAMES T. WYATT

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, under date of December 13, 1950, I received a letter from Mr. James T. Wyatt, who is associated with radio station KOIN in Portland, Oreg. Because the letter is clear in its statements, because it is cogent, because it is analytical, because it is objective, because it is exactly in line with the remarks just made by the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], and because it brings back to our minds the necessity of reverting to history and to the precepts of others in days gone by, I desire to read the letter into the Record at this time:

PORTLAND, OREG.,
December 13, 1950.

The Honorable GUY CORDON,
Senator from Oregon, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CORDON: It is frequently stated that our Senators and Representatives in Congress welcome individual views of the citizenry. With this in mind, I take the liberty of writing you about the serious dilemma facing our Nation.

The first half of this twentieth century presents a strange contrast. It witnessed great attainments by the United States in material well-being and also in that spiritual stature which overcomes racial hatreds, and gives succor to the oppressed and respect to the minority.

But on a global scale, the half century has been one of the most violent and destructive in the history of man. Our Nation became engulfed in two world wars, and on both occasions emerged victorious but lacked the statecraft to win the peace.

We are now being drawn into another vortex of global violence. Our competent generals have in recent weeks been assigned well-nigh impossible tasks; and our gallant troops have ridden into the Valley of Death, as did the Light Brigade at Balaklava, because "someone has blundered".

There is talk of bipartisan policy or the lack of it. Let me pose a simile. A ship is steered by its captain, upon whose competency rests the fate of passengers and crew. But the captain does not guess at the stars nor make emotional judgments on navigation. He must operate on proven principles.

In our American captaincy on foreign seas there are two outstanding and historic principles of navigation in United States statecraft. These were set down and proven by George Washington and Theodore Roosevelt. Sound and solid today as when originated, they are:

1. Avoid foreign entanglements.
2. Speak softly and carry a big stick.

There is plenty of latitude in these precepts to cover the changes of time and history and to meet new responsibilities. Washington's precept does not adjure against foreign dealings or interests, but against entanglement. Theodore Roosevelt believed in a strong voice in international affairs, but he adjured against a loud mouth and too little power.

These precepts remain the wise formula upon which our Nation achieved its sound position in the world.

As a citizen of Oregon, I urge you to do your utmost to reestablish these proven principles as a guide to our bewildered statecraft, to the end that America may again earn the admiration of the world.

Respectfully yours,

JAMES T. WYATT.

RECESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 9 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, January 18, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 17, 1951

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

O Thou God of infinite love and mercy, who art always seeking to guide and direct us into the nobler ways of life, help us to interpret all Thy righteous commands and judgments as gracious invitations to follow the paths which Thou hast marked out for us.

Grant that we may see more clearly that Thou art not commanding or expecting our finite minds to comprehend fully Thy divine will and Thy dealings with us, but that Thou art calling us to trust and obey Thee faithfully.

We pray that Thou wilt help us to understand that the measure of our faith and obedience is the measure of our wisdom and strength and peace.

Inspire us daily with a larger faith and a deepening assurance that there is no crisis which we cannot face, and no hardship which we cannot endure when our minds and hearts are stayed on Thee and when we place our hands in Thine.

In Christ's name we bring our petitions. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Monday, January 15, 1951, was read and approved.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that as chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs I may have until 12 o'clock tonight to file a report on the bill H. R. 1.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDING CHAPTER 26 OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 73) amending chapter 26 of the Internal Revenue Code.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I do not like to have all this legislation coming up by unanimous consent, particularly when there has been no opportunity to consider these measures. Therefore, it not having been brought to my attention that unanimous consent would be asked today to bring up this bill, I shall be obliged to object, until that rule has been complied with.

Mr. DOUGHTON. This bill has the support of all the departments concerned. It has the unanimous approval of our committee.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I know, but we have not had an opportunity to examine it. I feel that it is my duty to the Members of the House at

least to have examined it personally before any legislation comes up. We are liable to put a lot of legislation through otherwise that might be objected to.

Mr. DOUGHTON. I can understand the position of the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I should like to have the gentleman withdraw his request until I have had an opportunity to examine the bill.

Mr. DOUGHTON. It is all right to withdraw it, but this bill is identical with one that passed the House in the last Congress.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I do not care whether or not it was passed, I do not know that, and I feel that in justice to the Members on this side of the House I ought to be fully informed about it.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina withdraws the request.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from a committee:

JANUARY 16, 1951.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
The Speaker,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation to serve on the Public Works Committee, effective immediately.

Sincerely yours,

EARL CHUDOFF,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

CONSTRUCTION OF MODERN NAVAL VESSELS

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1001) to authorize the construction of modern naval vessels, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 1001, with Mr. RAINS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 25 minutes and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, the bill which is now before you for consideration embraces the immediate program of the Navy for the construction and conversion of naval vessels.

At the outset I want to emphasize one point. Under normal conditions this program, which involves the expenditure of approximately $2,000,000,000, would not be requested in its entirety, but would be phased over a number of years into the future, at least through 1954. However, the critical state of world affairs demands that we accelerate the Navy preparedness program in the same manner that we have already accelerated corresponding programs for the Army and the Air Force. As a result, the Navy preparedness programs for the next 3 years have been telescoped in the interest of national security. I also want to emphasize that the acceleration of this program is not a unilateral idea on the part of the Navy. It has the full concurrence of the entire Military Establisment and the President.

We must recognize the fact that there are categories of ships in which the Navy suffers from numerical deficiencies—it has too few for its needs. Some of the antisubmarine warfare types and some of the mine-sweeping types are examples of deficiency.

There are other categories in which the Navy suffers from obsolescence. Improvements in Navy weapons or enhanced capabilities of a prospective enemy require the construction of new ships. The Navy proposes to do all it can to meet its needs in these categories by converting ships already in being. Conversions, however, valuable as they are, cannot entirely meet that need. The Navy has greatly strengthened its war potential by conversions of conventional submarines to snorkel submarines and by placing modern antisubmarine weapons in existing destroyer types. Conversion of *Essex*-type carriers has helped, will continue to help, and must be continued, but the time has come to construct a new carrier—a successor to, and an improvement upon, the *Essex* and *Midway* types. This bill would authorize the construction of such a ship.

Generally speaking, this program is divided into two phases: First, new construction, which emphasizes antisubmarine vessels and mine sweepers; and, second, conversion of existing vessels, which emphasizes carriers and antisubmarine vessels.

New construction, the first phase of the program, consists of 500,000 tons of naval vessels. This would permit the construction of 173 new vessels as follows: 1 aircraft carrier of approximately 57,000 tons, 22 mine sweepers, 30 mine-sweeper boats, 7 submarines, 2 ocean escorts, 12 fleet tankers, 2 rocket ships, 1 ice breaker, 66 landing ships, 30 smaller vessels of various types.

These vessels, with the exception of the aircraft carrier, can be completed in a period of 2 years. The completion of the aircraft carrier will require 3½ years.

For security reasons the characteristics, capabilities, and improvements which will be embodied in these new vessels are omitted.

The second phase of this program consists of the conversion of 1,000,000 tons of existing naval vessels. This would permit the conversion of 291 existing vessels as follows: Six *Essex*-type carriers to accommodate improved jet aircraft, 12 cruisers, 2 guided missile cruisers, 194 destroyers, 12 radar picket destroyers, 31 landing craft, 34 smaller vessels of various types.

As in the case of new construction, the characteristics, capabilities, and types of improvements in these converted vessels are omitted for security reasons.

It should be noted that the new construction program, in addition to providing for the construction of a carrier, places emphasis upon mine sweeping craft and upon amphibious and landing ships; while the conversion program emphasizes the carrier and antisubmarine ships.

The carrier force continues to be the backbone of naval offensive power. The Navy has long been conscious of the submarine menace, but the mine threat is one that has been brought closely home as recently as the Korean campaign. And, in like manner, Korea has demonstrated the great desirability of proficiency in amphibious operations. Naval shore bombardment from surface ships has also proved its continued usefulness in recent months and days. We are fortunate, however, in having a reserve of battleships and cruisers and thus nothing is proposed in this field, at present, beyond modernizing the antiaircraft batteries of some of our cruisers.

In view of past controversies over the construction of a larger aircraft carrier, I want to briefly review the background of events which has led to the favorable decision to construct such a carrier.

During the late phases of the past war, carrier task force commanders reported an ever increasing need for larger, heavier, carrier-based aircraft to accomplish war missions. To accommodate these larger aircraft, they strongly recommended construction of an aircraft carrier larger than either the 27,000-ton *Essex* class or the 45,000-ton *Midway* class. The late Admiral Mark Mitscher, commander of the famed Task Force 58, instituted the original studies which resulted in the Navy recommendation for the construction of a 65,000-ton flush-deck aircraft carrier. Planning was undertaken in January 1946. By October 1947 plans had become sufficiently firm to justify a budget request for the construction of this carrier. Such a request was accordingly submitted in the Navy budget for 1949. That request was approved by the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of Defense—the late James Forrestal—the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, and by the President, and funds to undertake construction of the carrier were contained in the appropriation act of 1949.

The contract for the construction of the 65,000-ton carrier *United States* was awarded to the Newport News Shipbuilding & Drydock Co. on April 10, 1948. The keel was laid at Newport News on April 18, 1949. Construction of the carrier was canceled by Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson on April 23, 1949. At the time of cancellation, the estimated cost of constructing the carrier was $189,000,000. The termination settlement agreement between the Government and the Newport News Shipbuilding & Drydock Co. was concluded on December 21, 1950, at a cost to the Government of $2,718,672.

On three specific occasions the House of Representatives approved the construction of the aircraft carrier *United States*. The enactment of H. R. 6049, Eightieth Congress, was an implied authorization since it suspended work on

13 vessels in order to make the funds available for the carrier. Appropriation of the first increment of funds in the fiscal 1949 budget constituted the second approval. Appropriation of the second increment of funds was included in the fiscal 1950 Appropriation Act, which was passed by the House prior to the cancellation of the carrier.

The carrier which is proposed in H. R. 1001 is a further development of the *Midway* class. It will be of approximately 57,000 standard displacement tons and of flush deck design. Therefore, it is approximately 12,000 tons larger than the *Midway* class and approximately 10,000 tons smaller than the U. S. S. *United States*, which was canceled. It is intended as a base from which modern carrier aircraft may be operated, and it will accommodate bombers which are capable of waging atomic warfare. It is not a revolutionary weapon, but is an improved conventional carrier into which the lessons of World War II and thereafter will be built.

The ship will have increased catapult and arresting capacity, larger elevators, and higher hangar decks overhead in order to accommodate larger and faster planes. There will be added armor protection and improved underwater protection. Fire-fighting and electronic capabilities will be improved. The construction of this ship will not render the *Midway*-type or the modernized *Essex*-type of carriers obsolete. Its construction will place the Navy in a position of having at least a prototype for the test and operation of new carrier planes, the development of which may now reasonably be foreseen. The cost, under current dollar values, is estimated to be $235,000,000, approximately $45,000,000 more than the carrier *United States*. The principal reason for the increase in cost lies in the inflation which has occurred in the past 2 years.

In giving this statement on the background of the construction of a larger aircraft carrier, I hope that I have not renewed any of the antagonism which has heretofore existed because of this matter. There is no longer cause for controversy, since the construction of the proposed carrier now has the approval of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Secretary of Defense, and the President. So let us leave that controversy behind as we go forward in our preparations for national defense.

Now I want to call the committee's attention to section 4 of the bill. This section has not been previously submitted to any agency of the executive branch for approval. However, it represents the unanimous conviction of the members of the House Committee on Armed Services. You will note that it provides that no battleship, carrier, cruiser, destroyer, or submarine of the United States which has not been stricken from the Navy register, or any interest of the United States in any such vessel, shall hereafter be sold, transferred, or otherwise disposed of unless hereafter authorized by the Congress.

This action by the House Committee on Armed Services came about as the result of information which we received in local newspapers that a number of United States naval vessels were being sold to certain friendly countries in South America. We learned that the principal disposals consisted of two cruisers to Argentina, two cruisers to Brazil, and two cruisers to Chile. Further investigation revealed that these disposals were being made under the provisions of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended.

Section 408 (e) of that act, as amended, provides that the President may, from time to time, in the interest of achieving standardization of military equipment and in order to provide procurement assistance without cost to the United States, transfer, or enter into contracts for the procurement for transfer of, equipment, materials, or services to certain classes of friendly nations. The section further provides the manner in which the consideration for such transfer was to be determined. I do not deem the money consideration to be a very important factor. However, since the words "equipment, materials, or services," as used in the Mutual Defense Assistance Act, have been interpreted to include ships in the active fleet of the Navy, I deem it of the highest importance that we should take some immediate clarifying action. I do not know whether any Members of the House realized that our Government could dispose of almost anything it wished to, except merchant vessels, under the terms of that act. Neither the committee hearings nor the committee report clarify this point, as to ships, and I want to frankly admit that I did not have the slightest idea that combatant ships of the active fleet of the Navy could be disposed of under the terms of the act. During the entire period that I have been concerned with the affairs of the Navy, I have always insisted that all authorizations for naval ship construction contain a prohibition against the disposal of any such ship unless specifically authorized by the Congress. Those prohibitions which were written into previous ship authorization bills were nullified by the wording of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act. So the net effect of section 4 of the proposed legislation is to restore to the Congress the same rights which it has heretofore enjoyed in the disposal of combatant ships of the Navy.

I want to say that the intent of the House Committee on Armed Services, as expressed in section 4 of the proposed legislation, is not intended to cast the slightest reflection on anyone, either in or out of the Congress. Transfers which have already been effected under the act have all been made to friendly countries, and I am certain that they were made in the best of faith by all parties concerned. I do insist, however, that it is far more appropriate to have such matters considered by the Congress in the normal legislative manner when all of the facts are subjected to the light of public scrutiny. It is entirely possible that additional transfers may be made, but I am confident that all of you join me in the feeling that it is better to do it in a manner which experience has proved to be sound.

The total cost of the program contained in the proposed legislation is approximately $2,000,000,000, based upon current dollar value. The first increment of funds for this program will be contained in the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act. That is the best evidence that time is of the essence in this program.

With the exception of section 4, which I have just explained, the program has the approval of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Secretary of Defense, and the President—and is unanimously approved by the House Committee on Armed Services. I trust that this series of favorable actions will remove any doubts which may have existed in the minds of any members of this committee, and that you will forthwith approve this legislation.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I notice section 4 of the proposed legislation provides that no battleship, carrier, cruiser, destroyer, or submarine of the United States which has not been stricken from the Navy register or any interest of the United States in any such vessel shall hereafter be sold, transferred, or otherwise disposed of, unless authorized hereafter by the Congress.

Mr. VINSON. I thought that I would first deal with the other sections and then take up section 4.

Mr. Chairman, I will yield to any Member for any question in regard to the construction program at this point. I feel that if the subject is developed in this way, it will enable us more intelligently to understand everything in the bill.

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

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. Can the gentleman advise the House and the country whether any effort has been made to obtain the return of some 500 vessels which I understand we loaned to Russia during World War II?

Has the Government asked Russia for the return of those vessels?

Mr. VINSON. I will say that all I know about it is what I have read in the newspapers. I do not know whether a formal request in diplomatic manner has been made by Russia to return any of the vessels that were given to her under lend-lease during the last war.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I understand the gentleman is going to touch on the whole subject later in his remarks.

Mr. VINSON. Yes.

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

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Will the gentleman explain why it is that we justify an aircraft carrier at this time, in view of the controversy which preceded this authorization——

Mr. VINSON. All of you recall that some time in the fiscal 1949 the Appropriations Act made money available to commence the construction of a large airplane carrier which was to be of 65,000 tons. This carrier will be of 57,000 tons. That carrier was approved

by the former Secretary of Defense, Mr. Forrestal. The House again made money available in the fiscal 1950 Appropriation Act. Then on April 23, 1949, Mr. Johnson canceled the contract after the keel had been laid. When that contract was canceled, the Government had to pay the Newport News Shipbuilding Co. $2,718,632 for the work that had been done up to the cancellation of the contract.

A controversy arose between the Department of the Air and of the Navy as to the carrier. The Armed Services Committee held long hearings in 1949, and the Armed Services Committee unanimously concluded that each military department should be permitted, authorized, and justified to determine what kind of weapons it needed to carry out its military missions. So after that conclusion on the part of the Armed Services Committee, a restudy was made of the advisability of building an airplane carrier larger than what is known as the *Midway* or *Essex* class. Modern naval aviation has so developed that it has need for a larger deck from which to fly. Now, if the committee will visualize, an airplane carrier is nothing more than a mobile, floating landing field. That is all it is. With the development of jet aviation, it became necessary to strengthen the decks of various airplane carriers. So we are already on a program to do that, enabling carriers to carry larger airplanes which have a greater flight radius.

This, therefore, caused the Department to conclude, and rightly so, that to carry on the steady progress of advancement in the art of aircraft you must have a larger deck from which to fly. So, therefore, they have recommended that we expand the airplane carrier into a larger class than that of the *Midway* type. That is what this bill does. It does not conflict in the slightest degree with the roles and missions of the Air Force. It may be possible, and in all probability will be possible, that the airplanes that fly off of the *Midway* and fly off of the *Essex* type, and fly off of this type of carrier will carry planes which can deliver the atomic bomb. Now, that is not an encroachment on the function of the Air Department. It is simply an addition to and an augmenting of the striking force of the Air Force.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I think I am in full agreement with the gentleman, as most Members are, that we do need such a supercarrier.

Mr. VINSON. That is right.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. And as the gentleman recalls on the occasion last week when he submitted his consent request to bring this bill up I reminded him of the fact that we had appropriated in the past for one of these carriers and then that the will of the Congress had been thwarted and the carrier's construction had been canceled. I want to ask the gentleman this morning if there is any provision in this bill which would prevent the President or some new Secretary of National Defense whom he may decide to appoint in the future from deciding in his inordinate and great wisdom that the Congress did not know what they were doing and cancel the construction again after the ship is half built at the taxpayers' expense?

Mr. VINSON. There is nothing in this bill.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Does the gentleman think we should strengthen the bill by writing such a provision in it?

Mr. VINSON. No. I may say in this connection that I feel confident this ship will be built, for this reason: There is no controversy between the Navy and the Department of Air about it; it is approved by the Joint Chiefs of Staff; it is recommended by the Secretary of National Defense, and approved by the President. All we are saying in this bill is that the President is authorized to do these things.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. And the gentleman is absolutely convinced that the President will not change his mind?

Mr. VINSON. I am satisfied now that the ships referred to in this bill are going to be built, and we are asking for money in the third supplementary to commence them. We are going to get them under construction right away. Of course, the cancellation of the carrier cost about three million dollars.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. It was not $20,000,000?

Mr. VINSON. No; the gentleman is in error; it was $2,718,000. The settlement was made with the Newport News Co. and closed out on the 21st of December 1950.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Then the information that the committee gave me was incorrect?

Mr. VINSON. The correct amount is $2,718,000.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. May I ask the gentleman to yield just at this point for one further statement?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The House has great confidence in the distinguished gentleman from Georgia; we have followed his leadership on military and naval matters for a great many years. Can he assure the House that he personally will follow up on this matter and make sure that they do not decide to change their minds?

Mr. VINSON. I am satisfied that when we have a roll call here on this bill and when this bill, which involves an expenditure of some $2,000,000,000, is passed, there will be no hesitancy on the part of the Executive to carry out the wishes of the Congress as reflected in this bill.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. And the gentleman's committee will do its usual good job of checking

Mr. VINSON. We will do our best.

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

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. Did I hear the gentleman correctly when I understood that he said that in 1949 it was decided that each department of the armed services would determine its own kind of weapons?

Mr. VINSON. That was the report of the Armed Services Committee growing out of the fact that we had a controversy between the Department of Air and the Department of the Navy. The Armed Services Committee unanimously reported, and rightly so, that each service should have the right to determine the type and character and the characteristics of the weapons it must use to meet its mission; that is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. Does the gentleman want to leave it that way, that each service is the master of its own decision as to what type of weapon they shall have? What about the Joint Chiefs of Staff, if they should be in disagreement?

Mr. VINSON. I believe my statement is absolutely correct; at least, that is the way I want to leave it. But in my opinion the Joint Chiefs of Staff would be trespassing upon dangerous ground if when the Navy said they needed a certain type of submarine they said they could not have that type because the Joint Chiefs knew best. I think the Navy knows best the type of ship it needs; I think the Department of Air knows best what kind of planes it needs for strategic bombing; I think the Army knows best what kind of weapons it needs to use with its ground forces.

Mr. McCORMACK. And the gentleman leaves it that way, that each department determines its own weapons without regard to consultation or the views of the others?

Mr. VINSON. It may consult with them, but a wise Joint Chiefs of Staff would not override their decision. Each service must develop its own weapon. Then the Joint Weapons Systems Evaluation Board determines the capabilities by those weapons.

Mr. McCORMACK. I agree with that, but that is different from the gentleman's original statement. I am very much concerned if each department determines absolutely its own weapons.

Mr. VINSON. Each department must determine what kind of uniform it will have.

Mr. McCORMACK. Oh, now, that is a different proposition.

Mr. VINSON. Each department must determine this, that, and the other thing.

Mr. McCORMACK. I agree they should have original jurisdiction, but I am concerned with this absolutism.

Mr. VINSON. That was the conclusion of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. McCORMACK. The Armed Services Committee does not leave it up to themselves. You disagree with the services, and you should.

Mr. VINSON. Yes; but we give weight to what the services say.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is different. It is entirely different giving weight than to have the right of absolute decision.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I must proceed because there are some other matters here I wish to deal with.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. At the outset of the gentleman's remarks he said the program would cost an estimated $1,000,000,000.

Mr. VINSON. The construction program will cost a billion dollars.

Mr. GROSS. Is it one or two?

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

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

Mr. JAVITS. Was there pointed out before the committee the issue of very large aircraft for strategic bombing as a mission versus the Navy undertaking this same mission?

Mr. VINSON. There is no duplication, as far as I know, of the types of airplanes that are going to be used on carriers, and those of the Air Force that are used for strategic bombing.

Mr. JAVITS. The gentleman would then modify his answer by saying that the mission is to be determined by the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Mr. VINSON. The second phase of this bill deals with conversion. We propose to convert some 291 ships into various modifications. We are already converting certain airplane carriers. We propose to convert 6 of them; we propose to convert 12 cruisers, 2 guided missile cruisers, 194 destroyers, 12 radar picket destroyers, 31 landing craft, and 44 smaller vessels of various types. That conversion program involves ships that are taken out of mothballs, ships that are already in the fleet. They are making certain conversions. I cannot discuss the type of these conversions because that, in a great many instances, is secret. It will cost in the neighborhood of a billion dollars to convert these 291 ships.

Mr. Chairman, the next phase of the bill is a very important one. We wrote in this bill that no ships could be transferred without the permission of the Congress. I want to invite everyone's attention to this because I know every Member of Congress is deeply concerned about it.

That came about in this way: We read in the newspapers where two cruisers were going to be given to Argentina or sold to Argentina, two cruisers to Brazil, two cruisers to Chile, and then on January 15, two destroyers were transferred to Italy. We knew in times past that the old Naval Affairs Committee had written into every ship-construction bill a proviso that nothing built under that bill could be given away, transferred, or put under other flags except by direct permission of the Congress.

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

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

Mr. JOHNSON. What I am concerned about is how anyone can give property of the United States away?

Mr. VINSON. I am going to tell the gentleman right now.

Mr. JOHNSON. I agree that the legislation should make sure they do not.

Mr. VINSON. I will tell the gentleman right now that this whole House sat here and permitted it to be done. Few, if any of us, knew anything about it.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, who slipped that over on the House?

Mr. VINSON. Well, listen to this: Let me read it so that the record will be straight. Section 408 of this act as amended provides:

> Section 408 (e) (1): The President may, from time to time, in the interest of achieving standardization of military equipment and in order to provide procurement assistance without cost to the United States, transfer, or enter into contracts for the procurement for transfer of equipment, matériels—

Now, that was part of a section that was put in the bill that came out of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Mutual Defense Assistance Act, as amended on July 25. That section authorized the President to transfer combatant vessels and many other things. I was dumfounded when I found out what was going on, and I said, "Why, you cannot do it." I said, "Where is your authority?" I said, "Mr. COLE and I for 20 years have been putting provisions like this in Navy ship authorization bills, and those ships cannot be transferred unless Congress says so." "Well," he said, "you are not familiar with the Mutual Defense Assistance Act." We then read the act, and we found that it gave the President the authority to transfer combatant ships of the Navy, but excluded commercial vessels. So, the sum and substance was that you cannot give away or you cannot sell any of these ships of the Maritime Commission; but, lo and behold, you can sell airplane carriers, battleships, cruisers, and all. So we wrote a provision in the bill that you could not do it until you got permission from the Congress. Now we have corrected it. It was all right, probably, for them to have done it, but let Congress do it instead of the departments.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I want to congratulate the gentleman on correcting this error, and I hope that he will be vigilant in the future to see that no one can give the Navy away.

Mr. VINSON. We will watch them, if you gentlemen will just back us up. In that connection, the other day when we had up the billion dollar construction bill we wrote a provision in there that all the real property that was acquired under that bill or any previous act for the Army, the Navy, or the Air Force could not be sold without permission of Congress. But, lo and behold, I saw in the RECORD this morning that the President has sent up a special message requesting the repeal of that provision. Of course, I hate to differ with the Commander in Chief, the Executive, but I think that when the Government acquires these military stations, or when the Government acquires these ships, Congress, speaking for the American people, are the ones to dispose of them, and not the Executive.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I want to say to the gentleman that he is entirely correct in the position he has taken. I want to ask him this question. Does his action in this bill, or the action of his committee in this bill correct the situation so that they cannot sell ships already built under the law; bills brought out by the Congress?

Mr. VINSON. Well, they have already made some transfers which are beyond recall. But if we are to make any more, let the executive department come here with a request as it did for Greece, and we will have a hearing and let the Congress determine.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Commercial ships can be transferred under the law.

Mr. VINSON. If you pass this bill, the Committee on Armed Services will get back in the saddle again.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. May I inquire of the gentleman whether or not he will instruct the counsel of the Committee on Armed Services to carefully check and read all bills that come from the Committee on Foreign Affairs in the future to be sure that none of us are caught in the future?

Mr. VINSON. I trust the gentleman from Ohio and all of us will be at least cautious and try to know what is in all of these bills, but it is impossible to do so. I am not criticizing them. It is probably all right. But we did not know it until 6 months later.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I know the gentleman wants to be fair with all the Members of the House, and with that in mind I want to remind him during the debate on the mutual assistance bill some of us pointed out that under the provisions of the mutual assistance bill the Government could give away anything belonging to the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, or the Marine Corps. Some of us voted against the bill, and were criticized for it.

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

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Chairman, it is regrettable that the Congress today must consider in this legislation providing for construction of naval vessels the authorization of an airplane carrier.

I have no doubt in my mind as to the necessity for the carrier. Hearings before our committee have validated the necessity. It is ridiculous, however, to consider that a vessel of this type was authorized by the Eightieth Congress and the money appropriated for construction. A large carrier was then contemplated and the cost to the Government was much less. The order by the Department of Defense scuttling the carrier is an instance of the false economy often practiced by the military authorities. We now find that the carrier authorized in this bill is 8,000 tons less in weight yet costing forty-five millions more than the other. The cancellation order alone cost the taxpayers in the neighborhood of two millions. These amounts may be "small potatoes" to the present administration—but to individual citizens the sum is a considerable one.

Beyond the money consideration, we have the grave question as to time lost in preparing for proper defense. It may well be that the carrier authorized in this bill will not be constructed for use in the present emergency. Had the work

gone ahead on the previous carrier as envisioned by the Republican Congress of 1947–48 the Navy would be better prepared to play its role in the preparedness program.

I well remember the administration ousting of Admiral Denfeld for his insistence upon going ahead with the proper naval program despite political expediency. This legislation is a vindication of the views he expressed at that time.

I shall support this authorization, but feel impelled to make known the background of fumbling and inconsistency on the part of the executive department. Day after day it becomes more evident that the Republican Congress elected in 1946 was of great service to our people.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS].

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to say only a few words with respect to the pending bill.

This bill authorizes the construction of 500,000 tons of naval vessels and the conversion of 1,000,000 tons of existing vessels. The approximate cost of the program as proposed by the bill will be $2,000,000,000.

This is part of our national defense program. It is one of the many steps to be taken to meet the existing threat to our national security. Your Committee on Armed Services is determind that we have a strong, efficient, well-balanced defense establishment, that we be strong on land, in the air, and on the seas. In striving to attain this objective at the earliest possible date, for time is of the essence, those of us who serve on the Committee on Armed Services have not, and will not, permit any partisan or political considerations to influence our decisions.

The bill we have before us today was reported to you unanimously. I hope that it will pass this House unanimously.

During this session we will be called upon to consider many more bills pertaining to our national defense. No one expects that there will be unanimous agreement, in committee or in the House as a whole, on each and every one of them. Each of us may have his opinion as to what should or should not be done for building up the proper kind of a defense. The mere fact that some one of us may not agree with what is recommended, whether by the administration or by our committee, and has the courage to express his disagreement as he should, does not mean that he is against our achieving a strong national defense.

It must be understood that there can be honest differences of opinion on defense measures. Unity of purpose does not require that we refrain from expressing these differences.

I have taken the time to stress this fact because too many people, some occupying high places of leadership, promptly question the motives of anyone who may disagree. One who may honestly disagree is invariably accused of playing politics or partisanship if he should be of a different political party affiliation. There is altogether too much of this questioning of motives and name-calling.

We have had our differences in the Armed Services Committee. But I am pleased to say that not once have the motives, the good faith, or honest purpose of a single member of the committee ever been questioned. I hope that in this same spirit each and every defense bill that comes before us will be debated on the floor of the House.

The point which I believe should be emphasized in connection with the pending bill is that by this program we seek to build up the naval offensive power. You will note that the bill authorizes the construction of a new aircraft carrier of approximately 57,000 tons. It will take about 3½ years to build this carrier.

Prior to the Korean conflict we had the tragic experience of having construction stopped on a supercarrier which the Congress authorized and for which we appropriated funds. We also had the tragic experience of seeing our naval air arm drastically reduced. What was once the greatest naval power in the world was practically scuttled. The Marine Corps in June of last year, when we entered the Korean War, had been whittled down to only 74,000 men, as compared to 472,000 in September of 1945.

In other words, the administration had virtually destroyed the offensive power of our Navy. Our Committee on Armed Services has been endeavoring to correct this tragic mistake. We now realize how much damage the faulty policies followed by our national leaders has done to our state of preparedness. And we are indeed paying a dear price for these inexcusable errors.

You will also recall that in the Eightieth Congress we initiated a program for a 70-group Air Force. We appropriated funds to carry out the program, but the money we appropriated was impounded.

The point I wish to emphasize is that our present state of unpreparedness is not the fault of our Committee on Armed Services, nor of the Congress. It is the fault of those in charge of our national defense. They refused to carry out the wishes of the Congress.

And there is this further point I wish to emphasize: Whatever the President may conceive to be his duties and responsibilities as Commander in Chief, the primary responsibility for our national defense rests with the Congress. We are the representatives of the people. We decide the size, nature, and character of the defense we shall have. When we make that decision it is the duty of the President to see that it is carried out.

When we pass this bill to carry out a certain naval-construction program, and we appropriate funds for that purpose, it becomes the duty of the Executive to see that the will of the Congress is fulfilled. We will cooperate with the Executive for seeing that we have a strong national defense, and we have the right to expect that he will cooperate with us. That is the only possible way that unity can be attained in meeting the difficult problems now confronting us.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT].

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I arise to support this legislation which is designed to authorize the construction of modern naval vessels, for the conversion of existing vessels, and for other purposes. One of the vessels to be constructed is a 57,000-ton carrier for the United States Navy.

I would like to use the time allotted to me to discuss the arbitrary cancellation on April 23, 1949, of the 65,000-ton carrier, the U. S. S. *United States*, by the then Secretary of Defense after the Congress of the United States had not only authorized its construction but had actually appropriated the money.

It is not my intention to revive any old controversies, but to review what took place and to point out that the will of Congress was completely ignored when the construction of the carrier was canceled.

Briefly, here is the situation.

Carrying out his responsibility and after an intensive study based on years of experience with carrier-based aviation, the Chief of Naval Operations, speaking for the Navy Department, proposed a 65,000-ton carrier. It was not a super carrier as some tagged it, but a logical development of an existing one.

The recommendation to build the U. S. S. *United States* was concurred in by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Secretary of Defense, the Bureau of the Budget, the Congress, and by the President of the United States.

The difference in size between the proposed 65,000-ton U. S. S. *United States* and the 45,000-ton *Midway*-class carrier was that the *United States* would have been 1,090 feet in length and 135 feet in width compared with the *Midway* class of 990 feet in length and 105 feet wide. In other words, the *United States* would have been 100 feet longer and 30 feet wider.

With a flush deck and little or no superstructure the 65,000-ton U. S. S. *United States* would have permitted various types of planes, some equipped to carry A-weapons to fly 1,700 miles out and 1,700 miles back whereas the planes of our existing carriers had a range of around a thousand miles.

The cost of the *United States* was estimated at $189,000,000, and at the time of its cancellation the keel had actually been laid and the ship was under construction at the Newport News shipyards, Newport News, Va. In addition, at least a half dozen special types of aircraft to operate from the *United States* were under construction in the plants of several aircraft manufacturers.

At that time the Navy Department had obligated itself in the form of intent to contractors in the amount of $150,000,000 and spent $7,500,000 in cash. The shipbuilder had contracted for between 90 and 100 thousand tons of steel, all of which had been fabricated and 3,000 tons of it had been delivered. Commitments had been made by the Newport News shipyards to contractors for boilers, auxiliaries, and so forth, in the amount of $10,000,000. Ordnance in the amount of $3,000,000 had been contracted for by the Navy Department, while several additional millions of dollars were tied up in the initial cost of new types of air-

craft. Thousands of man-hours had been expended by officers and civilians of the Navy Department, not to forget travel expenditures, and so forth.

As the result of the cancellation of the carrier, the taxpayers of this country suffered the following estimated loss:

(a) Nearly $20,000,000 in material and labor.

(b) Another $45,000,000 in construction costs when taking into consideration the higher cost of materials today needed to build the new 57,000-ton carrier which will cost about $235,000,000.

(c) Two and one-half to three years in time from the standpoint of having the carrier available for immediate use.

Laying aside for the moment the loss in money, materials, time, and labor, the American people were stunned in the spring of 1949 when they learned that the Secretary of Defense had acted without consulting the Congress, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Chief of Naval Operations in canceling the carrier.

At this point I want to insert for the RECORD, the letter written by Secretary of the Navy John Sullivan to the Secretary of Defense dated April 26, 1949, together with another letter to the President on the same date tendering his resignation as Secretary of the Navy.

Time will not permit me to read these letters, but I hope that every Member of Congress will refresh his memory as to what actually took place and which resulted in the resignation of a very popular and able Secretary of the Navy, John L. Sullivan.

APRIL 26, 1949.

Hon. LOUIS JOHNSON,
The Secretary of Defense,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: On Saturday, April 23, without discussion with the Chief of Naval Operations, without consultation with the Secretary of the Navy, you directed the discontinuance of the construction of the U. S. S. *United States*, the construction of which had twice been approved by the President.

This carrier had been the subject of intensive study in the Navy Department since it was first proposed early in 1945 by the late Admiral Marc A. Mitscher whose combat experience had convinced him of its necessity. In a hearing with the Director of the Budget on December 16, 1947, with the approval of the Chief of Naval Operations and the Chief of the Bureau of Ships, I volunteered to surrender $307,000,000 which was the cost to complete the approved construction of other vessels, to insure that funds would be available for the U. S. S. *United States*. Its construction was explicitly approved by the reports of the Armed Services Committees of the Senate and House on June 2, 1948, and June 9, 1948, respectively. In the Naval Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1949 the appropriation for the first year of construction of the U. S. S. *United States* was approved by the Congress. Again on December 17, 1948, in a conference with the Secretary of Defense and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, with the approval of the Chief of Naval Operations and the Chief of the Bureau of Ships, I abandoned construction of other vessels in the amount of $57,000,000 to insure the continuance of the carrier and other vessels. Additional funds for the continuing construction of this vessel in the fiscal year 1950 were included in the budget message which the President sent to the Congress on January 3, 1949, and were included in the National Military Establishment appropriation bill passed by the House on April 13, 1949.

Professional Navy men, charged with the task of planning for a navy adequate to the defense of America believe that the construction of the U. S. S. *United States* is so indispensable to the continuing development of American sea power that they have twice sacrificed other substantial construction because of the carrier's highest naval priority.

On Monday, April 18, while discussing a variety of subjects with you, the question of the continuance of work on the U. S. S. *United States* was raised, and my opinion was asked. I started to give my opinion, but before I had talked more than a minute you advised me that you had another appointment and would discuss this matter with me at a later date. The following day I sent you a very brief memorandum touching on only one phase of the justification of this carrier. In this memorandum I referred to my desire to resume the discussions that had been interrupted the previous day.

I heard nothing about this again until Saturday, April 23, when in Corpus Christi, Tex., I was advised by long distance telephone that you had sent me a memorandum directing the discontinuance of construction.

I am, of course, very deeply disturbed by your action which so far as I know represents the first attempt ever made in this country to prevent the development of a powerful weapon. The conviction that this will result in a renewed effort to abolish the Marine Corps and to transfer all naval and marine aviation elsewhere adds to my anxiety.

However, even of greater significance is the unprecedented action on the part of a Secretary of Defense in so drastically and arbitrarily changing and restricting the operational plans of an armed service without consultation with that service. The consequences of such a procedure are far-reaching and can be tragic.

In view of the foregoing I am sure you will agree with me that no useful purpose can now be served by my remaining as Secretary of the Navy. I have accordingly submitted my resignation to the President.

I deeply regret the circumstances that lead to my departure from the National Military Establishment at such an interesting and crucial period of its development.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN L. SULLIVAN.

APRIL 26, 1949.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: It is with profound regret that I submit to you my resignation as Secretary of the Navy, effective at the earliest date convenient to you.

It is almost 4 years since you called me back into Federal service. For the three appointments you have conferred upon me and, even more, for the day-to-day consideration, kindness, and friendliness you have manifested toward me, I shall always be grateful.

I send you my very best wishes for your continuing good health and the success of your administration. More deeply than words can express, I regret the circumstances that prevent me from continuing in my present post to help you in your magnificent efforts.

Very sincerely yours,

JOHN L. SULLIVAN.

I am sure that the average person will agree that while the time and money lost in the scrapping of the carrier *United States* in a series of blunders that cannot be redeemed, there is none of us that will ignore that it was not the halting of the work on the carrier, but the basic principle, that was at stake. The principle is simply that by a stroke of the pen the Secretary of Defense ignored the wishes of Congress, who represents the American people, and thus weakened the defenses of the United States.

Since Korea events prove many of the arbitrary decisions by the Secretary of Defense similar to the cancellation of the carrier *United States* were made in defiance of the statutes of Congress and without doubt tended to weaken the defenses of this Nation.

I may add that the 57,000-ton carrier contained in the bill before us—yes; even all the ships provided for in this legislation—could be canceled by the present Secretary of Defense in the same manner as by his predecessor.

As I said in the beginning of my statement, it is not my intention to revive old controversies, but in my opinion as we approve this bill that provides for the construction of a 57,000-ton carrier, we should keep in mind the cancellation of the carrier *United States* by the arbitrary action of the Secretary of Defense in the spring of 1949. With this experience in mind, we should proceed immediately to amend the Unification Act so that the will of the Congress cannot be ignored. After all, we are the elected representatives of the people and charged with the responsibility of providing this Nation with an adequate national defense.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, the bill before us is one to enlarge the Navy, and a part of that Navy will be used in the Mediterranean. In fact, some units of our Navy are there now and have been for a number of years.

What I wish to talk to you about today during this 5 minutes is the incidental problem of trying to make some arrangement with Spain to get American bases in that area.

Last summer it was my privilege to go to Europe, under the direction of our chairman, to study the military defense assistance program. I think the program is sound, and if we do not overdraw manpower from America, it is a very good way to protect ourselves. It is much better to fight our battle for freedom on the perimeter of freedom than on the Atlantic coast, in the event another great war should befall the earth.

I went out of my way to go down to Spain to see what the obstacle was preventing cooperation between our country and Spain in the particular critical situation that we find ourselves today. I found that the main trouble at that time was that we did not have an ambassador to Spain, and therefore there was no man of sufficiently high rank to talk to Franco, the head man of Spain. I understand that we have corrected that situation. We are going to have an ambassador to that country. But here we have the same sort of objections and arbitrary conduct by a statement of the President that, irrespective of whether we have an ambassador, there will be no dealings with Spain in relation to the military defense assistance program in Europe, which we are now trying to implement.

The last Congress of the United States appropriated $62,500,000 for the purpose of aiding Spain. It was only a loan. It will be guaranteed so we will recover every dollar. Why we should turn down a chance to work with that country is more than I can understand. Everyone here knows that there is not a single piece of land in the entire world today, in the light of the modern situation and the terrible thing facing the world, that is more important to the security of the world than the Iberian Peninsula. Spain is the most strategic piece of property in the entire world today. From there, if we had bases we could fan out with our aircraft over all of industrial Europe almost to the Arctic Circle; we could fly out over the Mediterranean where we have friends around the entire basin, except Albania, and perhaps Spain—and we want to make the Spaniards our friends—we could patrol and protect North Africa, we could dominate the great Arabian oil fields in every way. For the security of ourselves and posterity we ought to find some way to work with Spain.

They are anxious to work with us. I had the pleasure of talking with what they call the grand staff of the army in Spain and I found them anxious to cooperate with America. The ranking Republican member of our committee went to Europe several years ago. He also visited Spain and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] wrote a very wonderful and convincing article showing the tremendous advantages that we could have by cooperating with this country. This article was published in the Reader's Digest. The bugbear to our cooperation with Spain seems to be that their social system and their political system are not like ours. There is not a Member of Congress who believes in their social system; there is not a Member of Congress who believes in their governmental system; but for goodness' sake, if they can help us in the distress in which we find ourselves, we ought to accept their help. The very fact of having troops in the area and the spending of American money might help their poverty. That is only an incidental matter and we would not want to do it for that purpose alone, but we should make friends and have a space to locate air, Army, and naval bases. The Pyrenees are a barricade in which a very small army in numbers could withstand the onslaught of an army 10 times as big coming from the north or from the east.

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

Mr. JOHNSON. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. Is it conceivable to the gentleman that we might be able to cooperate with Tito and then refuse cooperation with Franco?

Mr. JOHNSON. I was coming to that point. We have worked with the Soviets; we have worked with Tito; Portugal, which signed the Atlantic Pact has a dictator; yet in Spain, for some reason, in the area which means most for our security and for the protection of our children, we just coldly turn our backs to those people. Every Member of Congress that I know who has visited Spain believes as I do, that we should have a working agreement with Spain. At this time we can ill afford to turn a cold shoulder to a country of 22,000,000 people who could be so helpful to us, if the military storm should break over Europe.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, at long last we can rejoice that this Government is beginning to exercise a little hard common sense by sending an ambassador to Madrid.

I did write an article for the Reader's Digest about 2 years ago which also was printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 26, 1949, pointing out the great advantages it would be to us from a strategic and military point of view to recognize Spain and deal with her. I think any military man will tell you whether he is in the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, or the Air Force, that from a strategic and military point of vantage there is no spot more valuable to the United States, so far as helping continental Europe is concerned, than the Iberian Peninsula. It is not only a beachhead affording us excellent airdromes, but it is also a barrier due to the fact that the Pyrenees Mountains are almost impassable. By aiding Greece and Turkey we protect the east Mediterranean and keep open Suez Canal. By helping Spain we protect the west Mediterranean and keep open the Strait of Gibraltar. One is rather useless without the other.

We must also bear in mind that there is perhaps no country on earth that is more anti-Communist than Spain, or which would contribute more to the stability of present-day Europe than that proud country. Furthermore, Spain has minerals and raw materials that we sorely need.

One does not, Mr. Chairman, have to sanction the political, social, or economic system of any country before recognizing it. In fact, we are dealing now with Soviet Russia. We recognize Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and many of the other nations back of the iron curtain. Certainly we have more in common with Spain than we have with these satellite Communist countries. When we recognize these countries we do so because they have a stable form of government and regardless of what one might think of the Franco regime you will have to admit that it has brought order and stability out of chaos. Do not overlook the fact that they have between 400,000 and 500,000 fighting men. In my honest and humble opinion Spain is the one nation in Western Europe we could depend upon and rest assured would fight in case of a global conflict.

Mr. Chairman, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, I now want to add a few more observations or views to those I have expressed. My only reason for mentioning Spain is that my able colleague and very dear friend from California [Mr. JOHNSON] a member of the Armed Services Committee, brought up the matter. It may be a bit extraneous to this particular debate on this specific bill, but it certainly is most worthy of consideration.

Because of our limited debate I have yielded most of our time to other Members who desired to speak on the legislation now under consideration.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] stated a moment ago that aircraft carriers are very vulnerable. Of course, every weapon of war is vulnerable, but the truth of the matter is, not one single major aircraft carrier in World War II was sunk by submarines, aircraft, or any other weapon. Pray tell me, sir, where would we have been in World War II in our long trek from Guadalcanal, Leyte, Guam, Tinian, Saipan, Iwo Jima, and Okinawa to Tokio without our aircraft carriers?

The Pacific Ocean is a very big pond, and only those of us who have flown over it or sailed over it will appreciate the vast distances and the complex and difficult problems which that ocean offers. It was our aircraft carriers, supported by battleships, cruisers, destroyers, minesweepers and escort vessels that brought about victory to us in the Pacific war.

Recent events in Korea prove more than ever before the necessity for aircraft carriers capable of mobility and surprise attack. The function of carriers is to gain and retain complete control of the seas. It is to attack enemy shipping and to prevent the delivery of weapons, most of all oil, to supply the enemy. At the same time it is to make possible the delivery of all these supplies to our ground forces in foreign and distant lands and to supply our Air Force on land based fields. Never was a strong and versatile Navy so much needed as in modern mechanized warfare.

We all know that we must have a well balanced defense force. We cannot get along without any branch of our armed services. We must have a fighting team on land, sea, and in the air. Each branch of the service is indispensable for our own survival. Certainly, I would not minimize the necessity of having all three branches of our services built to their maximum strength.

This is no time for petty jealousies, nasty bickerings, and destructive recriminations but it is pleasing and reassuring to know that the Navy was not "sunk" and that the Marine Corps was not "liquidated" as some bitter partisans would have done as late as October 1949.

Naturally, all branches of the services should be represented on the Joint Chiefs of Staff but we do not want a land-locked psychology to determine the course that we shall pursue. I would not want the Navy and the Air Force to tell the Army that it should not build a bigger and better tank than the Sherman or the improved Patton. I would not want the Navy and the Army to tell the Air Force that it could not build a bigger and better plane than the B-29, the B-36, or the B-47. Likewise, I do not want the Air Force and the Army to tell the Navy that it cannot build a bigger and better carrier than the *Midway* or *Essex* type.

Mr. Chairman, the improvement and development of all the weapons of war from the super-bomber, super-carrier, the Garand rifle, the snorkel submarine, the improved radio and radar equipment, guided missiles, rocketfire, the atom bomb, bacteriological warfare, and perhaps the hydrogen bomb under develop-

ment, must go on. It must not be forgotten that our improved aircraft in World War II on the drawing board at the time of Pearl Harbor, never actually got into combat before the close of World War II.

In this age of scientific research and technological development the weapons of war like the automobile, radio, and television become obsolete almost overnight.

For the benefit of Members, and specially the new Members, I would like to give briefly the background of the battle for the larger and more effective aircraft carrier.

During the late phases of the Pacific war, carrier task force commanders reported an ever-increasing need for larger, heavier, carrier-based aircraft to accomplish war missions. To accommodate these larger aircraft, they strongly recommended construction of an aircraft carrier larger than either the 27,000-ton *Essex* class or the 45,000-ton *Midway* class carriers.

Studies of the need for such a carrier were originally instituted in the Navy Department by the late Admiral Marc Mitscher, commander of the famed Task Force 58. Construction of a 65,000-ton flush deck aircraft carrier was approved by the Navy Department for planning purposes in January 1946.

By October 1947, detailed designs and plans became sufficiently firm to justify a budget request for the construction of this carrier. Such a request was accordingly submitted in the Navy's budget for 1949. The budget request was approved by the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of Defense, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, and by the President, and funds to undertake construction of the carrier were contained in the Department of the Navy Appropriation Act, 1949.

The contract for the construction of the 65,000-ton carrier *United States* was awarded to the Newport News Shipbuilding and Drydock Co., on August 10, 1948. The keel was laid at Newport News on April 18, 1949. Construction of the carrier was cancelled by the Secretary of Defense on April 23, 1949. At the time of cancellation, the estimated cost of constructing the *United States* was $189,000,000. The termination settlement agreement between the Government and the Newport News Shipbuilding and Drydock Co., was concluded on December 21, 1950, at a cost to the Government of $2,718,672.12.

In addition to congressional approval of this carrier in the Naval Appropriation Act of 1949, it had congressional authorization through the enactment of H. R. 6049, Eightieth Congress, which bill was reported by the House Committee on Armed Services and subsequently passed by both the House and the Senate. The 1950 Appropriation Act carried an additional increment of funds for the construction of this large carrier which had already been started. This constituted the third approval of this carrier by the House of Representatives. It is pertinent to note that the House Armed Services Committee in its report of March 1, 1950, on unification and strategy, took the position that—

> In the case of the modern aircraft carrier and its relation to seapower, those best qualified to pass judgment are very evidently our Nation's professional Navy leaders.

The Navy leaders, of course, were unanimous in their approval of a large carrier.

The large carrier proposed in H. R. 1001 is a further development of the *Midway* class. It will be of approximately 57,000 standard displacement tons and of flush deck design. It is intended as a base from which modern carrier aircraft may be operated. The Navy points out that it is not a revolutionary weapon, but it is an improved conventional carrier into which the lessons of World War II and thereafter will be built. The ship will have increased catapult and arresting capacity, larger elevators and higher hangar decks overhead in order to accommodate larger and faster planes. There will be added armor protection and improved underwater protection. Fire fighting and electronic capabilities will be improved. The construction of this ship will not render the *Midway* type or the modernized *Essex* type obsolete. Its construction will place the Navy in a position of having at least a prototype for the test and operation of any carrier planes, the development of which may now reasonably be foreseen. The cost, under existing conditions, is estimated to be approximately $200,000,000.

Now, Mr. Chairman, those of us on the Armed Services Committee, Republicans and Democrats alike, welcome the most careful scrutiny, thorough examination, and any criticism that might be offered by any Member of this body. We do not claim to possess all wisdom and virtue and we know that other Members of this House are just as patriotic and concerned over the welfare of our Nation as are members of the Armed Services Committee.

Most assuredly I share the grave concern expressed by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] over these vast expenditures even for our Armed Forces. Planes, carriers, submarines, and all the weapons of war are not the only phase of our national defense. Often I have said and I repeat it now: That the first line of defense of any nation is its financial solvency, a sound economy, and a productive industry. There is, of course, a limit to what an individual or a nation might do—but let me say to the gentlemen from Indiana and New York that this bill was not hastily considered and that our report is anything but scanty. This matter was considered thoroughly, after long, exhausive hearings in the Eightieth Congress which both the hearings and the report of our committee will show. It is painful to all of us to vote for a bill that calls for an expenditure of approximately $2,000,000,000 to build up our Navy, but there is no alternative.

Because of our geographical position, recent events, and the painful experience that we have gained in combat, I believe that any fair-minded, informed, and intelligent person will agree that we must at all times maintain a superior Navy. Without it the other two branches of our services will be impotent, and I trust that some men in high places in the Pentagon now realize it. None of us is infallible.

Mr. Chairman, recently on our retreat—or withdrawal—if that is a more comforting term—from the Chongjin Reservoir in North Korea, the Seventh United States Infantry Division on the east and the First United States Marine Division on the west marched from Hagaru and Koto down to Hamhung and then to Hungnam. Pray tell me, sir, where would we have been then without the United States Navy? Scores of naval craft of every description were out in that harbor and due to the support of the Third Infantry Division our fleet—because of its mighty fire power, was able to evacuate 105,000 United Nations' troops—mostly American, of course—and more than 95,000 Korean civilians. Without our Navy that would have been a mass massacre—the most devastating and ignominious defeat in all our history. We accomplished almost the impossible. Without detracting one bit from the splendid job done by our Air Force in that maneuver, I think most informed men will agree that it was the tactical support offered by carrier-based planes that saved the day—not only at Hungnam but also at Inchon.

Now, our forces evacuated from North Korea, have joined the southern forces in the Pusan area. Bitter fighting is now going on in the vicinity of Wonson, north of Pusan and southeast of Seoul.

None of us should be too critical about the reverses we have suffered, and far be it from me to assess the blame upon any particular individual or branch of our services. I would be the last person to want us to surrender. Certainly, I do not believe in capitulation, but when it comes to evacuation or annihilation, I shall choose evacuation. We can lose a battle without losing a war. This whole Korean campaign is an ill-fated one, as much as that of Gallipoli in World War I—the biggest mistake Winston Churchill ever made—and I still consider him the greatest man of our century.

Whether or not we shall remain in Korea will be largely determined by Stalin and Mao. It may be that we are driven out of Korea, but that does not spell defeat for us. We should draw a hard and fast line from Japan through Okinawa, Formosa, to the Philippines, and put forth all our strength to hold it. However, I am not the expert to make the decision.

Mr. Chairman, let us serve notice upon Russia, Red China, and the whole world that much as we might differ in the United States upon various issues, we are, after all, one people with one language and one interest. We have no desire to annex an acre of territory or to collect a dollar of indemnity. We will, as we have in the past, continue to help to the best of our ability, all those people in distress and those less fortunate than ourselves. We shall carry on in spite of

all hardships and through every diversity to fight, and if need be die, in order that a just and lasting peace might be established and that all men everywhere shall enjoy the blessings of freedom and opportunity such as we have happily enjoyed in the United States of America.

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

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, it was originally my intention to offer an amendment to this bill providing that the new 57,500-ton aircraft carrier be named the U. S. S. *Forrestal;* however, there is some question about the germaneness of such an amendment to this bill. Perhaps we would be setting a bad precedent by naming naval vessels on the floor of the House. I have introduced a joint resolution providing that this new carrier be named the U. S. S. *Forrestal,* a fitting tribute, in my opinion, to a great American, a great patriot, a man who gave his life for his country.

When the resolution comes back from the Department I trust that the Armed Services Committee and the House of Representatives will join me in paying this fine tribute to former Secretary of Defense Forrestal.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON].

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, present world conditions make it imperative that our Navy shall be built up to meet any emergency that presents itself. We cannot delay this important matter any longer. To do so is to take chances that may prove disastrous. Our national security should take precedence over any other Government activity. The Committee on Armed Services, under the able leadership of its chairman, CARL VINSON, of Georgia, and with the full cooperation of the ranking Republican member, DEWEY SHORT, of Missouri, is to be congratulated that it recognizes the necessity of providing new construction and modernization of existing ships to meet any challenge we may be called upon to face.

The bill, H R. 1001, reported by the Armed Services Committee, and now before us for consideration, provides a construction program for the remainder of fiscal 1951 and for fiscal 1952 consisting of 173 new ships and 291 conversions. Each particular ship or type of ship is important primarily insofar as it contributes to a balance within the fleet in which it is intended to serve.

The bill involves an authorization to construct 500,000 tons of new naval vessels and to convert 1,000,000 tons of existing vessels. The construction program includes, as previously stated, 173 new vessels, as follows: 1 aircraft carrier of approximately 57,000 tons; 22 mine sweepers, 30 mine sweeper boats; 7 submarines; 2 ocean escorts; 12 fleet tankers; 2 rocket ships; 1 ice breaker; 66 landing ships; and 30 smaller vessels of various types. It is estimated that it will require 3½ years to complete the proposed aircraft carrier and that the remainder of the program can be completed in a period of 2 years.

The conversion program to modernize 291 presently existing vessels includes the following: 6 *Essex*-type carriers to accommodate improved jet aircraft; 12 cruisers, 2 guided-missile carriers, 194 destroyers, 12 radar picket destroyers, 31 landing craft, and 34 smaller vessels of various types.

The program will cost approximately $2,000,000,000 and is made necessary if our fleet is to be brought up to that state of efficiency that present improved methods of warfare require.

It is also appropriate to mention and emphasize that the proposed construction and modernization program will go far in stabilizing and restoring the shipbuilding industry. As I have heretofore pointed out on many occasions, the countenance of this industry in a strong, healthy condition is absolutely necessary as an arm of our national defense. Too often, through the years, it has been permitted to develop into a "feast or famine" existence. If the industry is to remain strong and be a constant source of strength, then the working organization must be kept together. Without work the workers must necessarily find other means of employment. It is, therefore, imperative that continuity of work be provided or the industry languishes into a state of weakness and unpreparedness for any emergency that may suddenly arise. This program presented by the Armed Services Committee will go far in strengthening our Navy and reviving our shipbuilding industry that has been fast dwindling into a state of weakness due to lack of work. I trust the bill will have unanimous support of the Congress.

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

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, the 3,000-year-old tactics of Cyrus, of Attila, and of Genghis Khan have been employed to advantage by the Chinese Reds against the 150,000 Americans and their 25,000 United Nations allies in Korea. The Mongol horsemen have hit and run with singular efficiency against our extended lines of communication.

Horses gave the enemy forces speed and mobility where our highly mechanized troops were bogged down in snow and ice. The hardy ponies of the Chinese Reds were not halted by snow-clogged mountain passes. In fact, both weather and terrain fought with them, rather than against them.

The only military strategy which could have checkmated such strategy under such conditions would have been more and better horses and horsemen. The military axiom of that great southern battlemaster, Gen. Nathan Bedford Forrest still holds true, "Get there fustest with the mostest."

The United States once was the greatest cavalry nation in all history. Nebraska boys, Georgia boys, Wyoming boys, Texas boys, learned to ride almost as soon as they learned to walk. From Rough Rider "Teddy" Roosevelt back through Jeb Stuart, "Swamp Fox" Francis Marion and "Light Horse Harry" Lee there had been heroes on horseback. Then what happened? At the end of World War II, with the atom bomb in sight, our cavalry was put out of business. It joined American economy as a historical curiosity.

Let us act before it is too late. Let us be ready—not for just one set of emergencies—but for all emergencies. In the defense bill, soon to come before this House, it is our duty as Americans to provide a place—an honored place—for that organization which has so valiantly and so successfully defended the lives and liberties of generations of our countrymen, the United States Cavalry.

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

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I think it is well to bring out in this debate that the program we are now asked to endorse is, in part at least, the same naval preparedness program ordered by the Republican Eightieth Congress, which was subsequently cut back by executive order on recommendation by Louis Johnson, when he was Secretary of Defense.

Mr. Johnson, in what has proven a very unwise economy move, cancelled out the supercarrier authorized in this bill along with many other naval projects contained herein. In a so-called economy program, which he insisted upon, Secretary Johnson cancelled out this carrier along with a congressional program of a 70-group Air Force and other defense projects which Congress voted.

For the benefit of the new Members of this Eighty-second Congress, there is nothing new in the present program. It was authorized by the Republican Eightieth Congress which, in spite of misrepresentations of the 1948 presidential campaign oratory, had voted.

This naval expansion program should have the support of every Member of the Congress. It is a program that would have been well under way to completion today if it had not been for the shortsightedness of the politically minded appointees of the Truman administration 2, 3, and 4 years ago.

Shades of Admiral Denfeld. Remember it was he who was fired as chief of naval operations because he told Congress, in the so-called B-36 hearings, that we should always maintain a great and powerful Navy.

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

FLOODS AND THE WAR EFFORT

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Chairman, recent floods in the great Central Valley of California have caused the people of that area to be even more concerned than ever before with the rapid completion of flood control projects.

I am sure that a knowledge of the facts will convince both Chambers of the Congress that the earliest possible completion of the presently authorized flood-control projects in that area is necessary and urgent in the light of national defense. I am sure the Members will also be inclined to give special consideration to those projects which have been long authorized, but whose delay has been the result of an attempt to grant a small portion of available

money to projects scattered all over 30 States and Alaska.

The new population going to California has relied upon the recommendations of the Army engineers and estimated early completion dates. Thousands of families have settled and invested their life savings on small farms in areas threatened with flood. It seems unbelievable to the people of California living in these areas threatened with flood that the first flood-control project to control the streams of this Nation was recommended for that area by the Corps of Army Engineers as early as 1913 and is still uncompleted.

One month after I entered upon my duties as Congressman for the Tenth District of California, in February 1949, I appeared before the Appropriations Committees of this Chamber of the Congress in support of flood control in California. They had recommended sufficient funds to complete flood control facilities on four rivers in the southern end of the San Joaquin Valley. At that time, I stated as follows:

The Tenth Congressional District of California, which I represent, embraces all of Kern, Kings, and Tulare Counties, the greater portion of which counties lies within the territory to be served by the Central Valley project, and the south 125 miles of the San Joaquin Valley lies within the Tenth Congressional District.

Those three counties now have a population of about 450,000, which is almost double the population of the same area 10 years ago. The area has over 14,000 farms, consisting of approximately 1,000,000 acres of harvested cropland, with an investment in farm land and buildings of over $200,000,000. The basic economy of the area is agriculture, where over 200 different crops are produced commercially. This cropland is now irrigated in some instances by diverting water from valley streams, but in most cases by pumping water from underground supplies. The tremendous burden placed on the area during the war for increase in production of agricultural crops to feed our allies, as well as ourselves, resulted in an increased area being placed under cultivation and intense cultivation of the land already farmed. Prewar water deficiency has been aggravated by the increased cultivation, together with a tremendous population growth. The water table is falling rapidly, so that the farmers must continually deepen their wells and use heavier pumping equipment.

The above-mentioned facts in connection with the San Joaquin Valley have been known for many years, and the Central Valley project was conceived to furnish supplemental water. The people in the area had high hopes when the Friant Dam was commenced on the San Joaquin River in November of 1939 that the water supply would be supplemented within a year or two. Today, 10 years after the Friant Dam was started, the area has received no additional water from the project except for a small area in Madera County.

The water shortage in the area makes the farmers' position critical.

The present status of the project is as follows:

Friant Dam, 98 percent complete.
Madera canal, 100 percent complete.
Shasta Dam, 99 percent complete.
Friant-Kern canal, 43 percent complete.
Delta Mendota canal, 20 percent complete.
Tracy pumping plant, 12 percent complete.

The Friant-Kern canal, the Delta Mendota canal, and the Tracy pumping plant should be completed at the earliest possible date in order that our farmers may receive the real benefits of water in the Friant-Kern canal.

The Delta Mendota canal and the Tracy pumping plant must be completed before a large part of the water to be used in the Friant-Kern canal may be diverted from the San Joaquin River.

I, therefore, want to emphasize the importance of using all appropriations possible in the Central Valley project for the completion of the said Friant-Kern canal, the Delta Mendota canal, and the Tracy pumping plant, and that the total appropriation be not less than a sum sufficient to complete these canals and pumps in the fiscal year 1950. This will require $40,000,000 for the Delta Mendota canal and Tracy pumping plant, and $21,000,000 for the completion of the Friant-Kern canal. I assure you that every person in the district desires the earliest possible completion date of the water facilities in connection with the Central Valley project, so that the real benefits of that project will not be denied to farmers who so urgently need the water. I sincerely believe that the people of the area are entitled to know that appropriations in connection with the above mentioned three vital parts of the Central Valley project will not be delayed for another period of years.

It is my understanding that the engineering studies for the canals mentioned have been completed and that it is possible, if the amount of money necessary were appropriated for these two canals and pumping system, that contracts could be awarded along the whole canal to different contractors, so that the work could be carried on simultaneously over the entire length of the canals.

An additional $12,000,000 should be designated for completion of the Delta cross channel, which is required to bring the water released from Shasta Dam to pumps at Tracy. It will be necessary that that channel be completed so that Sacramento River water may be pumped into the Mendota area so that the water may be diverted from the San Joaquin River into the Friant-Kern canal. This matter should also be completed in the year 1950. It seems a bit ridiculous to those of us in the area that the Friant and Shasta Dams, which have been practically completed for over 5 years, have been giving no practical benefit to water users as evidence of Government inefficiency. The real need in the area is water and the appropriations possible this year should be confined to the completion of the above mentioned units of the project.

To accomplish the desired purpose in the year 1950, which is over 10 years after the Friant Dam was commenced, will only require a designation of $72,000,000 to be applied toward the above mentioned work.

As a result of the above completion, supplemental surface and underground water would be made available, and the use of electric power for pumping would greatly decrease, with a resultant saving of thousands of dollars to the farmers of the area. There seems to be no possible argument against the request that all possible funds be appropriated to complete the irrigation facilities.

I know that all requests for appropriations to your committee are accompanied by statements of dire need, but I want to assure you that it is literally true that unless water is available by the year 1950, much of the acreage of farmers in the area will be forced out of production because of depleted underground water supply and recurring additional expense in deepening wells and installation of costly heavy pumping equipment. These farmers have been compelled to do progressively more expensive pumping during the 10 years that they have waited for the completion of the project. They should not be asked to wait longer.

The area to receive supplemental water from the Central Valley project has a rural population larger than the State of Oregon or the State of Washington or the combined population of the States of Arizona, Nevada, Idaho, and Utah. It is a highly developed area with a rural population dependent upon its continued agricultural prosperity. It has all the other resources which will make it possible for it to continue to grow.

The supplemental water to be supplied will be furnished to lands already highly developed agriculturally; that is, lands that have been cultivated for over 25 years.

The lands to receive the water are small acreages and in almost every instance, the farmers in these areas have banded together and have formed water service districts under the laws of the State of California, which will purchase the water from the project and distribute it to the farmers in their respective districts. Most of those districts already have canal systems available to accept immediate delivery of water.

I want to repeat that the problem is very serious and needs immediate attention. It must be admitted that even the completion of the above request will not solve all of the water problems of the San Joaquin Valley, nor will it furnish supplemental water to all lands under irrigation in that area, but it will provide the immediate relief necessary.

I, therefore, again urge that funds for the completion of the Delta Mendota canal, Friant-Kern canal, Delta cross channel, and the Tracy pumping system be given immediate recognition and priority, so that the water features of the project will be immediately completed.

Mr. Chairman, in 1949 the Appropriations Committee of the House and the committee of similar jurisdiction of the other body recommended substantially less money than the Corps of Army Engineers requested. The respective Houses accepted the recommendations of their committees. Presumably, this action was taken for economy reasons.

It is also understandable that flood-control projects heretofore authorized based upon the recommendations of the Corps of Engineers in 30 States and Alaska are each entitled to sufficient appropriations for their completion at a reasonable date. However, if total moneys available are limited, it becomes the duty of this Congress to determine which of the projects should be given special attention in the national interest.

On another occasion, in March of 1949, I advised the committee of this body as follows:

My name is THOMAS H. WERDEL, Congressman of the Tenth District of California. I desire to file this written statement on behalf of the Isabella project on Kern River in California, and I will make additional oral remarks in regard to the Isabella project, together with the projects known as Success, Terminus, and Pine Flat, all of which are treated as a unit.

The Congress appropriated $1,250,000 to be expended during the 1948 fiscal year on the Isabella project, and Congress finally appropriated $2,500,000 for that project during the fiscal year 1949. The present estimated cost of this project is in excess of $14,000,000.

During the 2 years for which funds have been appropriated, work has been commenced upon the construction of this project involving the construction of an auxiliary dam, the relocation of State highways and provision for the relocation of a water conduit, which is an element of a hydroelectric power development in the reservoir area.

I am appearing here today in support of the recommendation made by the Water Resources Board of the State of California that an appropriation be made for this project,

to be expended during the fiscal year 1950, in the amount of $6,000,000. The Presidential Budget has recommended one-half this amount.

I do not feel that it is sound economy for projects of this magnitude to be developed over an extended period of time, due to greater costs not only of supervision and planning but likewise of construction.

The character of the floods produced by the Kern River watershed has created an extreme hazard in the past and, with the rapid growth and development of the exposed area continuing at the same rate as in the past decade, these hazards will assume greater proportions as time goes by. The report of the Army engineers was completed 9 years ago and the subsequent delay in the construction of this project has caused great property losses, as evidenced by the information contained in the written statement I have submitted in which, for the year 1943, it is shown that with three other streams, the Kings, Keweah and Tule Rivers, emptying into Tulare Lake Basin in addition to the Kern, an estimated damage of $10,000,000 for that year alone was caused. These losses were all to agricultural crops of great value to the general public, as well as the producer, consisting of cotton, alfalfa, grain, sugar beets and other similar crops.

The control of these four streams is essential for the final protection of this great productive area of over 250,000 acres, in addition to the local areas existing along the stream channels themselves. Kern River threatens the city of Bakersfield, a community having a metropolitan population estimated, at the present time, to consist of 120,000 persons. Bakersfield lies many miles upstream along the river from the Tulare Lake Basin. During flood stages the water surface in the river channel has stood 17 feet above the developed business district of Bakersfield. From this, it is restrained by levees constructed of poor materials, which seep dangerously at such times. It has been estimated by the Army Engineers that one flood alone which occurred during February 1937, could have caused property loss in excess of $5,000,000, if the levee had failed to hold. The embankment was practically over-topped by that particular flood.

After the river leaves Bakersfield, it passes through and either floods or exposes to flooding a great area devoted to agriculture and the production of oil. Several large oilfields, having great productive capacity, are adjacent to or directly in the path of floods. Great damage could be caused to the oilfields, which are a nonreplenishing resource of the area. Exclusive of the values of oil, real property values in the areas threatened by flooding have increased approximately 65 percent in the past 8 years.

The report of the Army engineers shows not only that protection from floods, the dominant reason for the creation of the reservoir, is adequately taken care of, but also that the proposed storage of 550,000 acre-feet will provide a nominal betterment to the existing irrigation rights on the river. As an indication of the dominance of flood protection, the report also shows that the ratio of value of average annual flood benefit to irrigation benefit is 5 to 1. As a matter of fact, the average amount of additional useful water provided to the existing users is only 8 percent of the full requirement, with no useful supply available for the irrigation of any new lands not now irrigated from the river.

This average is not indicative of the fact that in actuality, the useful new water may vary from nothing in some years, to several times the mean in other years, so that its usefulnes cannot be fully depended upon.

The irrigation interests have stated they are willing to contribute a reasonable sum to the cost of the project, the amount of which will be determined by negotiations between the Army and the interested parties, as provided for in the authorization act of 1944, Public Law 534, Seventy-eighth Congress.

The service area receiving surface water from Kern River is one in which no water is required from any outside source, having an adequate supply within its own rights.

Besides the support of the State of California, the project has been consistently supported by the governing bodies of both the city of Bakersfield and the county of Kern.

This project is also shown by the report of the Army engineers to be one of outstanding merit in that the ratio of total benefits to cost is 2.8 to 1. On the basis of the facts as disclosed by the thorough investigations of the War Department and local agencies, it is unanimously agreed that the early completion of the Isabella Dam is a matter of great urgency. It is our earnest hope that Congress will recognize this fact by granting an appropriation of an amount sufficient to continue this work at an accelerated and more efficient rate.

When the same subject was under consideration before the Subcommittee on Civil Functions, House Appropriations Committee, on January 18 of last year, I again appeared before that committee and advised them as follows:

Mr. Chairman and members of the Subcommittee on Civil Functions, I believe it would be helpful to point out that the area of California being considered when we discuss the Kings, Kaweah, Tule, and Kern Rivers, is geographically constituted as follows:

The crest of the Sierra Nevada Mountains is approximately 100 miles east of the Pacific Ocean and the prevailing cyclonic winds from off the Pacific and Aleutian Islands are forced to rise to the altitude of 14,000 feet in the course of traveling that 100 miles. Mount Whitney is in that group. The range of mountains itself is probably 50 miles wide with hanging canyons of great altitude and steep slopes to the valley below. The mountains drop off very abruptly to the foothills and then to the San Joaquin Valley, the floor of which has an altitude of about 300 feet in the area constituting the delta country of the four streams which also constitutes the areas where floods occur. We should bear in mind that heavy water deposits are on the western slope of the Sierra Nevada Mountains due to the fact that the prevailing winds from the northwest are cyclonic in nature.

The flood-control problem is different each year. Some years there is very little flood water. However, on one occasion not too long ago a high-school teacher in Bakersfield took a group of boys by boat on the flood waters of these four streams a distance of 300 miles to San Francisco Bay.

Nearly all of the lands constituting the area threatened with floods by these four streams is valuable agricultural land, if it is properly protected. In addition to the agricultural values, there is a comparable degree of loss threatened each year due to the fact that the lower reaches of the Kern River, in the area threatened by floods, are now producing oil in large quantities.

The area between the Sierra Nevada and Coast Ranges to San Francisco constitutes the San Joaquin Valley. The Sacramento Valley extends about 250 miles north of the San Joaquin Valley.

The projects we are talking about are between the two mountain ranges: The Isabella Reservoir is on the Kern River; Pine Flat Reservoir is on the Kings River, and each of these rivers empties into what is known as Tulare Lake, which is the area, in excess of 200,000 acres, which has been previously mentioned by the witnesses today. The Tulare Lake Basin has been intermittently flooded in the past, even with relatively nominal amounts of snow in the high mountains.

The Success and Terminus Dams are on the two streams lying between the Kings River to the north and the Kern River to the south, the Tule and Kaweah Rivers, respectively.

It is my understanding that when this problem was first presented by my predecessor, Mr. A. J. Elliott, there was some small opposition in regard to the Success and Terminus Dams. I believe all of that opposition has now been removed and that the construction of the Success and Terminus Dams is now desired by all of the communities threatened by those streams, as well as by the people who have the agricultural developments, including those in the Tulare Lake Basin.

The reason I have mentioned the rivers—Kings, Kaweah, Tule, and Kern—collectively is that this project has from its inception been considered as a unit, for the very good reason that floods should be controlled on all four streams or a large part of the efficiency of flood control on the Kings and Kern Rivers will be lost. The reason for that loss is that all four streams, in years of excess water, flood the Tulare Lake Basin.

I am advised that the Bureau of the Budget, although it has heretofore recommended and this committee has appropriated moneys for engineering studies, has this year failed to recommend funds for the commencement of construction on either the Kaweah or Tule Rivers.

I want to point out to the committee that it is still a fact that the four streams involved, necessarily should be treated as a unit, even though most of the threat of flood comes from the larger streams, which are the Kings and the Kern. I also want to remind the committee that much of the area threatened with flood by the Kings and Kern Rivers has been developed by people who rely upon the express belief that this committee would appropriate the funds and that the Army engineers would complete the construction of flood-control developments on those rivers as expeditiously as possible. At the present time we are having one of the largest snowfalls in recent history on the high elevations of those rivers, and before the winter is out we may well expect so much water above the normal flow of the rivers as to wipe out a large part of the developments made in the threatened areas. Much of that development has been made by people who were forced to leave the Dust Bowl area, and who cannot afford such losses. I make mention of this subject for the reason that I now find that the Bureau of the Budget has not recommended that this Congress appropriate even 50 percent of the money heretofore not appropriated but still needed to complete the construction of the Isabella Dam. The result of such action is twofold—the threat of floods will be continued probably beyond the year 1952 and the cost of the project will be increased an unknown percentage due to the fact that continuing contracts cannot be let.

Mr. Elliott, who preceded me here, was advised in his last year that this matter, including the Tule and Kaweah Rivers, would be given the "go" signal by the Bureau of the Budget for the year 1949. The fact is that the people in the area would like to see those projects move along and get into the construction stage together.

It is a fact that the Army engineers have recommended a small appropriation for both Terminus Reservoir and Success Reservoir, but again this year, the Bureau of the Budget has not seen fit to include those items.

I am filing the resolution of the Terminus Dam Project Committee, which was unanimously passed at their meeting held in Tu-

lare, Calif., on January 13, 1950; also a telegram, dated January 17, 1950, addressed to me by Mayor Jack Davis, of the city of Visalia; likewise one on the Terminus Dam project. I ask that they be inserted to immediately follow my remarks in the RECORD.

In conclusion, I want the record to show that practically all of the areas threatened with flood by any one of the four streams that I have mentioned lie in the Tenth Congressional District of California, the district that I represent, which area is included in the counties of Kings, Tulare, and Kern in that State.

I believe that this committee should conclusively presume that all of the construction projects that it has considered can receive a substantial saving in the over-all cost, by the setting of a definite time when completion will be accomplished, so that firm contracts can be let.

I respectfully request, in the interest of the areas threatened with floods by the four streams that I have mentioned, that this committee pay particularly close attention to the statements heretofore made today by Mr. Chas. L. Kaupke, engineer for Kings River Water Association, and Mr. George L. Henderson, engineer for Kern River area.

Mr. Chairman, in 1949, President Truman, through the Bureau of the Budget, recommended only $3,500,000 of the sum of approximately $7,500,000 estimated as necessary to complete the Isabella Reservoir project. The House cut the recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget almost in half and allowed only $2,000,000. I followed the matter into the committee of the other body, where I appeared with other witnesses in an effort to increase the recommended appropriation in the other Chamber.

In connection with Isabella Reservoir, the committee of the other body did increase the amount appropriated by the House from $2,000,000 to $3,250,000. The increase allowed by the other body and finally agreed to by the House for last year was sufficient to permit the Corps of Army Engineers to announce that the Isabella Dam can be completed by the 1st of January 1953.

Speaking for the people of California, residing in that area threatened by flood during the spring run-off of the Kern River, I want to tell you that I am grateful for that increase, which was agreed to by this body.

During the fiscal year 1951 there were over 195 projects theretofore authorized on which partial appropriations had theretofore been made spreading over 39 States and Alaska as part of the civil functions recommendations of the Corps of Army Engineers. These projects involve a total cost when completed in excess of $4,000,000,000, on which only one-fourth has been appropriated to date. The Bureau of the Budget recommended only $460,000,000 on all of those projects for last year. The Appropriations Committee of this House cut $130,000,000 from the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget. However, action by the other body resulted in total appropriations of about $419,000,000.

I am sure it will be of interest to the House to know that the original estimated cost of Isabella Dam on the Kern River made in 1939 was $6,800,000. The 1950 estimated cost is $14,300,000, and although the reports of the Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of this House for the year 1951 show estimates of the civil functions of the Department of the Army indicating that the 1951 estimated cost of Isabella Dam is still only $14,300,000, I believe that spokesmen for the Corps of Army Engineers will now estimate that cost as being at least $5,000,000 higher, or a total of over $19,000,000. Similar increases in cost of construction can be shown for Pine Flat Reservoir. I have to admit, of course, that increasing construction costs are probably similar for all of the other 195 projects or more heretofore authorized and on which appriations for construction have heretofore been made.

It is my purpose to bring to the attention of the House at this time, as I intend to do again before the proper committees of this House and the proper committees of the other body, that economy in Government as well as efficiency, require appropriations to be made so that firm contracts can be let to responsible contractors for the completion of those projects which necessarily must be completed for the security of the country even when we are considering curtailment of expenditures for a military effort.

I am sure that spokesmen for the Corps of Army Engineers will recommend such appropriations for the completion of Isabella and Pine Flat Dams at the earliest date that they can be completed from a construction standpoint. In this connection, I want to quote the report of the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, for the year 1949, in regard to the four rivers—Kern, Kings, Kaweah, and Tule—each of which threatens the highly productive lands of the southern San Joaquin Valley with annual floods:

ISABELLA RESERVOIR, KERN RIVER, CALIF.

Location: The area covered by this project comprises the upper watershed of Kern River and Poso and Caliente Creeks, their valley alluvial fans, the Kern and Buena Vista Lake areas, and that portion of the San Joaquin Valley south of Tulare Lake Basin. Kern River is the most southerly of the major streams flowing into the San Joaquin Valley and drains an area of some 2,400 square miles in the Sierra Nevada. North Fork and South Fork, headwaters of Kern River, have their sources in the high Sierra Nevada, flow south 83 and 67 miles, respectively, and join near the town of Isabella to form Kern River, which flows thence southwest 72 miles past the city of Bakersfield to a point in the valley through just north of Buena Vista Lake. River flows at this point are either diverted into the Buena Vista Lake Basin for temporary storage or are carried northwest along the trough of the valley toward Tulare Lake Basin by improved flood and irrigation channels. Under normal conditions of run-off the flow of Kern River below Bakersfield is gradually dissipated by irrigation diversions so that Kern River water reaches Tulare Lake Basin only during large floods. Poso Creek drains an area of 290 square miles lying west of Isabella and north of Kern River. Its flows are usually dissipated before reaching the valley trough. Caliente Creek drains an area of 470 square miles adjoining the lower Kern Basin to the south. Its flows are dissipated in the valley floor south of Bakersfield. The valley area dependent for water supply on Kern River and Poso and Caliente Creeks, commonly called the service area, is approximately 1,560 square miles in extent.

Existing project: This provides for construction of Isabella Reservoir on Kern River, Calif., for flood control and other purposes, at an estimated first cost (1949) of $14,300,000 and $71,000 annually for maintenance and operation. The existing project was adopted by the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944. (See H. Doc. 513, 78th Cong., 2d sess., which contains the latest published map.)

Local cooperation: Payment, as determined by the Secretary of the Army upon the basis of continuing studies by the Bureau of Reclamation, the Department of the Army, and local organizations, is to be made to the United States by the State or other responsible agency for the conservation storage when used. Local interests state they will meet these requirements. The State of California has officially adopted the project.

Operations and results during fiscal year: Preparation of detailed plans and contract plans and specifications for construction was continued. Construction by contract of an earthfill auxiliary dam was begun in March 1948, and was completed in November 1948. Construction by contract of a core storage warehouse was begun in June 1948, and was completed late in July 1948. State Highway Routes 57 and 142, were relocated. Temporary housing facilities were acquired and operated, an auto mechanics' shop building erected, and educational facilities secured. By contract, a test fill was started April 22, 1949. Land acquisition (including improvements, disposals, and damages) was continued. Construction of main outlet gates by contract was started. Total cost of new work was $1,277,587.31; total expenditures were $1,394,699.62.

Condition at end of fiscal year: Final contract plans are being prepared; construction work on this project was started in March 1948. The total cost to date was $1,984,195.35 for new work, total expenditures were $2,016,024.28.

Proposed operations: The balance unexpended on June 30, 1949, amounting to $1,841,975.72, plus accounts receivable of $263,110.56, and an alotment of $2,350,000 made in fiscal year 1950, a total of $4,460,086.28 will be applied as follows:

Accounts payable	$246,281.63
New work:	
Continuation of preparation of detailed plans and contract plans and specifications, by hired labor, including hydraulic model studies and main dam test fill, July 1949 to June 1950	250,000.00
Construction of main dam outlet works, by contract July 1949 to January 1950	393,060.00
Acquisition (partial) of land and improvements, entire fiscal year	620,000.00
Furnishing slide gates for diversion tunnel, by supply contract, September 1949 to June 1950	160,000.00
Provision of educational facilities, by contract, July 1949 to June 1950	7,000.00
Operation of Government housing, July 1949 to June 1950	6,000.00
Relocation of electric transmission line, by contract, work completed in fiscal year 1949, deferred costs	6,006.45
Construction of administration and service buildings, and lookout, by contract, March to June 1950	120,000.00
Initiation of construction of main dam, spillway, auxiliary dam, etc., by continuing contract, commencing in April 1950	850,000.00

New work—Continued	
Payment to Southern California Edison Co., for relocation of Borel Canal and appurtenances, by continuing contract during fiscal year	$525,000.00
Initiation of relocation of county road between Kernville and Fairview, by continuing contract, March to June 1950	90,000.00
Initiation of relocation of Greenhorn Mountain Highway, State Highway No. 142, by continuing contract, September 1949 to June 1950	460,000.00
Concreting of outlet tunnel, by contract, February to June 1950	500,000.00
Furnishing Borel Canal slide gates, by supply contract, January 1949 to June 1950	130,000.00
Relocation of telephone line, by contract, March 1950 to June 1950	53,000.00
Engineering services for Borel Canal relocation, by contract, February to June 1950	20,000.00
Miscellaneous minor activities incidental to orderly prosecution of work, including fencing, firebreaks, minor buildings, etc., July 1949 to June 1950	23,738.20
Total for new work	4,213,804.65
Total for all work	4,460,086.28

The additional sum of $4,000,000 is needed to be appropriated for the following schedule of work during the fiscal year 1951:

New work:	
Continuation of construction of Greenhorn Mountain Highway, State Highway No. 142	$300,000
Continuation of construction of main dam, spillway, auxiliary dam	1,820,000
Utility revisions and miscellaneous items	300,000
Acquisition of lands and improvements	750,000
Payment to Southern California Edison Co., for relocation of Borel Canal and appurtenances	500,000
Completion of relocation of county road between Kernville and Fairview	300,000
Total for new work	4,000,000

Cost and financial summary

Total amount appropriated to June 30, 1949	$3,858,000.00
Cost of new work to June 30, 1949	1,984,195.35
Total net expenditures to June 30, 1949	2,016,024.28
Unexpended balance, June 30, 1949	1,841,975.72
Unobligated balance available, June 30, 1949	633,937.11
Amount appropriated for fiscal year ending June 30, 1950	2,350,000.00
Total unobligated balance available for fiscal year 1950	2,983,937.11
Estimated additional amount required to be appropriated for completion of existing project	8,092,000.00

	Fiscal year ending June 30—				
	1945	1946	1947	1948	1949
Appropriated	$50,000.00	$203,000.00	$55,000.00	$1,050,000.00	$2,500,000.00
Cost of new work	5,605.30	176,330.80	69,935.02	454,736.92	1,277,587.31
Total expended	5,400.48	167,398.57	71,582.92	376,942.69	1,394,699.62

KINGS RIVER AND TULARE LAKE, INCLUDING PINE FLAT RESERVOIR, CALIF.

Location: The area covered by this project comprises the upper watershed of Kings River, its valley, alluvial fan or delta, and the lake bed known as Tulare Lake. The upper basin above the town of Piedra is rugged and mountainous. Below Piedra the river enters the relatively flat alluvial valley where the river divides, one branch known as Fresno slough flowing north to join the San Joaquin River, and the second south to Tulare Lake, an area which in its unreclaimed state varied from a completely dry condition to a body of water some 750 square miles in extent. There is no natural outlet from this lake as it is separated from the San Joaquin Basin by a low ridge, but lake waters have escaped over this ridge at least once since settlement of the region. Tulare Lake also receives floodwaters of Tule, Kaweah, and Kern Rivers in some years. The area below Piedra, including Tulare Lake, is known as the Kings River service area.

Existing project: This provides for construction of the Pine Flat Reservoir with a gross storage capacity of 1,000,000 acre-feet and of the supplemental channel improvement work, at an estimated total first cost (1949) of $51,121,000, and $112,000 annually for maintenance and operation.

The existing project was adopted by the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944. (See H. Doc. 630, 76th Cong., 3d sess., which contains the latest published map.)

Local cooperation: Payment, as determined by the Secretary of the Army upon the basis of continuing studies by the Bureau of Reclamation, the Department of the Army, and local organizations, is to be made to the United States by the State or other responsible agency for the conservation storage when used. Local interests state they will meet these requirements, when an equitable allocation of charges is made. The State of California has officially adopted the project.

Operations and results during fiscal year: New work: Preparation of detailed plans and contract plans and specifications was continued. Excavation of the right abutment of main dam was begun February 1948 and was completed in September 1948. Twenty-four portable houses complete with roads and utilities were furnished and erected. Telephone lines were relocated, cattle guards, trash racks, and a core storage warehouse were constructed, and educational facilities furnished. Land acquisition (including improvements, disposals, and damages) was continued. Relocation of the Hughes Creek Road from Sunnyside Summit to Trimmer, by contract, was begun in February 1948 and was 92 percent completed at the end of the fiscal year. It is estimated to be completed August 5, 1949. Total cost for new work was $2,942,074.87, and total expenditures, $3,273,370.81.

Condition at end of fiscal year: Final contract plans are being prepared; construction work on this project was started in April 1947; and to date the following features of the work have been accomplished: Partial relocation of the Hughes Creek Road from Sunnyside Summit to Trimmer, and erection of fencing along the road; construction and fencing of Hughes Creek-Pine Flat detour road; excavation for right and left abutments for the dam; erection of 24 portable housing units complete with all utilities and roads, etc. The total cost for new work to date was $5,380,918.85, and the total expenditures were $5,333,688.24.

Proposed operations: The balance unexpended on June 30, 1949, amounting to $1,366,311.76, and an allotment of $7,000,000, made in fiscal year 1950, a total of $8,366,311.76, will be applied as follows:

Accounts payable	$260,230.61
New work:	
Continuation of preparation of detailed plans and contract plans and specifications, including hydraulic model studies, and additional core drilling, by hired labor, and by contract, entire fiscal year	660,000.00
Completion of relocated Hughes Creek Road, by contract, July to September 1949	127,000.00
Construction of bridge and measuring weir, by contract, July 1949 to June 1950	166,000.00
Construction of permanent Government housing, by contract, July 1949 to June 1950	170,000.00
Revision of educational facilities, by contract, July 1949 to June 1950	40,000.00
Paving and utilities for portable housing, by contract, July to August 1949	32,000.00
Operation of Government housing, July 1949 to June 1950	18,000.00
Acquisition of land and improvements, July 1949 to June 1950	365,000.00
Relocation of Vincent power line, by contract, Southern California Edison Co.	240,000.00
Construction of main dam and appurtenances, by continuing contract, commencing November 1949	5,400,000.00
Main dam sluice gates, by continuing contract, commencing August 1949	674,000.00
Construction of look-out and access roads, by contract, November 1949 to February 1950	106,000.00
Construction of grammar school, by contract, January to June 1950	78,000.00
Miscellaneous minor activities incidental to orderly prosecution of work, including fencing, minor relocations, sidewalks, landscaping, etc	30,081.15
Total for new work	8,106,081.15
Grand total	8,366,311.76

The additional sum of $17,500,000 is needed to be appropriated for the following schedule of work during the fiscal year 1951:

New work:	
Continuation of advance planning	$250,000
Continuation of construction of main dam and appurtenances	16,200,000
Spillway gates and miscellaneous operating equipment, by contract	300,000
Continuation of acquisition of lands and improvements	300,000
Continuation of utility modifications	450,000
Total for new work	17,500,000

Cost and financial summary

Total amount appropriated to June 30, 1949	$6,700,000.00
Cost of new work to June 30, 1949	5,380,918.85
Total net expenditures to June 30, 1949	5,333,688.24
Unexpended balance, June 30, 1949	1,366,311.76
Unobligated balance available, June 30, 1949	452,728.59
Amount appropriated for fiscal year ending June 30, 1950	7,000,000.00
Total unobligated balance available for fiscal year 1950	7,452,728.59
Estimated additional amount required to be appropriated for completion of existing project	37,421,000.00

	Fiscal year ending June 30—				
	1945	1946	1947	1948	1949
Appropriated	$50,000.00	$335,000.00	$1,065,000.00	$1,750,000.00	$3,500,000.00
Cost of new work	4,860.57	181,867.74	431,763.14	1,820,352.53	2,942,074.87
Total expended	4,107.81	149,566.93	397,715.66	1,508,927.03	3,273,370.81

Construction of administration building, service buildings, permanent housing, and look-out, by contract, entire fiscal year	$175,000.00
Relocation of Folsom-Auburn County Road, by contract, February to June 1950	210,000.00
Construction of right end of dam, by contract, July 1949 to January 1950	200,000.00
Fencing along north boundary of prison, by contract, November to December 1949	15,000.00
Construction of right wing dam, by contract, February to June 1950	440,000.00
Construction of Natoma Canal bypass tunnel, by contract, March to June 1950	230,000.00
Construction of right end dykes, by contract, February to June 1950	400,000.00
Construction of North Fork Ditch Co. Reservoir, March to June 1950	130,000.00
Miscellaneous minor work incidental to prosecution of work, including fencing, firebreaks, small buildings, etc.	14,248.74
Total	3,224,248.74
Total for new work	3,346,567.96

The additional sum of $7,500,000 is needed to be appropriated for the following schedule of work during the fiscal year 1951:

New work:	
Acquisition of lands and improvements	$400,000.00
Utility relocation, by contract	780,000.00
Construction of concrete gravity spillway section	5,320,000.00
Construction of outlet works and appurtenances	1,000,000.00
Total	7,500,000.00

Cost and financial summary

Total amount appropriated to June 30, 1949	$1,582,000.00
Cost of new work to June 30, 1949	1,445,751.26
Total net expenditures to June 30, 1949	1,335,432.04
Unexpended balance, June 30, 1949	246,567.96
Unobligated balance available, June 30, 1949	5,101.87
Amount appropriated for fiscal year ending June 30, 1950	3,100,000.00
Total unobligated balance available for fiscal year 1950	3,105,101.87
Estimated additional amount required to be appropriated for completion of existing project	46,110,000.00

	Fiscal year ending June 30—				
	1945	1946	1947	1948	1949
Appropriated	$50,000.00	$462,000.00		$70,000.00	$1,000,000.00
Cost of new work	29,152.08	298,701.65	$103,724.76	148,777.63	865,395.14
Cost of maintenance					
Total expended	25,641.79	282,877.40	113,685.00	141,929.12	771,298.73

KAWEAH AND TULE RIVERS, INCLUDING TERMINUS AND SUCCESS RESERVOIRS, CALIF.

Location: The area covered by this project comprises the upper watersheds of Kaweah and Tule Rivers, their valley alluvial fans and the reclaimed Tulare Lake Basin, their common terminus. Kaweah River, which drains an area of 1,250 square miles, is formed by the junction of its North, Middle, and South Forks near Three Rivers, flows southwest 10 miles through low foothills and emerges on the valley floor near the town of Lemon Cove. At this point the river divides into two channels, the flow to each being divided equally by control weirs. The northerly channel, known as St. Johns River, flows west 23 miles and unites with Cottonwood Creek to form Cross Creek, which flows thence southwest 35 miles to Tulare Lake Basin. The southerly channel, which continues as Kaweah River, flows southwest 4 miles and then divides into numerous distributary channels. Flows in these channels not diverted for irrigation or lost by seepage cross the delta region and unite with Tule River or Cross Creek to enter Tulare Lake Basin. Tule River, which drains an area of 630 square miles adjoining the Kaweah Basin on the south, is formed by the junction of its North and Middle Forks near Springville, flows southwest 13 miles and emerges on the valley floor near the city of Porterville. From this point the river continues west 39 miles across the alluvial fan to Tulare Lake Basin.

Existing project: This provides for construction of the Terminus and Success Reservoir projects, including supplemental spreading works, at an estimated first cost (1949) of $24,539,000 (including $13,395,000 for Terminus and $11,144,000 for Success), and $13,000 annually for maintenance and operation of the reservoirs. The existing project was adopted by the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944. (See H. R. Flood Control Committee Doc. 1, 78th Cong., 2d sess., and H. Doc. 559, 78th Cong., 2d sess., which contains the latest published map.)

Local cooperation: Payment, as determined by the Secretary of the Army upon the basis of continuing studies by the Bureau of Reclamation, the Department of the Army, and local organizations, is to be made to the United States by the State or other responsible agency for the conservation storage when used. Local interests state they will meet these requirements. The State of California has officially adopted the project.

Operations and results during fiscal year: (a) Terminus Reservoir on Kaweah River: The cost of new work during the year was $60,288.72 and the expenditures were $65,165.14, for work on detailed plans and contract plans and specifications.

(b) Success Reservoir: The cost of new work during the year was $57,286.45 and the expenditures were $61,191.30 for continuing preparation of detailed plans and contract plans and specifications.

Total project new work cost was $117,575.17, and total expenditures were $126,356.44.

Condition at end of fiscal year: Detailed plans and contract plans and specifications are in preparation for test fills for Terminus and Success Reservoirs. Construction work on this project has not been started. Total new work cost to date for the project was $415,385.07 and total expenditures were $396,854.14.

Proposed operations: The unexpended balances on June 30, 1949, of $85,541.72 for Terminus Reservoir, and $87,604.14 for Success Reservoir, and allotments of $120,000, made in September 1949, will be applied to payment of accounts payable amounting to $13,664.56 and $4,866.37, respectively, and for new work in continuing the preparation of detailed plans and contract plans and specifications for these reservoirs, $131,877.16 and $142,737.77, respectively, July 1949 through June 1950.

The additional sum of $1,000,00 is needed to be appropriated for the following schedule of work during the fiscal year 1951:

New work:	
Continuation of preparation of plans and specifications for Terminus Reservoir	$200,000
Acquistion of lands and improvements, and relocation of utilities, Terminus Reservoir	300,000
Total for Terminus Reservoir	500,000

New work—Continued	
Continuation of preparation of plans and specifications for Success Reservoir	$150,000
Relocation of utilities and roads, acquisition of lands and improvements, Success Reservoir	350,000
Total for Success Reservoir	500,000
Total for new work	1,000,000
Cost and financial summary	
Total amount appropriated to June 30, 1949	$570,000.00
Cost of new work to June 30, 1949	415,385.07
Total net expenditures to June 30, 1949	$396,854.14
Unexpended balance, June 30, 1949	173,145.86
Unobligated balance available, June 30, 1949	154,614.93
Amount appropriated for fiscal year ending June 30, 1950	120,000.00
Total unobligated balance available for fiscal year 1950	274,614.93
Estimated additional amount required to be appropriated for completion of existing project	23,849,000.00

	Fiscal year ending June 30—				
	1945	1946	1947	1948	1949
Appropriated		$240,000.00	$80,000.00	$50,000.00	$200,000.00
Cost of new work		93,048.26	142,428.25	62,333.39	117,575.17
Total expended		71,056.21	161,150.84	38,290.65	126,356.44

Mr. Chairman, I am sure that it is unnecessary to point out that the protection of Kern, Tulare, and Kings Counties in California, which were always at the top of the list of counties producing for the last war effort, is necessary to properly prepare for the national security in these difficult days of military preparedness.

I have no hesitancy in telling you that I have discussed this subject with Maj. Gen. Lewis A. Pick, Chief of the Corps of Army Engineers, and that he will advise you through the proper committees of this House that he considers expenditures for the control of floods in valuable agricultural areas as necessary expenditures even while we are considering a wartime budget.

Only 6 weeks ago, all four of the streams that I have mentioned were at flood stage. Normally, the flood season arrives during the spring runoff when the snows at the high elevations of the Sierra Nevada Mountains are melting. Last fall, that area had an early snow followed by rain. The damage to public and private property on the Kern River alone exceeded $3,000,000. The damage on the other rivers hereinabove mentioned was relatively even greater. Due to the heavy population and development of the threatened area which, as I have heretofore mentioned, was the result of reliance upon completion of these projects within a reasonable time following the year 1938, the damage could have been a hundredfold greater had there been a very small amount of additional water in the flood crest or had the local authorities been less diligent in the performance of their duties.

In conclusion, I want to again thank the Members of the House and the other body for the consideration that they have given to me and other people of the area in presenting this subject during the last 2 years, and for the action that they have taken to date. I discussed this subject with Maj. Gen. Lewis A. Pick, Chief of Engineers, United States Army, last Saturday morning and he advises me that they are going to support recommendations for the completion of the Isabella Dam on Kern River under firm contracts with responsible contractors capable of completing the project as soon as it is physically possible for the construction work to be completed. He has fixed that date as January 1, 1953, which means that this threat to national security and the war effort must be borne by the people of the area and the Nation as a whole through the flood seasons of 1951 and 1952.

Both in the interest of national security and in behalf of the thousands of innocent people who have settled in the threatened areas in reliance upon previous action of Congress, I want to point out to you the threat to national security is greatest in the areas of the four streams I have mentioned. I believe it must also be admitted by this House that the increase in estimated cost from $6,500,000 to over $19,000,000, and the threat to thousands of small families in lives and property is largely the responsibility of this Congress as a result of its prior action and the delay through "pork barrel" tactics in the completion of projects heretofore authorized and on which construction has heretofore commenced.

For the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1951, the Bureau of the Budget has recommended the sum of $8,695,000 to continue construction of the Pine Flat Dam, and $4,975,000 for the Isabella Dam and Reservoir. It is felt that these amounts are in line with appropriations that will be needed in the present session. However, if it is deemed necessary, General Pick may appear before the committee later this year and request additional funds. Appropriations for continuing the planning studies for the proposed Success and Terminus Dams have not been requested by the Corps of Army Engineers for this year, nor was any money appropriated for that purpose in the last fiscal year. The Corps of Army Engineers explained that in making their recommendations to the Bureau of the Budget, they were restricted by Presidential directive in requesting appropriations for new projects not already under construction.

It is also inequitable and unjust for this Government to delay in the payment of fair values for the properties taken by this Government for construction of the Isabella Reservoir. You all know that these values fixed by the Government are always low, and displaced people must make investments elsewhere so as to be able to move from their property when the Government advises them that it plans to complete the project or require their removal. All of those people need the moneys due from the Government for their condemned property to make their new investments. There is no justification in law or equity for delay in this regard.

I respectfully and sincerely again ask your consideration in connection with these projects and call to your special attention that the threatened damage in the agricultural area involved is special and peculiar to the security of the country and the projects must be considered as part of the national defense effort.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER].

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Chairman, in considering this $2,000,000,000 supplemental appropriation bill for naval construction, one can hardly question the need for a build-up of the Navy within the limits of its prescribed mission. As part of the present mobilization program the Navy's obligations under its mission obviously will be greatly expanded. Under such circumstances it will become increasingly difficult to question any Navy appropriation requests of this or any type. The real problem centers in our long-range strategic plan which is still undetermined, or, if so, still unannounced.

Further, in the current frantic haste to do immediately what should have been done long since in the interests of national security, it is quite obviously the order of the day to give the military what it wants, with few questions asked, and without demanding the normal justification for efficient and economic utilization of resources and manpower. Under these unfortunate circumstances, one must be content these days to isolate from the multibillon dollar security program only the obvious misadventures in military financing.

The projected 60,000 ton carrier constitutes, it is understood, some 60 percent of the total warship tonnage covered in the request. I am inclined to believe, despite the cautiously worded description of the reporting committee, that this is substantially the same supercarrier project. It is difficult, even in the frenzy of the moment, to understand why it now rates only an hour's discussion on the floor of the House, a sketchy explanation from the reporting committee, unprecedented security classification, and virtually no coverage in the public press.

It is possible, though not probable, that this is not the same supercarrier project that was canceled once before. The projected vessel is reported to be lighter than the other, though, if newspaper reports are correct, it will cost even more. The newly projected supercarrier will carry, it is also reported, planes capable of delivering the atomic bomb. If true, this brings up the ob-

vious question of the mission. The atomic bomb is generally conceded to be a strategic weapon. If strategic atomic bombing is to take place from shipboard, other questions arise which should be of interest to the Congress. Our atomic stockpile is generally conceded to be our most precious military possession. If a portion of that stockpile is to be put to sea, Congress is being asked to make a far-reaching decision.

In the past, Congress has heard evidence that far more than one vessel is involved. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—volume 95, part 15, pages A4537–A4538—contains a report by one of our colleagues, the Honorable Mr. BOYKIN, of Alabama, that the now canceled supercarrier would entail a task force of 140 supporting vessels of different types and 45,000 personnel and would cost some one and a half billion dollars, a figure which we must assume would be considerably higher today, and that this huge force would function so that only 28 bombers could operate off the decks of the supercarrier; and, further, that the Navy's long-range plan envisaged no less than seven of these supercarriers, and, of course, seven supporting task forces. Congress at least should know whether the bill now under consideration is the start of such a program, or any part of it, and if further supplemental appropriations will be necessary to complete the supercarrier or a supporting task force. Only then can Congress weigh the project in proper perspective.

Should Congress satisfy itself regarding the related subjects outlined above, it deserves to hear further evidence on other basic questions which must always be raised in connection with the supercarrier project, namely, the vulnerability of the supercarrier to new-type snorkel submarines in light of the Navy's own post-World War II exercises off Newfoundland and in the Caribbean, and the vessel's vulnerability to land-based aircraft; the supercarrier's production time in relation to the programed development of other weapons; the supercarrier's cost in critical resources and critical manpower in relation to over-all defense needs; the supercarrier's ability, or lack of it, to function in certain key areas such as the Mediterranean, and to utilize the Panama Canal; the supercarrier's effectiveness and recuperative ability under full-scale combat conditions rather than in a Korean-type conflict where enemy submarine and aerial opposition is completely lacking.

In the prolonged discussions of the past over the supercarrier, such questions as these were never satisfactorily answered. Perhaps they have since been resolved. If so, Congress and the people deserve to know something more than is now known about it.

Congress does not wish, it is evident, to hold up any priority projects of the military. But the supercarrier, by description of the reporting committee, is a long-range research and development project. Further discussion on the subject obviously will not jeopardize any immediate security needs. And even in this clouded "give the military what it wants" atmosphere which seems to prevail Congress cannot forget its obligations to the people regarding military expenditures.

Therefore, if the remainder of this bill bears a priority stamp, let it be considered in that light. And let the supercarrier request be considered, not in frantic haste but in proper perspective and in the light of the many unanswered questions regarding it. Let that portion of the bill containing the supercarrier request be considered apart, so Congress and the people can get these questions answered.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. DOYLE].

LONG BEACH NAVY SHIPYARD REACTIVATED

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, being again a member of the important Armed Services Committee of this House and having heard all the discussion before the committee membership with reference to this bill, H. R. 1001, I voted in committee for it, and I now again happily do the same thing. I urge its passage by unanimous approval of the House membership.

Within the hour you have heard the distinguished chairman of our Armed Services Committee explain the bill and answer fully and frankly all the questions directed to him. In addition thereto, you have a committee report accompanying this bill for your attention in which the justification—yes, the absolute need of this bill becoming effective at the earliest possible date is more fully explained. On pages 4, 5, and 6 of the committee report is found the explanation of the changes to be made in the existing laws by virtue of the passage of H. R. 1001. I recommend that each of you take time to read the same to observe these changes.

I take this occasion also, and it is a very happy occasion to me to be able to announce to you that last week our distinguished Secretary of the Navy, Hon. Frank Matthews, personally notified me to announce that the Navy Department had that day issued an order immediately reactiviating the great Long Beach Naval Shipyard which is located in my home city of Long Beach, Los Angeles County, Calif.

That great and modern facility was inactivated as part of the so-called economy program by the former Secretary of Defense, taking into consideration the fact that there was a physical condition there with reference to the earth which the then Secretary of Defense felt chiefly justified his order. I know you will recall my active, vigorous opposition thereto on that ground at that time; and you will further recall that many members of the California delegation in the House cordially supported me in my opposition to the inactivation program.

The Long Beach Naval Shipyard was constructed as a necessary and essential World War II facility at a cost in excess of $75,000,000, and its wartime peak work force reached the substantial figure of at least 16,000 employees. The deactivation of this yard was commenced late in 1949 and was completely in mothballs by late June 1950. There remained in charge thereof merely a custodial force of about 500 employees, and at this time there is in command at the Long Beach Naval Base a distinguished naval captain, J. Y. Dannenberg. Just this week there has been directed to take charge of the shipyard unit of the great Long Beach Naval Base distinguished naval captain, Emmett E. Sprung.

Already hundreds upon hundreds of the former skilled and other workers are happily trending their way to the reemployment at this great naval facility which meant so much in the total national defense and national production of ships' program during World War II.

The world-famous Roosevelt drydock is located there and reputedly the most powerful ship crane is located there, it having been taken over from Germany as one of the war trophies and placed at the dockside of the Long Beach Naval Shipyard.

Secretary Matthews personally told me that full use would be made of the navy yard at the earliest possible date with an estimated employment by midsummer of at least 3,500 and that all departments of the yard would get under way at the earliest possible date. He stated that the present world conditions made the modern and valuable available facilities of this great Long Beach Naval Shipyard and Naval Base necessary at the earliest possible date.

During the last war and until the inactivation commenced, the yard was the chief repair base for the Pacific battleship fleet and is still the home base of that fleet. At the time of the order of inactivation in late 1949 it was generally conceded Nation-wide that because the Long Beach Naval Shipyard was the last great naval shipyard facility to be constructed prior to the war, it contained the very latest and best of work machinery and facilities to suit all modern needs and that there had been put into that yard the benefit of the considered experiences and opinions of the best authorities of our great Naval Establishment.

Furthermore, it would appear that this opinion was justified by reason of the magnificent achievements of the yard at all times and upon all assignments and missions. Not only has the city of Long Beach and its rapidly increasing population and all of its varied segments of commerce, trade, shipping, and oil always cordially welcomed what Long Beach terms the "Navy family"; but, needless to say, the personnel of the United States Navy and their families and all their connections who have found it necessary to live at Long Beach and in the Long Beach area on account of being assigned to work or services or duties at the Long Beach Naval Base have made and earned for themselves a place of utmost respect and real and warm welcome by all the civilian population of that whole area in which they have resided and worked. Too, from the greatest to the least, in terms of rank, they have contributed much to the prosperity and happiness and progress of Long Beach and to the other communities close by in which they have resided with their families.

In my frequent visits to the Long Beach Naval Shipyard, before it was inactivated, and also since, and by mail and by personal calls upon me and otherwise, I have been greatly inspired by the stories

of self-sacrifice and of unselfish service and of most excellent attitudes held and activities rendered by the employed civilian population at the Long Beach naval facility at all times.

So, as it was from the beginning at the Long Beach Naval Shipyard, it is again anticipated with happy and confident outlook that by teamwork and mutual understanding and common objective the Navy personnel and the civilian personnel are beginning to team up to again so reactivate and carry on the necessary work and mission to be done at the great Long Beach Naval Shipyard that it again will make known records to be envied and respected by all.

And right here may I just say that I hope and trust that you, my colleagues from the Eastern, Midwestern, Central, and Southern States, have by this time learned or begun to learn and appreciate the ever-increasing importance and strategic location and relationship of the shipyards of the Pacific coast and all the installations and problems of the Pacific coast to the total problems of our beloved Nation. Increasingly, this Congress, the executive departments and the administrative departments of Government must familiarize themselves more than ever with the fact that never yet has either the naval or the civilian shipyard problem and national defense problem of the Nation been adequately met and provided for as relates to the increasing necessity of recognizing and providing for the necessity of these naval and privately owned and commercial shipyards of my native State of California and the other Pacific Coast States. Does not this present world emergency and the Korean War and the increasing importance of Asia and India and Africa, as far as marine geography is concerned teach us this lesson?

In closing may I say that, when the newspaper representative asked me to make a brief statement about the reopening of the Long Beach Naval Shipyard recently, I said:

> I feel that the reactivation is not only timely, but it is tangible evidence of the strategic value and the necessity of the Long Beach Naval Shipyard as a permanent naval operating facility. This present order of earliest possible reactivation justifies my vigorous opposition from the beginning to the order of inactivation on the grounds stated at that time and to my continuing vigorous presentation of the need of keeping the yard ready to reopen at the earliest possible date with the least possible delay.

I compliment the Navy Department and its distinguished Secretary and the Chiefs of Staff and all the top officials of our Government in our beloved Nation who, again, have demonstrated their good judgment and common sense in this order of reactivation of this great naval shipyard facility. And I deem it a great honor and privilege to again publicly state, on behalf of my home city of Long Beach and the great Eighteenth Congressional District which I have the honor to represent for this third term, that the total Navy family will again be cordially welcomed and that the total civilian citizenry will again do its dead-level best to cooperate to the utmost in all mutual problems in this emergency hour for our Nation and for the world.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I take this opportunity to congratulate warmly a great chairman and a great committee on this continuing evidence of their sound leadership in the field of American military preparedness.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, the presentation of this legislation brings to light one of the shabbiest performances by the executive branch of the Government in the history of this Nation. The President and his advisors, including the then Secretary of Defense, Mr. Johnson, canceled the construction of the supercarrier in April 1949. The blame rests solely on the doorstep of the White House. Congress originally authorized the ship and appropriated the necessary funds on the specific recommendations of our military leaders.

Because of this grievous error the cancellation of the carrier, the American taxpayers lost $20,000,000 in material and labor plus forty-five million in cost differential between the original supercarrier and the one proposed in this bill. In addition, Mr. Truman's concurrence in the cancellation of the supercarrier in 1949 has cost 2½ to 3 years in time.

With these facts unquestioned, can there be faith, past or present, in the preparedness decisions by the President? It is high time that the Congress cease being a rubber stamp to the dictatorial demands of the President and his advisers. The Eighty-first Congress made a horrible record simply because in most instances it bowed weakly to the requests of Mr. Truman. That Congress did not truly represent the people but rather submitted to the dictates of the executive branch of the Government. One of the few courageous stands taken by the Eighty-first Congress was the report of the House Committee on Armed Services condemning the action taken by Mr. Truman in canceling the supercarrier and firing Admiral Denfeld.

Our citizens are not so naive that they will believe there is any difference between the orginal supercarrier and the one proposed by this bill. The public would admire our President and his own military advisers if an honest statement were made admitting that an error had been made in 1949. No, that procedure is not followed. Instead, there is an attempt to justify the new carrier on the basis that it is really a different ship. Such subterfuge is reprehensible and should be exposed. A careful analysis of the blueprints of the two ships by qualified engineers would reveal, I am sure, no material difference between them. This is no time for "face saving." The administration would get public confidence by straightforward admissions of past errors.

The need of aircraft carriers is best evidenced by their use in the Korean War. Without carriers in that part of the world our land forces would be in even worse condition than we now find them.

In conclusion, I emphasize that this Congress must assert itself and not rubber stamp the demands of the President and his advisers. The people elected the Eighty-second Congress to participate jointly in military and foreign affairs decisions and the President for the benefit of our Nation had better cooperate or Congress will take over to better strengthen our Nation and restore the confidence of our people.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> *Be it enacted, etc.*, That the President is hereby authorized to undertake the construction of, or to acquire and convert, not to exceed 500,000 tons of modern naval vessels in the following categories and subcategories:
>
> (a) Combatant vessels, 315,000 tons, divided into:
>
> 1. Warships, 100,000 tons, including one aircraft carrier of not to exceed 60,000 tons.
> 2. Amphibious warfare vessels and landing craft, 175,000 tons.
> 3. Mine warfare vessels, 25,000 tons.
> 4. Patrol vessels, 15,000 tons.
>
> (b) Auxiliary vessels, 175,000 tons.
> (c) Service craft, 9,000 tons.
> (d) Experimental types, 1,000 tons.

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

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask the chairman of the committee a few questions. This measure provides for the expenditure of $2,000,000,000 for construction and conversion, as I understand it, but I see no limitation in the bill as to the amount of expenditure. Is there any limitation in the bill?

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman is correct. There is no limitation. It all depends upon what it will cost. The Committee on Appropriations will be called upon to furnish the money to finish these vessels. It is now estimated it will cost in the neighborhood of $2,000,000,000 to carry out the program.

Mr. GROSS. Is there any way that a limitation can be put in the bill?

Mr. VINSON. If a limitation is placed in the bill, it might turn out not to be the proper limitation because conditions may warrant the spending of more money.

Mr. GROSS. In other words, what the gentleman is saying is that we do not know how much longer this Truman inflation is going on, do we?

Mr. VINSON. May I point out to the gentleman I have for a long time been of the opinion that there should have been ceilings and controls on prices, and so forth. The gentleman is not making any point so far as I am concerned by calling that to my attention. I think we should have had controls a long time ago. I think the longer you put it off, the more inflation we will have.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman. May I ask him a further question? Is this construction and conversion program to be carried on under cost-plus contracts?

Mr. VINSON. It will be carried on under whatever authority the Navy has to make contracts; which in a great many instances is through negotiated

contracts. It will probably all be by negotiated contracts.

Mr. GROSS. And on the basis of cost-plus?

Mr. VINSON. I do not know about that. But may I point out that in connection with the profits which were made during the war on ship construction they ran less than 2 percent.

Mr. GROSS. Less than cost-plus?

Mr. VINSON. There was less than 2 percent of profit on ship construction during the last war.

Mr. GROSS. I should like to ask if we have any surplus cruisers in the United States Navy.

Mr. VINSON. I would not call them surplus. We have a great many cruisers still in the mothball stage. But we want to keep them there, because we need them, and the security of the country requires them.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman think we have surplus cruisers to turn over to South America at this time?

Mr. VINSON. It was felt that those cruisers should be turned over to South America in furtherance of some idea of standardization of equipment and the good-neighbor policy. I am finding no fault with it. Of course we would have to spend a great deal of money to keep those cruisers modernized and bring them up to date. Those cruisers are about 14 or 15 years old.

Mr. GROSS. Is it not true that we have used cruisers and other combat vessels in the Pacific during World War II which were over 20 years old?

Mr. VINSON. That is right.

Mr. GROSS. And they performed good service, did they not?

Mr. VINSON. They certainly did.

Mr. GROSS. And yet we propose in this bill today to provide for conversion and construction to the tune of $2,000,000,000 and we are practically giving away warships to South America?

Mr. VINSON. No. We are prohibiting the giving away of any cruisers which belong to the fleet or anything else which belongs to the fleet.

Mr. GROSS. That is with reference to the terms of this bill. But they have already been given away.

Mr. VINSON. And the gentleman sat here and voted for it just like everybody else.

Mr. GROSS. I do not on the spur of the moment know whether I did or not. I do not remember when the act was passed.

Mr. VINSON. I have looked up the gentleman's record, and I do not find where he opposed it—and none of us did oppose it. We did not know what we were doing. We know now what we are doing. They cannot be given away in the future.

Mr. GROSS. When was that act passed?

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman was right here. It was on the 25th day of July. The gentleman and all of us here gave this authority. None of us knew what we were doing.

Mr. GROSS. I think both of us will scrutinize much more carefully the activities of the Committee on Foreign Affairs henceforth, will we not?

Mr. VINSON. I have always been doing that, and I want the gentleman to get in the same frame of mind as I am.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] has brought up a question which I think we could well spend 5 minutes thinking about. I think the gentleman from Georgia, in answering the question that there was no limitation was on safe ground provided you want these goods delivered. I wish somebody would show me how to go out and make a firm commitment of sale or purchase for goods to be delivered over a long period of time—over a period of 6 months or 1½ years or 2 years or 3½ years, such as is provided for here. We cannot do it because there is no stability to the buying power of the great American monetary exchange which we call the dollar. That is what we are up against. Beefsteak may be $4 a pound within the next 4½ years. This conversion job and this new ship we have been discussing may cost us $20,000,000,000 before we are through. That is something for all of us to think about and to act upon if we get a chance.

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

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. And yet we expect private business to form firm contracts; do we not?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Well, I do not, any more.

Mr. GROSS. We pay out billions of dollars under the cost-plus contract system.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I do not expect them to do it any more, because it would be expecting the impossible, because of these continually advancing costs, in both wages and materials.

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

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON. This cost-plus contract worries Members very much, and it used to worry me a great deal, but I heard some testimony by some admirals who had charge of construction work during the last war, and they testified, under oath, that the cost-plus cost of vessels and other things was cheaper in the net amount than the fixed, firm contract.

Mr. CRAWFORD. As long as you have negotiated contracts and the renegotiation procedure, I do not worry so much about the cost-plus contract, because you are supposed to pick those things up when you recheck the figures. Anyone familiar with accounting understands that procedure.

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

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. I am very glad the gentleman raised that point. The Ways and Means Committee will report to the House within a few days a new renegotiation bill. Of course, the uncertainty in the cost of material and labor, the failure to have any ceilings, and the failure to have any limitation just makes it out of the question to say what these ships are going to cost.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is correct.

Mr. VINSON. We hope it will be $2,000,000,000, but we have a renegotiation bill to fix the price whenever they are fixed.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I hope when that bill is reported by the Ways and Means Committee that the House will support it, because we need it.

Now we are up against this proposition on another score: We are trying to make up our minds whether or not we are going to support nine billion or sixteen billion additional taxes, or whether or not we are going to finance this program through deficit financing. As far as I am concerned—and I want to get this on the RECORD, so that my people will understand my position—as far as I am concerned personally, I am solidly in favor of cutting this budget to the irreducible minimum, and then enacting whatever Federal taxes are necessary to cover that budget. Now, that is right straight from the shoulder, and nobody has to guess about my position on that. I do not mean to say by that I am in favor of the budget that was submitted by the President, because I think there are a lot of unnecessary social do-goods, expansion of present social security, and other things in this budget that we can get along without. I am in favor of reducing some five or six or seven billion dollars from that budget, and then putting our people on a straight 48 hours per week base time; no overtime over 40 hours. Put them on a 48-hour week, and get out here and produce the stuff at today's price level, and run our national economy up to $330,000,000,000 or $350,000,000,000 per annum, which we can do; and assess the $62,000,000,000 of taxes, and you will have about 18 percent of the take out of that national income as you have about 18 percent when you were taking $38,000,000,000 out of the $225,000,000,000 national income. We can do the job if we make up our minds to do it. Otherwise, we can let the hounds of inflation devour us. That, I do not want.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I take this time for the purpose of propounding a couple of questions to the chairman of the committee. They have regard to section 4. No doubt this has been considered by the committee, but I would appreciate it if the chairman would explain the reason for eliminating amphibious-warfare vessels, landing craft, and mine-warfare vessels from the list of those which this section prohibits being transferred without the consent of Congress.

Mr. VINSON. That is the auxiliary end, and they do not want auxiliaries.

Mr. KEATING. It is not clear to me—perhaps there is evidence before the committee to that effect—that other countries are not requesting amphibious-warfare vessels and these landing craft and mine-warfare vessels. I wonder whether those should not also be included in the prohibition against transfer.

Mr. VINSON. In the first place, no country wants that type of auxiliary ship and does not need them. Should they make request for them, in view of our position in regard to combatant types of vessels, no doubt they will come before the committee and say they have a request for auxiliaries and ask us what we think about it. We would probably have a hearing and probably, if the facts warranted, approve it. They could give away or sell auxiliaries, but not combatant types.

Mr. KEATING. We have, of course, great confidence in the gentleman and his committee. By that does the gentleman mean he feels he can assure the House that no such vessels, amphibious-warfare vessels, landing craft, and mine-warfare vessels will be given away or transferred or sold to foreign governments without the matter first being brought before the Congress

Mr. VINSON. I am satisfied that if any auxiliary ships were in process of being transferred they would consult the Committees on Armed Services of the House and the Senate, especially in view of the prohibition we are writing in the present bill.

Mr. KEATING. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I may say to the gentleman that the nature of the construction of auxiliary and amphibious craft is such that their life is very limited.

Mr. KEATING. And the gentleman also feels that if foreign governments should request that such ships be turned over to them the matter would be brought before the committee before definite action was taken?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. If this bill is enacted into law, yes.

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

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. I feel sure the House will understand that in view of this proviso we put in the bill there will be no danger of the auxiliary ships or any other kind of ships being given away without specific act of Congress.

Mr. KEATING. I thank the gentleman for this assurance.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the chairman of the committee and the ranking minority member [Mr. SHORT], and all the members of the Committee on Armed Services in bringing out this bill for the construction of naval craft. I congratulate them especially on the authorization of the building of the big airplane carrier which had it been proceeded with 18 months ago would have been completed today.

Mr. Chairman, we are working and fighting for the survival of our country; we are working and fighting for the protection of these youngsters who are in Korea. The construction of that great aircraft carrier would have meant fewer boys killed in Korea, fewer boys lying in the hospitals today.

Mr. Chairman, I am not alone in my thinking, because I have the opinion of naval experts that sufficient mobile bases in the form of aircraft carriers would mean that Russia and China or any other country would never dare strike us. If we have enough of these mobile aircraft carriers in the Pacific, the Atlantic, the Mediterranean, and the Persian Gulf or wherever needed, this country will be superbly protected. I would gladly have voted for more aircraft carriers—a dozen if necessary.

Reference has been made to the death of Mr. Forrestal, former Secretary of Defense, and the giving of his life for his country. May I again remind the Members of the House of the sacrifice of Admiral Louis Denfeld because he dared tell the Congress and the country of the need for aircraft carriers in our naval construction, and for the construction of other seacraft under the sea and otherwise. He is not an unsung hero, because his praises are sung everywhere. Everyone in the Navy should get down on his knees and thank God for Louis Denfeld. The country as a whole should feel the same way.

Many men have difficult tasks to perform, but when they know in their hearts they are fighting for the survival of our country, no sacrifice is too great for them. The expenditure of money is insignificant, because the people of the country want the money spent in every necessary way to protect our Nation.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. The state of preparedness that the Navy enjoyed in the beginning of the present Korean conflict was due in a large part to Admiral Denfeld because he was farsighted during his tenure of office as Chief of Naval Operations. I do not want to detract from Admiral Sherman when I make this assertion because he is also doing a good job.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes, he is doing a fine job but Admiral Denfeld paved the way for him. Many members of the Navy did not dare speak. The country was thoroughly aroused when Admiral Denfeld did speak, so therefore a great deal of good was accomplished. I shall vote, as I always have, for every wise measure involving our national defense.

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

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. Of course, this is not the place or time to open old sores, but if ever in our history a committee of Congress was justified in a fearless comprehensive report that it wrote, it was the Committee on Armed Services of the House in the B-36 hearings more than a year and a half ago. I think recent events in Korea have fully substantiated and corroborated the sound, solid, common-sense view that our committee took in those hearings in the report that it made. It is too bad that Louis Denfeld was permitted to sacrifice, you might say, his career, but he did the Navy and the country a great service. We can thank God that we had a Navy in this Korean conflict because the evacuation at Hungnam will go down as one of the greatest achievements in our military annals. The gallantry and the resourcefulness shown there are without parallel. We need a Navy more today than we ever have.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I agree with the gentleman from Missouri in his statement about the great work that the Armed Services Commitee has done. The gentleman knows and I know what a tremendously great country we have and of the great people we have in it. Our people are ready to make any sacrifice for the survival of the country. All they need is to be told the facts and they are with you 100 percent.

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, like every Member of the House I am glad today to see this legislation which restores the Navy, and rightfully so, back to the place it formerly occupied. Anyone who has followed our military history knows that a balanced defense made up of three strong arms is vital to the safety of this Nation. In 1949 many of us were alarmed and some of us protested against the planned and attempted demolition of naval aviation and the Marine Corps under the guise of unification. Our old Committee on Naval Affairs, under the able chairmanship of our present distinguished chairman, built up a strong Navy which in the last war contributed momentously to the bringing about of peace and the cessation of hostilities. We witnessed a period in which there was an effort made to relegate that Navy to a role in which its offensive potential was to be stripped from it, and it was to be merely a convoy Navy. The report of the committee, to which the able ranking minority member just referred, called to the attention of the country the danger of that course. With the force of public opinion, the activity of our Committee on Armed Services, and with the importance of our Navy in view of its activities in Korea, still strongly impressed in the minds of the American people today, we are again on the road to reestablishing a strong, aggressive Navy, with an air arm of proven effectiveness—the type of Navy that is vital to the safety of this country.

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

Mr. Chairman, there is one thing that the gentleman from Indiana, a brand new Member making his first speech, emphasized that we do not want to forget—and with all of our desire, in which I join and I know all of the other Members join, to fully fortify our defenses we just cannot put our own judgment aside for everything just because it is put up to us in the Congress on a defense basis. We have to ask some questions and we ought to have a complete record on what we are trying to do. What the gentleman from Indiana emphasized is that this business is not just a matter of building an aircraft carried. That is perhaps the lesser expense. It is like lots of things in life; it is not the

original cost but it is the maintenance that comes high. What he pointed out was that a carrier needs protection; a carrier needs continuous supply; it needs aircraft and this is very important, that carriers are vulnerable. We heard great debate about that fact, and let us again emphasize what he said, which is very true, that this operation in Korea demonstrates that where we fill a world role we have to perform many military responsibilities like those in Korea, which do not represent the kind of full-scale war which we would have to wage if we took on a first-class military power like the only one that is threatening today, the Soviet Union. We are waging a very different kind of war in Korea than we otherwise would if we were in a world war. The primary question of enemy capability in the air alone would make a significant difference.

The question that I would like to address to the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services is this—and I join with all my colleagues in my deep respect for him—Can the chairman tell us what the strategic mission of the Navy is insofar as it can be made public that justifies this carrier? May I just amplify that question in this way: We always understood and like other Members in the House I went to the Command and General Staff School at Leavenworth, and I have a certain amount of military knowledge, that the classical role of the aircraft carrier was attack on enemy ships and support of aviation in connection with amphibious missions. The question I want to ask is: What is the role of the Navy in strategic bombing which justifies this enormous expense for a new supercarrier which the gentleman from Indiana has properly emphasized, and which justifies us in passing this bill in this fashion?

Mr. VINSON. I will say to the gentleman from New York that one of the justifications is to always have an airplane carrier that can accommodate the expansion and the development in aviation. As naval aviation, particularly jet aviation, develops, we have need for longer and stronger carrier decks. Progress in one demands comparable progress in the other. The construction of this carrier will give the Navy a prototype which will enable it to thoroughly service test any aircraft which will be available to it in the foreseeable future.

Mr. JAVITS. Will the gentleman tell us what has been told to the committee, what the committee can tell the public, as to the role of the Navy in strategic bombing? Does the Navy have a strategic bombing role and, if so, what is it?

Mr. VINSON. The Navy does not have the primary role of strategic bombing. That primary role is assigned, by agreement, to the Air Force. The construction of this ship does not in the slightest degree interfere with the primary roles and missions of the Department of the Air.

Mr. JAVITS. We are then to understand, and the chairman will correct me if I am incorrect, that this is a secondary bombing role which the Air Force agrees, which the Joint Chiefs of Staff agree, and which our military authorities agree, it is necessary to vest in the Navy?

Mr. VINSON. I do not think that any one branch of the armed services should have a monopoly of the use of any particular weapon. I think, that if we can develop atomic weapons that the artillery can use, that the Army should have the privilege of using them.

Mr. JAVITS. The gentleman does agree with me, though, that both the Air Force and the Joint Chiefs of Staff have agreed that the effort this supercarrier has the capability of mounting shall be part of the Navy mission?

Mr. VINSON. They have agreed that this ship shall be built, and this ship will be used to take care of the development of the aircraft.

Mr. JAVITS. So that when we pass the bill we pass it in response to a completely agreed upon armed services need?

Mr. VINSON. Approved by the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the gentleman.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. Was the gentleman aware when the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949 was passed that there was slipped into that act a provision by which the President of the United States could peddle our combat warships all over the world?

Mr. JAVITS. May I say to the gentleman that I did not recall that anything was slipped into the act. The act was very carefully analyzed and very carefully drawn. When the gentleman from Georgia alluded to this act I called a page and sent for a copy of the act to study it in order to determine just exactly what it did do. I did not have it fresh in my mind. I will go to the gentleman's table and read it. But I am confident—and I can say this as a responsible person in the Congress, regardless of what committee one belongs to—there was nothing in the act that was slipped in or slipped by. It was analyzed, it was discussed on the floor, and it was debated. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] has just said that he himself raised the question with respect to this provision.

An analysis of title IV of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act shows by section 401 that the President could transfer no naval vessel out of military stocks if—

The Secretary of Defense, after consultation with the Joint Chiefs of Staff, determines that such transfer would be detrimental to the national security of the United States, or—

The equipment—

is needed by the Reserve components of the Armed Forces to meet their training requirements.

Considering the character of the Defense Secretary and his experience, considering also the confidence of the Congress in the Joint Chiefs of Staff, I can certainly understand the acceptability of this provision within the context of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act. I do not see that this should prevent the House from now recalling this power with respect to naval vessels, but I certainly do not see how it can be called a provision slipped by when the power is provided to be so carefully checked.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I have been somewhat puzzled as to what the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS], who seems to be speaking for the Air Force, was trying to get at, no doubt because of my ignorance of military procedure. I just want to ask the gentleman from Georgia, in a situation such as they have over there in Korea, such as we had a few days ago when these men were fighting with their backs to the sea, does it make any practical difference, at least to them, whether the Navy or the Air Corps comes to their rescue?

Mr. VINSON. It does not.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I did not think it did.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. The gentleman has not forgotten that last summer our ground forces in Korea begged for tactical air support which in plain words is nothing more than close air support for ground troops.

It was the Navy and the Marines who furnished this close air support and the reason they did not furnish more was because they were short of carriers, due to the fact the carriers were in moth balls. Now, air support for the ground troops is being furnished by the Air Force as well as the Navy and Marines. But the fact remains that last summer we were short of carriers, which is one of the many reasons why the 57,000-ton carrier in this bill is urgently needed.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. The President is authorized to convert not to exceed 1,000,000 tons of existing naval vessels, from among those vessels on the Navy list determined to be best fitted for conversion, to modern naval vessels, of the following categories and subcategories:

(a) Combatant vessels, 980,000 tons, divided into:

1. Warships, 990,000 tons.
2. Mine-warfare vessels, 10,000 tons.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 14, strike out "980,000" and insert "1,000,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary for the construction, acquisition, or conversion of the foregoing vessels.

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

Mr. Chairman, I hold in my hand an article from the January 16 issue of the New York Times in which I have found shocking statements attributed to one of our leading Air Force generals, and which jars my faith in our military leadership.

This article is based on a purported interview with Maj. Gen. Emmett (Rosie) O'Donnell, commander of our Far East Air Force Bombing Command, who is being transferred to the Strategic 15th Air Force at March Field, Calif.

General O'Donnell is quoted as having said:

> The Air Force now is worried about some of the opinions held on the effect of bombs on limited targets, especially troop concentrations. We would kill a hell of a lot of them (Chinese Communists) if they would concentrate * * * the trouble is that they don't concentrate and I don't blame them.

For the past 5 years the Congress and the people of the United States have been propagandized into a false sense of security relative to our Air Force power and how our strategic planners would strike with lightning and devastating blows on any enemy. Our military men have told us that they had it all planned the way they wanted to fight and where they wanted to fight, but something happened in Korea that they apparently just did not think of. The enemy, according to General O'Donnell, wanted to use other methods of fighting and also determine where they wanted to fight. This caught our planners and propagandists off base and now they have the audacity to say that the enemy will not concentrate so we can kill them.

This reminds me of the statement of a southern general during the Civil War to the effect that "We can lick those damn Yankees with cornstalks but they won't fight with cornstalks."

Another quotation from General O'Donnell's interview, which to me is the most tragic and sickening of all, was:

> We have not learned a single important lesson in this war. We picked up a few small pointers or minor techniques and it was excellent training, but that is all.

Now, mind you, Mr. Chairman, that is the statement of one of our leading generals in the United States Air Force, and if it represents the kind of thinking that persists in the Pentagon today, Heaven help us.

Thousands of our boys have died in the blood-stained rice paddies in Korea and General O'Donnell declares that we have not learned a single important lesson in this war. Does General O'Donnell mean to say that unpreparedness and the lack of a properly trained Air Force to support our troops has not been a lesson from which to profit?

The claims by the Pentagon in October and November of 1950 of complete annihilation of the North Korean Army by tree-top bombing, which was followed the next day by an attack by 30,000 Red troops on our forces from the exact spot where the Air Force claimed to have done such staggering damage, apparently did not teach any lesson. To me such an incident in the Korean War was proof that our planning over there was way off base.

It seems imperative to me that this Congress should demand an explanation of such interviews as was given by General O'Donnell. Any high-ranking officers making such stupid statements as are found in General O'Donnell's interview should be brought to an accounting.. They should be brought before the Armed Services Committees of the Congress so that we can ascertain why their strategy has proved so unsound militarily in Korea.

Actually, Mr. Chairman, many of our military leaders have become almost untouchables to criticism. They consider criticism by Members of Congress very unpatriotic and their attitude has had the effect of intimidating Members of Congress. Consequently, this seemingly untouchable group has been able to build up a gigantic political machine, backed by huge sums of money, with never a fear that their bungling and grab for power would ever be contested.

The sad part of it all is that the rank and file of the Air Force and Army, from the privates to the sergeants, have had to take the punishment caused by questionable leadership of the generals. These men in the ranks have courageously fought their hearts out, with death always knocking, yet their leaders refuse to learn from their costly mistakes.

We are paying in blood for the errors, the half-baked thinking, the misconceptions, the inaccuracy and half-truths, and, in many cases, the arrogant disregard of sound military planning. Many military errors have been committed in Korea and they should be thoroughly reviewed. Congress should insist on honest and complete answers to the debacle in Korea. If the reputations of some individuals are dulled by an investigation, so be it. It is more important to have ability and efficiency in command of our fighting forces than it is to have high positions occupied by military politicians. Precious blood and lives and our treasured principles are at stake.

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

Mr. Chairman, I recognize that constructive criticism is always a good thing. As a member of the Armed Services Committee, I agreed fully last year with the report of the committee when we stated that Admiral Denfeld had been treated improperly. There is a great deal of criticism that can be made today. I have listened to the remarks that have been made. Many of those remarks were justified, because they were made by members of this committee. This committee works as a whole from both sides of the aisle. Something was said a moment ago about our military leadership, about some lack of resourceful action on the part of our Air Force, I want to say that I am very much concerned that this apparent lack of confidence that is spreading throughout the country may be a terrible handicap to us in our coordinated effort to get prepared for what we are facing in the future. We cannot change the things that have happened in the past, but we must go forward as a body to help correct those mistakes; to take advantage of these mistakes in the future, to let the Red menace that faces us know that the United States of America is advancing to the defense of freedom, liberty, and civilization as a unit. We need cooperation today more that ever in this country. I say to you I do have confidence in our military leaders today. I disliked very much to see Admiral Denfeld go, but I have been impressed with the ability of Admiral Sherman who has taken his place. Taking into consideration the intense cold and the condition of the weather in Korea, our Air Force and our Air Force leaders have given a very fine account of themselves.

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

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON. General O'Donnell was commanding a strategic group of airplanes and they did learn nothing about that particular type of warfare.

As you know from the hearings, we had them use B-29's to support ground troops. They are not built for that use. We were caught unprepared in this way, that we had no adequate tactical air force in being which could go there and support the infantry; that is the situation we were caught in. I think the General meant that they learned no important warfare combat lesson because of the fact that they had the wrong kind of planes for the job they were supposed to do. He is a very fine officer in my opinion.

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED.. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I agree with the gentleman that Admiral Sherman is doing a superlatively good job as Chief of Naval Operations.

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. I thank the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

The bill now under consideration provides for the construction of a large aircraft carrier and the construction and conversion of other ships. We need this aircraft carrier and the fact that the will of Congress was heretofore frustrated by the cancellation of the construction of the aircraft carrier *United States* should not prevent us from authorizing today, and later appropriating funds for a large aircraft carrier when we know it is badly needed and we are even more convinced of this need today than when we passed the former bill.

The passage of this bill authorizing the construction of this aircraft carrier is one step forward in the correction of a past mistake, and in the passage of this bill by a unanimous vote, we will give Russia and the world evidence of the fact that we intend to continue to have the greatest Navy in the world, and I predict that in the immediate future we will pass other bills increasing the armed might of the other branches of our Armed Forces sufficiently to where we will be able to successfully resist aggression in those areas which we determine are tenable and which are necessary to be held to preserve our freedom and our liberty.

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

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to query the chairman or some members of the committee. First, as I read the bill, there is no dollar limitation upon this authorization; is that correct?

Mr. VINSON. That is correct.

Mr. SCRIVNER. As we have talked of the 56,000-ton carrier some figure has been used. What is the figure contemplated as the cost of this carrier?

Mr. VINSON. It is estimated that it will cost $235,000,000.

Mr. SCRIVNER. To what point of construction of the carrier does the $235,000,000 take us?

Mr. VINSON. That takes care of the machinery and the hull, but it does not include the aircraft.

Mr. SCRIVNER. It does not include the aircraft and many other accessories?

Mr. VINSON. It at least does not include the aircraft.

Mr. SCRIVNER. So we can expect a greater cost than the figure the gentleman gave us. In addition to that and when this carrier is completed and finally goes to sea, how many auxiliary craft is it expected will be needed to accompany this one vessel?

Mr. VINSON. The same number of ships that are used in a task force now of the types of the *Midway* or the *Essex*. The ship will be 1,000 feet long and 225 feet wide. It will have the same screening and the same protection that any of the airplane carriers in the task force have; it will be part and parcel of a task force which oftentimes has three or four airplane carriers in it.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I understand that, but it has not been made clear to many of the members of the committee. Do we have in being those auxiliary accompanying craft?

Mr. VINSON. Yes; we have.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I am interested in this and I am trying to get some definite information.

Mr. VINSON. We have in reserve enough different categories, cruisers, destroyers, mine sweepers, and so forth, to meet the requirements if this ship goes into action.

Mr. SCRIVNER. We hope, of course, that in the event anything breaks out and we need this carrier it will be in the right ocean. In other words, this carrier cannot go through the canal.

Mr. VINSON. That is right; it will have to go around Cape Horn.

Mr. SCRIVNER. In the use of this carrier would our forces be limited by the same type of order that MacArthur is limited by now? Namely, that if they knew of some particular target that should be bombed the Navy would have to wait for some orders of some supreme power such as the United Nations to give them permission?

Mr. VINSON. I cannot answer the gentleman's question. He will realize that that is not a question that would come before the Committee on the Armed Services. He must ask someone else to answer it.

Mr. SCRIVNER. It is a question which comes to everybody's mind, because with hands tied the way MacArthur's have been, no air force could do a real job anywhere.

Mr. VINSON. According to that argument there is no use having aircraft over there at all. I do not agree with that concept.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Of course we should have aircraft there. Perhaps at some time in the future the order will be changed. I understand that England has just completed the construction of a flush-deck carrier. I am wondering if in the consideration of this authorization any information has as yet been received by the committee as to the usability and feasibility of this particular type of carrier?

Mr. VINSON. We have not any information to answer that question.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Are our naval officials all now in complete accord on the feasibility of a flush-deck carrier without any superstructure at all?

Mr. VINSON. There would necessarily have to be a certain type of island on this flush-deck carrier. It will be a small island. It will not be a flush deck in the broad sense that you would say this table is a flush-top table.

Mr. SCRIVNER. There has been some modification in the original plans calling for flush deck?

Mr. VINSON. That is right. They will have a small island.

Mr. SCRIVNER. They are satisfied that the planned island will be sufficient to give them the needed operational ability and there will be no interference with landing or taking off?

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I was a little bit disappointed to hear inserted in the RECORD by my good friend and able colleague from Michigan who spoke a while ago a quotation by an Air Force general indicating that we have learned no lessons from Korea and also quoting him to indicate that our Air Force had done less than a magnificent job over there in Korea.

I want to say that I support the present bill wholeheartedly, as I recognize, like anyone else who believes in a well-balanced national defense, that we must have a strong and versatile Navy. I think the Navy has done a magnificent job in Korea and off the coast of Korea. It performed a magnificent job in evacuating troops from the northern part of Korea, then landing them down in the southern part of Korea. It had a real problem to contend with when they carried out that difficult operation.

I have talked to the men who came back from Korea and they uniformly agree that the Air Force likewise has been doing a magnificent job over there. It has done a great job. At times I do not believe we could have kept men in Korea without the backing of our Air Force working 24 hours a day. If I have any thought I want to get over today to this House it is that unification is working in Korea. We have three great branches of service over there, the Army, Navy, the Air Force and, of course, the fighting marines, which are under the Navy. They are all working together as a great team and they are all doing a magnificent job.

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

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

Mr. SHAFER. I hope the gentleman did not construe my remarks as a criticism of the Air Corps. My remarks were to criticize a lot of stupid statements being made by generals in interviews and so forth, and also, if I had been permitted to finish my remarks, I would have pointed out that some promotions that are being made should be based on merit rather than upon politics down in the Pentagon Building. That is what I mean to bring out.

Mr. BROOKS. I thank the gentleman for his statement. I felt sure that the gentleman wanted to praise the armed services in the Far East as a unit. I am critical however of the remarks made by the general officer to whom the gentleman from Michigan referred; I am very critical of that fact because I think unification is working over there in Korea today, and I think all branches of the service are doing a fine job under most adverse conditions. I know that the Navy and Air Force have a different type of role to perform than that of the Ground Forces. I know that we have no opposition from the enemy in the air and we have no opposition on the high seas, that the opposition is on the land, and the Ground Forces have done the real job of carrying the heavy burden of the load, supported by the Navy, and the Air Force at the present time. In the supporting roles, the Navy and the Air Force are doing equally a great job and are entitled to recognition likewise with the Army for a magnificent role in Korea today.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 4. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended, or the provisions of any other law, no battleship, carrier, cruiser, destroyer, or submarine of the United States which has not been stricken from the Navy Register as provided by section 2 of the act of August 5, 1882 (22 Stat. 296), as amended, or any interest of the United States in any such vessel, shall hereafter be sold, transferred, or otherwise disposed of unless authorized hereafter by the Congress.

SEC. 5. The balance of tonnage authorizations remaining in the following acts are hereby rescinded:

(a) The act of December 17, 1943 (Public Law 204, 78th Cong.).

(b) The act of July 9, 1942 (Public Law 665, 77th Cong.).

(c) The act of May 24, 1941 (Public Law 72, 77th Cong.) as amended by the act of December 17, 1941 (Public Law 353, 77th Cong.).

(d) The act of May 26, 1943 (Public Law 61, 78th Cong.).

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

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. MILLS] having assumed the Chair, Mr. RAINS, Chairman of the Committee of the

Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 1001) to authorize the construction of modern naval vessels, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 366, nays 0, not voting 68, as follows:

[Roll No. 5]

YEAS—366

Aandahl	Burton	Frazier
Abbitt	Busbey	Fugate
Abernethy	Bush	Furcolo
Adair	Butler	Gamble
Addonizio	Byrne, N. Y.	Garmatz
Albert	Byrnes, Wis.	Gary
Allen, Calif.	Camp	Gathings
Allen, La.	Canfield	Gavin
Andersen, H. Carl	Cannon	George
	Carlyle	Golden
Anderson, Calif.	Carnahan	Goodwin
Andresen, August H.	Case	Gordon
	Chatham	Gore
Andrews	Chelf	Gossett
Anfuso	Chenoweth	Graham
Arends	Chiperfield	Granahan
Armstrong	Chudoff	Granger
Aspinall	Church	Green
Auchincloss	Clevenger	Greenwood
Ayres	Cole, Kans.	Gregory
Bailey	Cole, N. Y.	Gross
Baker	Combs	Hagen
Barden	Cooper	Hale
Baring	Corbett	Hall, Edwin Arthur
Barrett	Cotton	
Bates, Ky.	Cox	Hall, Leonard W.
Bates, Mass.	Crawford	
Battle	Cunningham	Hand
Beamer	Curtis, Mo.	Harden
Beckworth	Curtis, Nebr.	Hardy
Belcher	Dague	Harris
Bender	Davis, Ga.	Harrison, Va.
Bennett, Fla.	Davis, Wis.	Harrison, Wyo.
Bennett, Mich.	Dawson	Hart
Bentsen	Deane	Harvey
Berry	DeGraffenried	Havenner
Betts	Delaney	Hays, Ark.
Bishop	Dempsey	Hébert
Blackney	Denny	Herlong
Blatnik	Denton	Heselton
Boggs, Del.	Devereux	Hess
Bolling	D'Ewart	Hill
Bolton	Dolliver	Hillings
Bonner	Dondero	Hinshaw
Bosone	Donovan	Hoeven
Bow	Doughton	Hoffman, Ill.
Boykin	Doyle	Hoffman, Mich.
Bramblett	Eberharter	Holifield
Bray	Elliott	Holmes
Brehm	Engle	Hope
Brooks	Evins	Horan
Brown, Ga.	Fallon	Howell
Brown, Ohio	Feighan	Hull
Brownson	Fellows	Hunter
Bryson	Fenton	Irving
Buchanan	Fernandez	Jackson, Calif.
Buckley	Fine	Jackson, Wash.
Budge	Flood	James
Buffett	Fogarty	Jarman
Burdick	Forand	Javits
Burleson	Ford	Jenison
Burnside	Forrester	Jensen
Johnson	Mumma	Sheppard
Jones, Ala.	Murdock	Short
Jones, Mo.	Murphy	Sikes
Jones, Hamilton C.	Murray, Tenn.	Simpson, Ill.
	Murray, Wis.	Simpson, Pa.
Jones, Woodrow W.	Nelson	Sittler
	Nicholson	Smith, Kans.
Judd	Norblad	Smith, Miss.
Karsten, Mo.	Norrell	Smith, Va.
Kean	O'Brien, Ill.	Smith, Wis.
Kearney	O'Brien, Mich.	Spence
Kearns	O'Hara	Springer
Keating	O'Konski	Staggers
Kelley, Pa.	Ostertag	Stanley
Kelly, N. Y.	Passman	Steed
Keogh	Patman	Stefan
Kerr	Patterson	Stigler
Kersten, Wis.	Perkins	Sullivan
Kilday	Pickett	Taber
King	Poage	Tackett
Kirwan	Polk	Talle
Klein	Potter	Taylor
Kluczynski	Poulson	Teague
Lanham	Powell	Thomas
Lantaff	Preston	Thompson, Mich.
Latham	Price	
LeCompte	Priest	Thompson, Tex.
Lesinski	Prouty	Thornberry
Lind	Quinn	Tollefson
Lovre	Radwan	Towe
Lucas	Rains	Trimble
Lyle	Ramsay	Vail
McCarthy	Rankin	Van Pelt
McConnell	Redden	Van Zandt
McCormack	Reece, Tenn.	Vaughn
McCulloch	Reed, Ill.	Vinson
McDonough	Reed, N. Y.	Vorys
McGregor	Rees, Kans.	Vursell
McGuire	Regan	Walter
McKinnon	Rhodes	Weichel
McMullen	Ribicoff	Werdel
McVey	Riehlman	Wheeler
Machrowicz	Riley	Whitaker
Mack, Wash.	Roberts	Whitten
Madden	Robeson	Wickersham
Magee	Rodino	Widnall
Mahon	Rogers, Colo.	Wier
Mansfield	Rogers, Fla.	Wigglesworth
Marshall	Rogers, Mass.	Williams, Miss.
Martin, Iowa	Rogers, Tex.	Williams, N. Y.
Martin, Mass.	Rooney	Willis
Mason	Roosevelt	Wilson, Tex.
Meader	Sadlak	Winstead
Merrow	St. George	Withrow
Miller, Calif.	Sasscer	Wolverton
Miller, Md.	Schwabe	Wood, Ga.
Miller, Nebr.	Scott, Hardie	Wood, Idaho
Mills	Scrivner	Woodruff
Mitchell	Scudder	Yates
Morgan	Secrest	Yorty
Morris	Seely-Brown	Zablocki
Morton	Shafer	
Moulder	Shelley	

NOT VOTING—68

Allen, Ill.	Gillette	O'Neill
Angell	Grant	O'Toole
Beall	Gwinn	Patten
Boggs, La.	Halleck	Philbin
Breen	Hays, Ohio	Phillips
Celler	Hedrick	Rabaut
Clemente	Heffernan	Reams
Colmer	Heller	Richards
Cooley	Herter	Rivers
Coudert	Jenkins	Sabath
Crosser	Jonas	Saylor
Crumpacker	Kee	Scott, Hugh D. Jr.
Davis, Tenn.	Kennedy	
Dingell	Kilburn	Sheehan
Dollinger	Lane	Sieminski
Donohue	Larcade	Stockman
Dorn	McGrath	Sutton
Durham	McMillan	Underwood
Eaton	Mack, Ill.	Velde
Ellsworth	Miller, N. Y.	Welch
Elston	Morano	Wharton
Fisher	Morrison	Wilson, Ind.
Fulton	Multer	Wolcott

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Cooley with Mr. Angell.
Mr. Durham with Mr. Beall.
Mr. Larcade with Mr. Miller of New York.
Mr. Lane with Mr. Coudert.
Mr. Rabaut with Mr. Eaton.
Mr. Patten with Mr. Fulton.
Mr. Dollinger with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. Heller with Mr. Saylor.
Mr. Heffernan with Mr. Ellsworth.
Mr. Boggs of Louisiana with Mr. Gwinn.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Walcott.
Mr. Welch with Mr. Stockman.
Mr. Sabath with Mr. Hugh D. Scott, Jr.
Mr. Hays of Ohio with Mr. Elston.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Gillette.
Mr. Colmer with Mr. Herter.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Jenkins.
Mr. Clemente with Mr. Jonas.
Mr. O'Toole with Mr. Velde.
Mr. McGrath with Mr. Wilson of Indiana.
Mr. Sutton with Mr. Allen of Illinois.
Mr. Kennedy with Mr. Phillips.
Mr. Donohue with Mr. Wharton.
Mr. Multer with Mr. Kilburn.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEMBERS OF COMMISSION ON RENOVATION OF THE EXECUTIVE MANSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 40, Eighty-first Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Commission on Renovation of the Executive Mansion the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. RABAUT, Michigan; Mr. MCGREGOR, Ohio.

AMENDING CHAPTER 26 OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House Joint Resolution 73, amending chapter 26 of the Internal Revenue Code.

The Clerk read the title of the House joint resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the House joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That chapter 26 of the Internal Revenue Code is amended by adding at the end of subchapter E a new section designated 3183 to read as follows:

"SEC. 3183. National emergency transfers of distilled spirits.

"(a) Transfers permitted: under regulations prescribed by the Secretary, distilled spirits of any proof including alcohol (the term 'distilled spirits' or 'spirits' as hereinafter used in this section shall include alcohol) may be removed in bond in approved containers and pipelines from any registered distillery including a registered fruit distillery (such registered distillery and registered fruit distillery hereinafter referred to as 'distillery'), internal revenue bonded warehouse, industrial alcohol plant or industrial alcohol bonded warehouse to any distillery, internal revenue bonded warehouse, industrial alcohol plant or industrial alcohol bonded warehouse for redistillation, or storage, or any other purpose deemed necessary to meet the requirements of the national defense: *Provided*, That any such distilled spirits may be stored in approved tanks in, or constituting a part of, any internal revenue bonded warehouse or industrial alcohol bonded warehouse: *Provided further*, That any such distilled spirits removed to an industrial alcohol plant or industrial alcohol bonded warehouse may be withdrawn therefrom if of a proof of 160 degrees or more for any tax-free purpose, or upon payment of tax for any purpose, authorized by part II of subchapter C; and any such distilled spirits removed to a distillery or internal revenue bonded warehouse may be withdrawn therefrom if of a proof of 160 degrees or more for any tax-free purpose authorized by part II of subchapter C or for any purpose authorized in the case of like spirits produced at a distillery: *Provided further*, That any such distilled spirits, upon removal from a distil-

lery or internal revenue bonded warehouse for transfer to an industrial alcohol plant or industrial alcohol bonded warehouse or for any tax-free purpose authorized by part II of subchapter C, shall be subject to the provisions of part II of subchapter C: *Provided further*, That when any distilled spirits are removed under the provisions of this section to a distillery, industrial alcohol plant, or industrial alcohol bonded warehouse, the tax liability of the proprietor of the distillery, internal revenue bonded warehouse, industrial alcohol plant, or industrial alcohol bonded warehouse from which the spirits are removed, and the liens on such distillery, industrial alcohol plant, or industrial alcohol bonded warehouse, shall cease; and at and from the time the distilled spirits leave the distillery, internal revenue bonded warehouse, industrial alcohol plant, or industrial alcohol bonded warehouse the tax shall be the liability of the proprietor of, and the liens shall be transferred to the premises of, the distillery, industrial alcohol plant, or industrial alcohol bonded warehouse to which the distilled spirits are transferred: *Provided further*, That when any distilled spirits are removed under the provisions of this section to an internal revenue bonded warehouse the proprietor of such warehouse shall be primarily liable for the tax on the spirits at and from the time the spirits leave the premises from which transferred: *Provided further*, That the provisions of section 2901 of the Internal Revenue Code shall apply in respect of losses of any distilled spirits transferred, or removed for transfer, under this section to a distillery or internal revenue bonded warehouse; and the provisions of section 3113 of the code shall apply in respect of losses of any distilled spirits transferred, or removed for transfer, under this section to an industrial alcohol plant or industrial alcohol bonded warehouse: *And provided further*, That sections 2836, 2800 (a) (5), and 3250 (f) of the Internal Revenue Code shall not apply to the redistillation of such spirits at a distillery nor shall section 2780 of the code apply to the removal of such spirits from any distillery or internal revenue bonded warehouse.

"(b) Exemption from statutory requirements: The Secretary may temporarily exempt proprietors of distilleries, internal revenue bonded warehouses, industrial alcohol plants, or industrial alcohol bonded warehouses from any provision of the internal revenue laws relating to distilled spirits, except those requiring payment of the tax thereon, whenever in his judgment it may seem expedient to do so to meet the requirements of the national defense. Whenever the Secretary shall exercise the authority conferred by this subsection he may prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to accomplish the purpose which caused him to grant the exemption.

"(c) Termination of section: The authority conferred upon the Secretary by this section shall expire 5 years from the date of enactment of this section."

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD in explanation of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, House Joint Resolution 73 would permit the use of beverage spirits in the synthetic rubber program and other phases of the National Preparedness Program, and would provide for appropriate safeguards and controls for the withdrawal and movement of such alcohol under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury. The authority conferred is similar to emergency legislation in effect during World War II.

The legislation has the support of all interested departments in the executive branch of the Government and received the unanimous approval of the Committee on Ways and Means. Identical legislation was passed unanimously by the House late in the Eighty-first Congress but failed of passage in the Senate because of insufficient time for its consideration.

DETAILED EXPLANATION

The emergency provisions of chapter 26 of the Internal Revenue Code (sec. 2883 (c), (d), and (e)), which were enacted early in 1942 and which permitted, during World War II, the utilization for industrial purposes of distilled spirits produced at beverage distilleries, were repealed by Public Law No. 448, approved February 21, 1950. It is again necessary to make available distilled spirits produced at beverage distilleries for industrial use in the defense effort, under internal-revenue safeguard.

Under section 3331 of the Internal Revenue Code, the Government may withdraw and is presently withdrawing beverage distilled spirits for emergency industrial use. However, this section of the law makes no provision for the transportation in bond, storage, denaturization, or distillation of such spirits under internal-revenue supervision, after withdrawal free of tax for governmental purposes. This joint resolution would restore, with minor modifications found desirable as a result of experience during World War II, the emergency provisions formerly contained in subsections (c), (d), and (e) of section 2883 of the Internal Revenue Code.

Subsection (a) of this joint resolution would accomplish the following:

First. Permit the removal of distilled spirits from registered distilleries, internal-revenue bonded warehouses, industrial-alcohol plants, and industrial-alcohol bonded warehouses, to any other such facility for any purpose deemed necessary to meet the requirements of the national defense;

Second. Permit the storage of distilled spirits in approved tanks in any bonded warehouse;

Third. Permit the withdrawal of distilled spirits of 160 degrees of proof or more from a distillery, industrial-alcohol plant, or bonded warehouse for any tax-free purpose authorized by sections 3100 to 3126, inclusive, of chapter 26 of the Internal Revenue Code;

Fourth. Permit the transfer of tax liability and tax liens where distilled spirits are removed under the provisions of the section from one plant or warehouse to another plant or warehouse;

Fifth. Make applicable the provisions of sections 2901 and 3113 (relating to losses and tax refunds for leakage or evaporation) in respect of losses of any distilled spirits transferred or removed for transfer under the subsection; and

Sixth. Make inapplicable section 2836, which restricts hours for distilling, and sections 2800 (a) (5) and 3250 (f), relating to the rectification of spirits, in respect of redistillation of such spirits at a distillery. It would also make inapplicable section 2870, which prohibits the removal of spirits from any distillery or bonded warehouse at any time except during daylight hours.

Subsection (b) of the proposed new section 3183 would authorize the Secretary of the Treasury temporarily to exempt proprietors of distilleries, internal-revenue bonded warehouses, industrial-alcohol plants, or industrial-alcohol bonded warehouses from any provision of the internal-revenue laws relating to distilled spirits, except to require the payment of tax thereon, whenever in his judgment it is deemed necessary to do so to meet the requirements of the national defense. This subsection (b) is the only significant difference between this joint resolution and the provisions of former section 2883 (c), (d), and (e). The only other difference which may be noted is that this joint resolution would permit the transfer to, and storage of, alcohol on distillery or internal-revenue bonded warehouse premises.

Subsection (c) provides that the authority conferred upon the Secretary of the Treasury by the proposed new section shall expire 5 years from the date of enactment of such section.

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

EXEMPTING CERTAIN TEXTILE MACHINES AND PARTS FROM DUTY

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 1012) to permit educational, religious, or charitable institutions to import textile machines and parts thereof for instructional purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to inquire of the gentleman from North Carolina as to the extent of the importations that will come in under this bill?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, this will permit the importation of certain textile machinery by educational, religious, or charitable organizations for their own use only. They will not be imported for any other use or for resale or anything of that kind. A similar bill was passed by the House in the last Congress but failed in the Senate on account of lack of time.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. This is a pretty broad bill. As I understand it, there is only one special type of machine not manufactured in this country that will be brought in, is that right?

Mr. DOUGHTON. That is correct.

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

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 1012 would permit the free entry of textile machinery imported by an educational, religious, or charitable organization "for its own use in the instruction of students and not for sale or for any commercial use." Free entry is now provided under existing law for similar articles used for instruction purposes. The legislation is identical with a bill which was unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means and passed the House of Representatives by unanimous consent late in the Eighty-first Congress. This measure, H. R. 1012, has also been unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, is further amended by adding at the end of title II (the free list) thereof a new paragraph to read as follows:

"PAR. 1817. Any society or institution incorporated or established solely for educational, religious, or charitable purposes may import free of duty any textile machine or machinery, or part thereof, for its own use in the instruction of students and not for sale or for any commercial use, under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe."

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

GASOLINE TAX DEDUCTION

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 136) allowing the consumer of gasoline to deduct, for income-tax purposes, State taxes on gasoline imposed on the wholesaler and passed on to the consumer.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 23 (c) (3) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to deduction of retail sales taxes) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(3) Gasoline and retail sales taxes: In the case of a tax imposed by any State, Territory, District, or possession of the United States, or any political subdivision thereof, upon persons engaged in selling tangible personal property at retail, or upon persons selling gasoline or other motor vehicle fuels either at wholesale or retail, which is measured by the gross sales price or the gross receipts from the sale or which is a stated sum per unit of such property sold, or upon persons engaged in furnishing services at retail, which is measured by the gross receipts for furnishing such services, if the amount of such tax is separately stated, then to the extent that the amount so stated is paid by the consumer (otherwise than in connection with the consumer's trade or business) to his vendor such amount shall be allowed as a deduction in computing the net income of such consumer as if such amount constituted a tax imposed upon and paid by such consumer."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by this act shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1948.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 15, strike out "December 31, 1948" and insert "December 31, 1949."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 136 would allow consumers of gasoline a deduction for income-tax purposes for State taxes on gasoline or motor-vehicle fuels imposed at the wholesale level but passed on to consumers. Most States impose taxes on gasoline and other motor fuel at the retail level. Six or seven States, however, impose taxes at the wholesale level which, nevertheless, appear as a separate item in the price paid by the consumer. This bill would merely allow consumers in such States to receive the same deduction for income-tax purposes as consumers in other States.

Identical legislation was reported by the Committee on Ways and Means late in the Eighty-first Congress, at which time the Treasury Department stated it would have no objection to enactment of legislation to accomplish this purpose.

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

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Friday next, and that when the House adjourns on Friday it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

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

There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR THE BALANCE OF THIS WEEK AND NEXT WEEK

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the majority leader as to the program for the balance of the week and for next week, if possible?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am glad the gentleman asked the question. There is no further legislative program for the remainder of the week. Our purpose in going over until Friday is simply that the Committee on Ways and Means might report the renegotiation bill, and it will not be ready until Friday. That is the reason for going over. There will be no legislative business at all on Friday, so the Members can govern themselves accordingly.

On Tuesday next the renegotiation bill will come up, assuming a rule is reported, which I think probably will. Then I am informed by the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services that a bill relating to the reorganization of the Air Force is about nearing its completion in committee, and they expect it to be reported out and a rule obtained. That bill will be assigned for Wednesday.

Any other program for next week I am unable to state now, but if any does develop I shall advise the House as far in advance as I possibly can.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I appreciate the information the gentleman has given us.

SMALL DEFENSE PLANTS ACT INTRODUCED—VITAL TO EXISTENCE OF SMALL BUSINESS DURING MOBILIZATION PERIOD

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include certain statements and excerpts.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, legislation of the greatest importance to small businessmen throughout the Nation was introduced simultaneously in the Senate and House today by Senator JOHN J. SPARKMAN, chairman of the Senate Small Business Committee, and myself, as chairman of the Small Business Committee of the House.

This legislation is the Small Defense Plants Act of 1951. It is H. R. 1600. Its urgency, as well as its nonpartisan nature, is demonstrated by the fact that every member of both the Senate and House Small Business Committees has given it his endorsement. In the Senate, I understand that all the members of the committee are joining Chairman SPARKMAN as cosponsors of the bill. Several members of the House committee plan to introduce the bill, and all members endorsed it in the committee's final report.

FATE OF SMALL BUSINESS DEPENDS ON THE CONGRESS

It is no exaggeration to say that the fate of thousands of small businesses throughout the Nation hangs on the passage of the Small Defense Plants Act.

At present, the small businessman is holding the short end of the stick when it comes to obtaining scarce materials or equipment, since the large producers are taking care of their own affiliate or subsidiary fabricators first. The small businessman also is handicapped in obtaining defense contracts, since he cannot afford to station representatives at the doors of the Government procurement agencies.

In addition, the small-business man has been placed at a disadvantage by the broad authority given the military departments to negotiate contracts, rather than to advertise for bids. Small business has proved that it can compete with big business on a public-bid basis, but the bulk of negotiated defense contracts has been given to large companies rather than small ones.

I am sure that most of the Members have heard of these problems from small-business men in their own districts. Every day, small-business men from various parts of the Nation have come to the House Small Business Committee, or have been referred there by their Representatives, in search of assistance to enable them to continue in operation.

PRESENT LAWS ARE NOT ADEQUATE

The committee has done what it can, as have the small-business offices which have been set up in the procurement agencies. The unvarnished fact, however, is that under present law, no one has any real authority to give small business an equal opportunity to compete for defense contracts or to obtain scarce materials. The job will not be done unless new legislation is passed.

After extensive study and investigation, the House Small Business Committee has come to the conclusion that the Small Defense Plants Act is the answer to the pressing problems now confronting small business. It is based on the Smaller War Plants Act of World War II, but it embodies a more positive approach. Where the Smaller War Plants Act included permissive clauses, the Small Defense Plants Act has mandatory provisions which assure that action will be taken.

Prompt action by the present Congress will save the day for small-business men throughout the Nation. No more important action can be taken for the preservation of our system of free, competitive enterprise.

The Small Defense Plants Act is discussed in further detail in a joint statement by Senator SPARKMAN and myself which will be inserted in today's RECORD by Senator SPARKMAN. In addition, the final report of the House Small Business Committee includes an analysis of the bill, as introduced in the Eighty-first Congress, and the compelling reasons for its passage. This analysis is part of the section, Small Business and the Mobilization Program, beginning on page 11 of the report. The material on the Small Defense Plants Act runs from page 26 through page 35.

Without objection, I should like to insert this material at this point in the RECORD for the further information of Members:

PROPOSED SMALL DEFENSE PLANTS CORPORATION (H. R. 9243 AND S. 3978)

Under the joint sponsorship of the chairman of this committee and the chairman of the Senate Small Business Committee, a bill was introduced to create the Small Defense Plants Corporation and to preserve small-business institutions and free, competitive enterprise. The enacting clause provides that the legislation may be cited as the "Small Business Defense Plants Act of 1950." This bill as introduced follows the general pattern of the Smaller War Plants Corporation Act but with sufficient change in language to make it a more positive instrumentality. Many of the provisions of the SWPC Act were permissive, whereas the proposed Small Business Defense Plants Act of 1950 contains many mandatory provisions designed to more affirmatively aid small business in its participation in the national defense program and to make certain that small business also retains its fair share of essential civilian production.

BACKGROUND OF LEGISLATION—EFFECTIVENESS OF THE SMALLER WAR PLANTS CORPORATION IN WORLD WAR II

The proposed legislation is the result of experience in World War II. This experience is a warning, because the Smaller War Plants Corporation was not set up during the defense period but came at a time when we were in a full-scale and devastating war. The bill was introduced by the present chairman of the committee after all other efforts to effectively mobilize small business had failed and after it had become apparent that small business must have an agency within the Government which could speak and act for all small business. This experience also demonstrated that during a period in which policies are determined and plans inaugurated small business cannot make itself heard at the council tables. This experience justifies the conclusion that the only way to fully mobilize small business is to provide an agency for that purpose. Such an agency provides a rallying point for all small business and enables the Government to utilize our industrial capacity to the fullest extent.

Experience has also taught us that during periods of emergency when the greatest emphasis is on defense mobilization civilian supplies normally furnished by small business cannot be had because of the inequitable distribution of raw materials. There is ample proof that it is necessary to establish an agency within our national defense structure with adequate powers to solve the problems of small business, not only to fully mobilize for the national defense but to safeguard the segment of our economy which, more than any other, exemplifies our free enterprise system. The committee does not take the position that the present bill is the complete answer to all small-business problems in a defense economy, but it is of the opinion that passage of this or similar legislation will be a long step forward.

It was the extreme imbalance of the economic scales in the production program of World War II that finally forced Congress to act. The Smaller War Plants Corporation Act became law on June 11, 1942. This action in behalf of small business was slow in coming and was almost too late. The agency could not really begin to function effectively until early 1944, after the peak years of war production had passed. By this time the pattern of war production had been set. Big business had converted early and extensively from peacetime to wartime production, and small business had played little or no part. With these handicaps the Smaller War Plants Corporation began the job of mobilizing the full potential strength of the Nation's small-business institutions for the war effort.

Once given the chance, small business showed what it could do. Despite every conceivable obstacle, small business manufactured some 30 percent of World War II production. Had there been an effective Smaller War Plants Corporation in the early days of the war, the achievement of small business would have been even more impressive.

The most valuable single activity of the Smaller War Plants Corporation seems to have been the liaison work between small-business men, and procurement agencies for the awarding of prime contracts. The Corporation was able to act effectively as a Washington representative for thousands of small-business men who, on their own, could not afford to maintain a 5- or 10-percenter in residence. The last available figures on number and value of prime contracts awarded with the assistance of the Smaller War Plants Corporation carry through July 1945. These figures are set forth in graphic form in chart III.

A study of chart III readily shows that SWPC got its prime-contracts assistance program under way slowly. Beginning in early 1944, the trend of prime-contract assistance shows increasing momentum until, in 1945, it reached its peak. In the bimonthly period April to May 1945 some 600 prime contracts, valued at $750,000,000 were awarded with SWPC assistance. SWPC actively assisted small plants in obtaining reconversion contracts in addition to war contracts.

The Corporation succeeded to a lesser extent in procuring for small-business men subcontracts from cooperating large prime contractors. When a large prime contractor found that he had to subcontract part of his work, he could contact SWPC and through its offices be put in touch with qualified small manufacturers who had available productive capacity. Chart IV, which follows, is self-explanatory.

The Corporation was also empowered to make direct loans to small business to finance plant and equipment improvement and to supply capital to be used in the manufacture of war or essential civilian supplies. The Corporation could also purchase capital equipment and lease it to small plants holding war contracts. The record of loans to small business is shown on chart V.

The achievement of the Smaller War Plants Corporation is measurable in concrete terms. Despite its slow start, the Corporation succeeded in loaning more than $550,000,000. Losses were insignificant. Almost a billion dollars in subcontracts was obtained by small business through the direct assistance of the Corporation. More than $5,500,000,000 worth of prime contracts was awarded to small business with the assistance of the Smaller War Plants Corporation. These figures show anything but an insignificant achievement. It is clearly indicated by the record that the Smaller War Plants Act and the Corporation created under this act did much to advance the knowledge and understanding of the position of small business in the American economy.

This act also had the effect of focusing attention on our antitrust laws and antitrust law enforcement. In the postwar period the accumulated evidence of the concentration of economic power and the misuse of that power served to illustrate the necessity and the desirability of more effective enforcement of the antitrust laws for the protection of small-business enterprise. The provisions in the Defense Production Act with respect to abrogation of these laws during the present period of mobilization are recent evidence of the desire on the part of the Congress to keep our antitrust laws intact during periods of emergency.

ANALYSIS OF PROVISIONS

No attempt will be made in this analysis to interpret precisely each section and subsection of the proposed Small Business Defense Plants Act; rather, the analysis is intended to delineate the broad objectives intended to be accomplished. Essentially, the bill provides for positive means for small business:

(1) To secure a fair share of Government contracts under the national defense program;

(2) To secure a fair share of scarce materials for essential civilian production;

(3) To be assured fair and equitable treatment when acting as subcontractors;

(4) To obtain loans for expansion and conversion in the interests of the national defense program; and

(5) To achieve full economic and industrial mobilization.

In order to accomplish these major objectives, provision is made for:

(1) The integration of this legislation with the basic legislation: The Defense Production Act of 1950 (sec. 2 (a)).

(2) A revolving fund in the Treasury for the purpose of making loans and acquiring property (sec. 2 (b)).

(3) The appointment of a board of directors to exercise the managerial functions of the Corporation (sec. 2 (c)). This provision is of particular interest to small business because of the qualifications of the members of the board. The board, which is to be composed of 5 directors appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate, is to be composed of 2 members who have been engaged exclusively in private small-business enterprise, in industry, or commerce for at least 10 years. The three other directors are to be chosen, one from the ranks of labor, one from the ranks of farmers, and one from the public at large. The foregoing managerial plan should bring together appointees from four groups having the basic small-business-consumer philosophy of free, competitive enterprise at its best.

(4) Banking powers vested in the Corporation to enable it to adequately finance small-business concerns for defense and essential civilian production (sec. 3 (a) and (b)).

(5) The Corporation's entry into contracts with the United States Government for the purpose of furnishing equipment, supplies, or materials to the Government and to arrange for the performance of such contracts through the letting of subcontracts to small-business concerns. This would enable the Small Defense Plants Corporation to act as a Government prime contractor and to sublet to small-business concerns who would act as subcontractors to the Corporation. This very important provision was added to the Smaller War Plants Corporation Act after its original passage and proved to be extremely beneficial to small business. Actually, the SWPC took over very few contracts, but the power was there to do so if necessary and was, in effect, notice to the procuring agencies to award small business a fair proportion of the prime contracts. It is an effective provision by which the end result can be obtained without its being utilized to any appreciable extent (sec. 3).

(6) Authority to coordinate and to determine the means by which the productive capacity of small-business concerns can be most effectively utilized for national defense and essential civilian production. To that end the Corporation would be empowered to consult and cooperate with the appropriate governmental agencies in the issuance of all orders limiting production. Likewise, the bill imposes upon other governmental agencies the duty and responsibility of consulting and cooperating with the Corporation for the accomplishment of the same objectives (sec. 6).

(7) Full mobilization and integration of small business in the national defense program by empowering the Corporation to make or arrange for a complete inventory of all productive facilities of small-business concerns which can be used for defense and essential civilian production. This is a very important provision particularly during a period of partial mobilization. An inventory of small-business concerns has long been on the agenda of the committees and agencies dealing with proposed programs of plant dispersal. The committee is of the opinion that, if a complete inventory of the productive capacity of small business could be made promptly and expeditiously, it would be found that much of our potential productive strength and manpower is already widely dispersed. In many lines of productivity, our strength may possibly be found already adequately dispersed throughout the country, while in other lines the nucleus for expansion away from the concentrated areas would be found existent.

The committee believes that it is of paramount importance to have such an inventory made, not only in order that we may have proper dispersal of our productive capacity but in order that our villages, towns, and cities may retain their full importance in the national community. It is uneconomic and impractical for us as a Nation to draw manpower and materials into highly concentrated areas to the detriment of other geographic areas of our country. We should, and must, have plant dispersal, and it may best be accomplished, and can be accomplished, by the utilization and expansion of existing facilities in every part in our country. The committee is of the opinion that a most constructive approach to the plant-dispersal problem is a complete inventory of small-business productive capacity of all types throughout the United States (sec. 7 (1)).

(8) Obtaining detailed information on subcontracting and the treatment received by subcontractors from Government prime contractors. Provision is also made enabling the Corporation to take appropriate action to insure that subcontractors who are small-business concerns receive fair and equitable prices, conditions, and terms from prime contractors.

This is an important provision for small business because of the concentration of prime contracts in the hands of a relatively few concerns as compared with the total number which could be employed in production for national defense. One of the greatest sources of complaint during and following World War II was the subcontractors who claimed inequitable and unfair treatment at the hands of the prime contractors. Instances of prime contractors' renegotiating and receiving a higher price with no adjustment of subcontract prices were brought to the attention of the committee. If small businesses are to be utilized principally as subcontractors in our national defense program, the committee is of the opinion that it is the duty of the Congress and the Government to insure fair and equitable treatment in the making and performance of subcontracts (sec. 7 (3)).

(9) Necessary action to be taken by the Corporation to provide incentive for small-business concerns to engage in work in the interest of the national defense or in vital civilian production. This incentive may be provided through loans to facilitate conversion of existing plants or by equipping such plants and giving equal opportunity in every respect (sec. 7 (4)).

(10) Determination by the Corporation of which business enterprises within any industry are to be designated "small-business concerns." The committee recognizes that a small concern in the steel industry is vastly different in capitalization, number of persons employed, sales volume, and so forth, than a small concern, for instance, in the tool and die industry. This determination is for the purpose of qualifying small-business concerns for the benefits to be derived under the proposed legislation. This type of determination would be a long step forward in removing the cause of general dissatisfaction with the definitions of small business currently incorporated in the various procurement acts. The procurement agencies presently use that part of the definition pertaining to number of employees in a single business enterprise, including affiliates and subsidiaries, but do not use the other two standards incorporated in the definition. These standards are that the business enterprise must be independently owned and operated and that it is not dominant in an industry (sec. 7 (6)).

(11) Examination by the Corporation of the method of filling orders and the bases for allocating materials when small-business concerns are unable to obtain scarce materials either for national defense or for essential civilian supply. Equipment, materials, and supplies are the lifeblood of small business and are as necessary to their existence, whether in the manufacturing or the distributing trades, as they are to that of big business. The difference is in the arteries of supply.

If allocation of materials, equipment, and supplies is undertaken by the Government under the Defense Production Act, the Corporation is empowered to make studies and recommendations which other agencies must accept. This plan of operation would assure small-business concerns a fair and equitable share of such supplies both for national defense and for essential civilian goods.

(12) A specific course of action rather than a mere policy declaration that a "fair proportion" of all Government purchases shall be placed with small-business concerns. The bill provides that small-business concerns shall receive prime contracts if it is determined by the Corporation and the contracting procurement agency "(1) to be in the interest of mobilizing the Nation's full productive capacity, or (2) to be in the interest of the national defense program" (sec. 8 (a) and (b)).

Sections which have not been mentioned are principally procedural and administrative.

SMALL-BUSINESS MOBILIZATION IMPERILED

The lack of integration of small business in mobilization plans imperils not only small business but mobilization itself. Logistics is defined as "that branch of the military art which embraces the details of the transport, quartering, and supply of troops." A modern military establishment cannot live on the countryside nor set up a forge here and there to mold bullets or to sharpen sabers. The operation of a modern military establishment is the most exacting and skilled business operation in the world today. In the support of our military requirements, every man, woman, and child in the United States is expected to accept his share of the duty and responsibility involved in the mobilization of our total resources. No patriotic citizen questions for a moment the inherent duty freely accepted by the young men and women of our country who serve in the Army, Navy, and Air Force. No one questions for a moment the right of our Government of the people, through their duly elected representatives, to set up agencies and do those things which are necessary to take care of the problem of logistics for our Armed Forces. No one questions the necessity for sacrifice and denial, oftentimes even the necessities of life, on the part of our civilian population in the maintenance of our basic freedoms.

If these things be true, why then is it necessary for this committee or any other committee of the Congress to fight for the rights of small business in the mobilization program? The policy of the Congress with regard to small business has been plainly expressed in procurement and other legislation and more recently in the Defense Production Act. The executive department has accepted that policy as being fundamentally sound and has taken steps to make it effective. In view of these two salient facts, why is it necessary to provide for an additional agency specifically charged with the duty and responsibility of providing an equal opportunity for small business in the mobilization program.

INFORMATION CANNOT SUPPLANT POSITIVE ACTION

The fundamental difficulties lie in two general areas: First, the apparent lack of comprehension on the part of administrative officials in carrying out congressional policy and, secondly, the need for more definite standards by which the policy of Congress may be carried out. The services rendered to small business by the administrative departments and agencies is largely informational in character. Information does not, in and of 'tself, provide an equal opportunity for small business to participate in the national-defense program or in the supplying of essential civilian needs. It cannot take the place of positive action such as would be provided by the establishment of an

agency specifically charged with the responsibility of solving small-business problems.

SMALL-BUSINESS SUPPORT

The committee has received numerous expressions from small-business men all over the country in support of legislation to establish a Small Defense Plants Corporation. Many small-business organizations representing all types of industry and commerce have indicated their interest. The Small Business-Antimonopoly Conference, composed of national organizations representing small business, farmers, labor, and consumers, has urged the passage of the bill to "create the Small Defense Plants Corporation and to preserve small-business institutions and free, competitive enterprise."

UNANIMOUS ENDORSEMENT OF THE COMMITTEE

The committee is fully cognizant of the situation which prevailed prior to passage of the Smaller War Plants Act of 1942. Members of the committee recall the well-nigh impossible situation in which small business found itself during the 2 years prior to Pearl Harbor. The committee realizes that the continued work of the Small Business Committees of the House and Senate during the past 9 years has greatly improved the relationship between the Government and small business and that sincere efforts are being made to solve small-business problems under existing legislation. However, the committee is of the firm opinion that these problems cannot be wholly solved without the establishment of a separate agency with sufficient power and authority to mobilize all small business. It is also essential that small-business concerns do not lose their place in manufacturing and distributing products for civilian use.

The committee concedes that the failure to give adequate consideration to the problems of small business in our present circumstances is not willful neglect. It is due to the fact that many of the problems pressing for a decision must be considered in their entirety. The collateral issues involved must often be brushed aside if the end result is to be obtained. In the absence of the proper tools, equipment, and necessary materials, no manufacturer or processor can make delivery of his products or services. Likewise, the executive departments, without acts of Congress, cannot be expected to carry out the will of the people; therefore, the committee is unanimous in its endorsement of the intent and purpose of the bill introduced by the chairman of this committee to create a Small Defense Plants Corporation.

THE HOUSE SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE OF THE EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS—A RECORD OF SERVICE TO SMALL BUSINESS—NINE YEARS OF EFFORT TO ACHIEVE LASTING RESULTS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, completion of 9 years of service to small business and the public was marked recently by the House Small Business Committee with publication of its final report of activities during the Eighty-first Congress.

The final report, which describes the accomplishments of the committee during the Eighty-first Congress and makes a number of recommendations for future action, demonstrates a continuation of the policies which have motivated the committee since its inception.

The House Small Business Committee was created by House Resolution 294 of the Seventy-seventh Congress. This resolution was introduced on August 12, 1941, and was approved on December 4, 1941—just 3 days before the sneak attack on Pearl Harbor.

The committee began its activity during the tumultuous period of mobilization for World War II. It was a period during which small business, harassed by materials and manpower shortages and handicapped in the obtaining of war contracts, was desperately in need of assistance. Many thousands of small businesses were forced to close their doors during the early World War II years.

The first major task of the Small Business Committee was to attempt to alleviate the critical situation in which small business has been placed. Hearings were held in all sections of the Nation, and more than 400 witnesses testified or submitted statements. Interest in the committee's work was so great that 174 Members of Congress attended the hearings.

As a result of these hearings the Murray-Patman bill, providing for the establishment of the Smaller War Plants Corporation as a part of the War Production Board, was drafted and enacted into law. The Smaller War Plants Corporation materially assisted small business in assuming its rightful place in the war effort, and despite initial handicaps, small businesses manufactured approximately 30 percent of World War II production.

SMALL BUSINESS AGAIN FACES CRISIS

Once again, as in the early World War II period during which the House Small Business Committee was created, American small business is facing a crisis. The months ahead will determine whether small business will be given full opportunity to participate in the mobilization effort, or whether it will be neglected.

The challenge is as great today as it was when the House Small Business Committee was created in 1941. During the present mobilization, civilian production will be curtailed, and materials will be scarce and more costly. Almost certainly, additional restrictions on production will be imposed. As never before, small business needs an advocate in the House—not to obtain special privileges, but to provide the small businessman with equality of opportunity to produce and sell defense articles and essential civilian goods.

These problems are discussed in detail in the final report of the committee. The report discloses that throughout the Eighty-first Congress the committee has made considerable strides in obtaining action of benefit to small business.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS ADOPTED

An impressive list of committee recommendations has been adopted in whole or in part by the Congress and the executive agencies. These recommendations include:

LEGISLATIVE

First. The amendment to the Economic Cooperation Act to assure small business a fair and proportionate share of procurement in the United States from funds expended for the European recovery program and allied programs.

Second. The passage by the House of a bill increasing fines for violations of sections 1, 2, and 3 of the Sherman Act from $5,000 to $50,000.

Third. The passage by the House of a bill to provide for a uniform statute of limitations in treble-damage suits under the antitrust laws and to permit the United States—as a person—to sue for damages because of violations of the antitrust laws.

Fourth. The passage by the Congress of a bill to amend section 7 of the Clayton Act, forbidding acquisition of the assets of a corporation when such acquisition tends to substantially lessen competition and create a monopoly.

Fifth. The elimination of premium payments on contracts for the purchase of Government royalty oil—Public Law 280, Eighty-first Congress, first session.

OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS ADOPTED

First. The establishment within the Munitions Board of an Office of Small Business. A Small Business Office was established.

Second. The appointment of a civilian with a small-business background as the directing head of the Munitions Board's Small Business Office.

Third. The establishment of a Board of Review by the General Services Administration.

Fourth. Extension of the average time between advertisement of invitations to bid and closing of bids by the Department of Defense and the General Services Administration.

Fifth. The initiation of a program to standardize specifications on items in common use throughout the Government.

Sixth. More prompt notification to successful bidders and more expeditious handling of the ensuing contracts.

Seventh. The program of wide publicity on advertised bid procurement.

Eighth. The initiation of a survey designed to reduce procurement through negotiation, with a corresponding increase in advertised-bid procurement.

Ninth. The program to assure consideration of transportation costs and charges in estimating low bids.

Tenth. The program to assure small business greater participation in negotiated contracts with the Department of Defense.

Eleventh. The successful opposition of the committee to regulation W—Federal Reserve Board—resulting in the reduction of down payments and the lengthening of maximum maturity dates—March 7, 1949—and, finally, abolishment of regulation W on June 30, 1949.

Twelfth. The elimination of unfair competition in the operation of post exchanges and ships' stores, through cooperation with the House Armed Services Committee.

Thirteenth. The elimination, through cooperation with the House Armed Services Committee, of unfair competition in the procurement of officers' uniforms.

Fourteenth. The elimination, through cooperation with the House Armed Services Committee, of unfair competition by the Army in the operation of laundry and dry-cleaning facilities.

Fifteenth. The elimination of unfair competition to small metal-working manufacturers through procurement by certain Government agencies from the Federal Prison Industries, Inc.

Adoption of these recommendations represents real progress in maintaining the vigor of the free enterprise system. Nevertheless, the most crucial period for

small business still lies ahead. The committee has made a number of recommendations for further action in the small-business field. They are:

PRESENT RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE COMMITTEE

First. The passage of legislation to establish a Small Defense Plants Corporation.

Second. The reappointment of a special assistant for small business to the Secretary of Defense.

Third. The reappointment of a special adviser to the Chairman of the Munitions Board who will also act as the directing head of the Office of Small Business.

Fourth. The establishment of an Office of Small Business in the Munitions Board as distinguished from a "Small Business Office."

Fifth. The appointment of a special assistant for small business to the Administrator of the General Services Administration.

Sixth. The establishement of an Office of Small Business—or Small Business Service—in the General Services Administration.

Seventh. The establishment of an Office of Small Business within the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice.

Eighth. The establishement of an Office of Small Business within the National Security Resources Board.

Ninth. The appointment of a special assistant for small business to the chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Tenth. A continuing investigation, by future House Small Business Committees, of the functional operation of the Federal Trade Commission and the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice.

Eleventh. A realistic revision of the present definition of small business in order that all small business may be included in a meaningful definition.

Twelfth. Refusal of procurement agencies to allow bids to be revised after opening in order to preserve the integrity of competitive bidding.

Thirteenth. A broadened scope of investigation of Government procurement operations by successor House Small Business Committees.

SMALL DEFENSE PLANTS CORPORATION

Outstanding among these recommendations is the proposal that a Small Defense Plants Corporation be established by legislation.

This recommendation initially was embodied in the Small Defense Plants Act, introduced by Senator JOHN J. SPARKMAN, chairman of the Senate Small Business Committee, in the Senate and by myself in the House last July.

The Small Defense Plants Act will be reintroduced during the present Congress. It has been endorsed by the entire membership of the Senate and House Small Business Committees, and has received wide approval among small-business men throughout the Nation.

The bill would set up an independent agency, the Small Defense Plants Corporation, with broader and more positive powers than the Smaller War Plants Corporation of World War II.

The unanimous opinion of the members of the Senate and House Small Business Committees is that present statutes are not adequate to assure small business a square deal in the mobilization period. New legislation must be passed to accomplish this objective. For this reason, the proposal for the creation of a Small Defense Plants Corporation is one of the most important recommendations in the committee's history.

THE PRESERVATION OF RELIGIOUS AND CIVIC LIFE IN OUR NATION

Since its formation, the House Small Business Committee has been working for one fundamental objective—the preservation of the family and civil life of our Nation through the maintenance of a healthy small-business economy. Our smaller towns and cities inevitably will suffer great dislocations if the lion's share of defense and essential civilian production is channeled into large enterprises. On the other hand, if this production is equitably distributed to small as well as big business, our traditional family, civic, and religious values will be preserved in the smaller communities of the Nation.

The problems which brought about the creation of the committee during the World War II mobilization period have returned in full force today.

Their solution will require a positive, intelligent program of action on the part of Congress and the executive agencies. I am confident the challenge will be met.

FTC, ANTITRUST DIVISION INVESTIGATION

In addition to the Final Report the committee also has just issued a study entitled "Antitrust Law Enforcement by the Federal Trade Commission and the Antitrust Division, Department of Justice—A Preliminary Report." The latter report, an outgrowth of an investigation launched by the committee in the fall of 1949, is an attempt to determine the operational weaknesses of the FTC and the Antitrust Division and to make constructive suggestions for improvement. Already this investigation has produced information which should lead to more effective enforcement of the antitrust laws. The investigation is far from complete, and the committee has recommended continuance of the investigation during the present Congress.

It is impossible to give a brief summary of these two reports, since they cover extremely broad fields. However, I should like to list the table of contents of the final report as an illustration of its scope and as an aid to those who may wish to consult it:

TABLE OF CONTENTS OF FINAL REPORT

	Page
Introduction	1
Acts affecting small business passed in Eighty-first Congress	2
Part I. Recommendations of the committee	3
Previous recommendations adopted in whole or in part, Eighty-first Congress	3
Legislation	3
Other recommended action	3
Present recommendations of the committee	4
Part II. Small-business difficulties prior to mobilization	5
Competitive handicaps	5
Part II. Small-business difficulties prior to mobilization—Continued	Page
The credit problems of small business	6
Business financing by the Government	6
The Small Business Act of 1950	7
Small business and Federal taxes	8
Revision of the tax structure	8
Government contracts	9
Materials in short supply	10
Part III. Small business and the mobilization program	11
Events leading to mobilization	11
Korea and its economic aftermath	11
A growing national budget	11
Prices, wages, and profits	11
Pressure of growing demand	12
Prospect for producers	12
The President's call for legislative action	13
Submission of the Defense Production Act	13
Need for positive legislation for small business	15
Economic concentration and World War II	15
Control by prime contractors	15
Distribution of new facilities	17
Weakness of the Defense Production Act	20
A small share of contracts and materials for small business	20
A subordinate role for small business	20
Defense Production Act of 1950 (Public Law 774)	21
Small-business provisions [title VII, secs. 701 and 708 (e)]	22
Loans and guaranties	22
General provisions	22
Delegation of Presidential powers	23
Creation of the National Production Authority	23
Office of Small Business	23
Defense mobilization under NPA	25
The declaration of a national emergency	25
Proposed Small Defense Plants Corporation (H. R. 9243, S. 3978)	26
Background of legislation—Effectiveness of the Smaller War Plants Corporation in World War II	26
Analysis of provisions	30
Small-business mobilization imperiled	33
Information cannot supplant positive action	34
Small-business support	34
Unanimous endorsement of the committee	34
Part IV. Small business participation in procurement	36
Government a principal purchaser	36
Number of procuring activities	36
Small-business efforts to participate	37
The committee's program of assistance	38
Limitations to investigation	39
Previous suggestions and criticisms	39
Types of contracts—Competitive and negotiated	41
Contracts in defense agency procurement	41
Contracts in civilian agency procurement	42
Criticism of negotiated contracts	43
Expansion of procurement information to the public	46
Government procurement manual	46
Central Procurement Information Office	46
Inauguration of a broad and positive program	47
Small-business clinics	47
The Federal catalog system	48
Specifications and standardization	49
Time factor in bidding	50
Revision of bids	51
Transportation costs and charges	52
Definition of small business	53
Definition in current use by Government agencies	53
Definition industry by industry	54

Part IV. Small business participation in procurement—Continued Page
Department of Defense 54
Special Assistant on Small Business to the Secretary of Defense 55
Munitions Board 55
Small Business Office 55
Executive meeting 56
General Services Administration 57
Policy-maker for civilian procurement 57
Board of review 58
Office of Small Business for GSA 58
A small-business procurement mandate 59
Economic Cooperation Administration 59
Legislative action 59
ECA counsels small business 60
Other informational aids to small business 61
Facts for foreign purchasers 62
"Contact clearinghouse" 62
Small-business share of ECA payments 63
Cooperation with the committee 64
Department of Commerce 64
Procurement facts for small business 64
General assistance to small business 65
Clearinghouse for technical information 65
Part V. Studies and investigations 66
Identical bid prices 66
Special study 66
Equal low bids 66
Consumer-credit controls 67
Oil imports 69
The outlook in steel 76
Expansion in capacity of the steel industry 77
Structure of the steel industry 81
Steel distribution 83
Steel prices 84
Normal position of the independent fabricator 85
Steel distribution and the defense agencies 85
Cement distribution 86
Pricing practices 86
Production records still falling 87
Increases in plant capacity 88
Problems of independent fur farmers 90
Part VI. Antimonopoly activities 97
Antitrust legislation, 81st Cong 97
H. R. 5139, increasing fines to $50,000 97
H. R. 8763, uniform statute of limitations and suit by United States for "actual damages" 98
H. R. 2734, antimerger bill 99
H. R. 4402 100
Investigation of antitrust-law-enforcement agencies 101
The Federal Trade Commission 101
History of investigation 101
Scope of investigation 102
Conclusions and recommendations (preliminary) 103
Antitrust Division, Department of Justice 105
History of investigation 105
Scope of investigation 105
Conclusions and recommendations (preliminary) 106
Small Business—Antimonopoly Conference 108
Committee issues 50-year antitrust history (H. Doc. 599) 109
Supplement, 1950 109
List of committee hearings and reports 110

HEARINGS AND REPORTS, EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS

Finally, I include a list of hearings and reports issued by the committee:

HEARINGS AND REPORTS OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS

HEARINGS

Effects of Foreign Oil Imports on Independent Domestic Producers:

Part 1: Dallas, Tex., May 25 and 26; Washington, D. C., June 9 and 15; New York, N. Y., July 14; and Wichita, Kans., August 17, 1949.

Part 2: New York, N. Y., November 15 and 16; and Washington, D. C., November 30, 1949.

Part 3: Washington, D. C., April 16; Jackson, Miss., April 24; New Orleans, La., April 25; Lake Charles, La., April 26; Shreveport, La., April 26; Little Rock, Ark., April 27; Oklahoma City, Okla., April 28; and Santa Fe, N. Mex., May 2, 1950.

Pattern of Steel Distribution in the States of Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, and Texas; Dallas, Tex.; May 27, 1949.

Small Business Objections on Basing Point Legislation, Particulary S. 1008; Washington, D. C.; June 28, 29, 30, July 1 and 5, 1949.

Small Business Organizations; Washington, D. C.; August 22, 1949.

Steel—Acquisitions, Mergers, and Expansion of 12 Major Companies, 1900 to 1950; March 10, 1950; Washington, D. C.

Problems of Independent Fur Farmers; Denver, Colo.; May 27, 1950.

Small Business Program of the Department of Defense (Executive Meeting); Washington, D. C.; June 8, 1950.

Functional Operation of the Federal Trade Commission; Washington, D. C.; June 26, 27, and 28, 1950.

REPORTS

Progress Report—First Session; House Report No. 1576; February 2, 1950.

Small Business Organizations—Four Case Studies of Organizations Purporting to Represent Small Business; House Report No. 1675; February 21, 1950.

Effects of Foreign Oil Imports on Independent Domestic Producers; House Report No. 2344; June 27, 1950.

Congress and the Monopoly Problem—Fifty Years of Antitrust Development, 1900–1950; House Document No. 599.

Antitrust Law Enforcement by the Federal Trade Commission and the Antitrust Division, Department of Justice—A Preliminary Report.

Identical Bid Prices to Federal and State Governments by Four Major Industries (Staff Report).

Congress and the Monopoly Problem—Fifty Years of Antitrust Development, 1900–1950 (Supplement, 1950).

Final report.

HOUSE SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE—WEEKLY STAFF REPORT TO COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, each week a report is rendered to committee members by the staff on current problems and activities. This is a short one-page report which usually includes five or six succinct paragraphs concerning complaints of small-business men on a variety of subjects, as well as information of general or specific interest to the committee. The weekly report serves to keep the committee aware of the progress of the work and of the problems constantly arising in our economy which affect small business.

These weekly reports to the committee have also been made available to other interested Members of the House and to the press. For the future information of the Members, I include as a part of my remarks copies of the weekly reports for the weeks ending January 6 and January 13, 1951, which follow:

WEEKLY REPORT OF STAFF ACTIVITIES TO COMMITTEE MEMBERS, JANUARY 6, 1951

Committee reports: On January 1 Chairman PATMAN filed the committee's final report (H. Rept. 3237), as required by House Resolution 22, and a report entitled "Antitrust Law Enforcement by the Federal Trade Commission and the Antitrust Division, Department of Justice—A Preliminary Report" (H. Rept. 3236). These reports were released to the public on January 4. Requests to date approximate 3,000 for each document. The final report (110 pages) recounts the committee's activities during the Eighty-first Congress, with particular emphasis on the effect of mobilization on small-business institutions during the past 6 months. The preliminary report on the antitrust law enforcement agencies is best described by quoting a passage from the introduction: "The committee does not present the material in this report as its final conclusions on the monopoly problem. All findings should be viewed as preliminary and tentative. Many important witnesses are still to be heard. Several areas of antitrust administration need considerable additional exploration." The report recommends continued study of the functional operations of these agencies during the Eighty-second Congress.

NPA Office of Small Business: Creation of the Defense Production Administration (DPA) and appointment of NPA Administrator Harrison to head it pose a problem for NPA's OSB. Close contact with OSB since its establishment has convinced the staff that NPA's industry divisions view OSB as an impediment rather than a help. Evidence is plentiful that the OSB is doing its best but lacks authority to make its recommendations effective. Despite these handicaps, E. H. Lane, Special Assistant to the Administrator for Small Business, and his assistants have performed outstanding service, and it is regrettable that cooperation at the industry division level has not been more apparent. The departure of General Harrison probably will further reduce OSB's effectiveness.

Cement: The Big Three have again upped prices in the Lehigh Valley area (10 cents per barrel, bulk; 12 cents per barrel, paper). Philadelphia carlot buyers now pay $3.37 in bulk and $3.68 in paper.

Replacement parts: A representative of the automotive replacement parts rebuilding industry urges prompt action in listing units of this industry for materials for essential civilian production, stating: "Whether or not we have new cars we must still have transportation. America rolls on wheels. Hundreds of thousands of our people depend on the automobile for transportation. These people are the key to our survival and ultimate victory. Transportation must be maintained."

Antitrust: The Supreme Court this week, in ruling on a treble damage case involving maximum resale prices, declared in effect that agreements to fix maximum prices, "no less than those to fix minimum prices, cripple the freedom of traders and thereby restrain their ability to sell in accordance with their own judgment." The Court's decision was unanimous.

WEEKLY REPORT OF STAFF ACTIVITIES TO COMMITTEE MEMBERS, JANUARY 13, 1951

Defense procurement: The Armed Services Procurement Act (Public Law 413, 80th Cong.) contains 17 exemptions under which "contracts may be negotiated * * * without advertising." The most important of these since the declaration of a state of national emergency on December 16 permits negotiation if it is "determined to be necessary in the public interest during the period of a national emergency declared by the President or by the Congress." The directive of the Secretary of Defense issued on December 18 stressed the intent "to spread contracts across industry as widely as possible in order to broaden the scope of the military procurement program," with the comment that "broadening the base will require a wider use of negotiation." In the

fiscal year 1950 dollar value of defense purchases under advertised-bid procedure was 27.3 percent of the whole, while negotiated contracts amounted to 72.7 percent. Small business was able to secure approximately 52 percent of defense contracts let by competitive bidding. The picture with respect to negotiated contracts was vastly different. Small business was awarded only 14 percent of the total dollar value of these contracts. Figures for the last half of 1950 undoubtedly will show a sharp decline in advertised-bid purchases with a corresponding increase in negotiated contracts.

Small business: Inquiries from small-business men have greatly increased. Their letters indicate growing scarcity of materials for the manufacture of civilian supplies, particularly metal products. Inability to secure scarce materials has caused small business to seek defense contracts in greater number than at any time since Korea. Rated (DO) orders, small-business men assert, would enable them to keep their plants going.

Subcontracts: Complaints from subcontractors plagued by scarcity of materials bring to light a point which apparently is not generally understood. That is, a subcontractor, in order to secure materials for defense orders, must have a firm contract with a prime contractor. NPA informs the committee it now has representatives at each Commerce Department field office whose sole duty is to secure scarce materials for defense orders. No action is taken by these representatives unless the prime or subcontractor submits authoritative evidence of proper contractual relationships with the Government.

Scrap (iron and steel): NPA Order M-20 governs inventories of iron and steel scrap held by all handlers and producers. Records of receipt, deliveries, inventories, and use are required. All ferrous metals are included, either alloyed or unalloyed, in order to conserve and utilize every possible bit of scrap metal containing iron or steel. Order M-20 should tend to prevent coercive tie-in contracts (weekly report November 25).

Technical training program: The scientific Manpower Advisory Committee of NSRB, composed of 12 men prominent in education, industry, and science, has recommended a policy to insure the training of young scientists, engineers, and others with special skills.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. PRESTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes on Friday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

USE OF GERMAN AND JAPANESE NATIONALS IN OUR ARMED FORCES

Mr. POAGE. 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 Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, we have just passed by unanimous vote, a bill that will require a substantial number of American boys to man the ships which we have authorized. The number of boys that are used in the naval forces of the United States must be deducted from the total number who might otherwise be available for service in our ground forces as it is impossible to use these same boys in the land forces and in the Navy at the same time. This bill must, therefore, make it even more difficult to supply our Army with all the American boys it would like to have. Our supply of manpower for our land forces is desperately short. If we do nothing to relieve that shortage, this very bill, for which we have all voted, will but make the drafting of 18-year-old boys and of fathers the more likely. There are relatively few Members of this House who want to face either of these alternatives. Nor is it necessary until we have exhausted every other source of manpower.

It seems clear to me that our first step should be to open enlistments in our Army to citizens of other countries, particularly of Germany and of Japan, to serve in their own areas of the world in the defense of their own homes against communism. Why should we not be relieving the strain on American manpower by using the manpower that is available in parts of the world where the greatest military threat is posed? Why should we not give those people a chance to enlist in the American Army? I am not talking about drafting them; I am just suggesting that we should let them enlist in our army—that we should not wait on the creation of any German Army, Japanese Army, or United Nations Army. We need men now in our Army. There are hundreds of thousands of men in Germany and in Japan who want to enlist. Let us take them in.

Surely there is no other way whereby we can get so much help so cheaply or so quickly. Hundreds of thousands of these men are well-trained veterans of past wars who would make the soundest kind of fighting men right now. They do not have to be drafted. They want to eat United States Army food. Let us give them the chance. We do not have to bribe them by giving them American citizenship as we have foolishly assumed in the past. I propose that we use Germans in the defense of Germany and Japanese in the defense of Japan. I do not propose that any of these troops be brought to the United States either now or later. On the other hand, I do propose to make it unnecessary to send so many American boys to Europe and to Japan, and at the same time I propose to strengthen our position in both Europe and Asia.

RESIST COMMUNIST AGGRESSION

Mr. LANTAFF. 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 Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANTAFF. Mr. Speaker, many of the citizens of this country, including myself, are shocked and embittered by the fact that several of the countries to whom we are now, and have been, extending both military and economic aid to resist Communist aggression are still actively trading with the enemy by exporting strategic war materials to Russia, the Chinese Communists, and the satellite countries.

Some have attempted to rationalize this trade by saying that our allies must stockpile strategic materials which can be imported from the Communist bloc.

It hardly makes sense, however, to trade strategic materials with our enemies so that we are better equipped to kill each other. I recognize that much has been done by the United States to curb the export of strategic materials to Russia and China but our attempts to persuade our allies to follow the same action have met with little success.

The Belgians, for example, will export, this year, 64,000 tons of steel products and 18,000 tons of copper, zinc, and other nonferrous metals to Russia, even though such metals are sorely needed in Western Europe. Steel, copper, brass products, tires, and much machinery were exported, during 1960, from Britain to both Hong Kong and Chinese ports. Even today, Britain is transshipping Malayan rubber to Soviet ports.

Recently we were informed of a transaction whereby the French steel industry had negotiated to furnish 450 miles of steel rail to China, which in all probability, would have been used to construct rail lines from the interior of China to Indochina where valiant French forces are bitterly engaged with the Communists. The French Government is to be commended for taking steps to stop this shipment.

In the past year the countries of Western Europe have exported almost a billion dollars' worth of machinery and materials to the Soviet war potential. Numerous reports indicate that extensive trade with the Communist bloc is still being carried on, notwithstanding the provisions of the supplemental appropriation bill adopted by the Eighty-first Congress.

This active trading with the enemy becomes even more shocking when we realize that through our economic aid—through American taxpayers' dollars—we have helped rehabilitate the industrial potential of these same countries. If we expect the American public to fully support the effort of adequately preparing ourselves, and of helping other freedom-loving people resist communism, then we must put a stop to this unscrupulous trade.

It is for this reason that I have today introduced into the House a bill to provide that no economic or financial assistance of any kind whatsoever shall be furnished to any foreign country which permits the exportation of strategic war materials to the Communist bloc.

CONSTRUCTION OF HOSPITALS AND HEALTH CENTERS IN RURAL AMERICA

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, since coming to Congress on January 3, 1949, I have been intensely interested in the construction of hospitals and health centers in rural America, and particularly in the Seventh District of Alabama, which I have the honor to represent here, under the terms of the Hill-Burton hospital construction program.

I am happy to have voted for the Hospital Construction Act amendments of 1949, which greatly liberalized the pro-

gram. I have supported every appropriation designed to breathe life into this program, and shared the disappointment which many Members of the Congress felt, and which was more widely felt by those areas which had perfected plans for building hospitals and health centers under the terms of the program, when the appropriation for the fiscal year 1951—July 1, 1950, through June 30, 1951—was cut by 50 percent.

When the Hospital Construction Act amendments of 1949 were passed, it was generally agreed that beginning with the fiscal year 1951 that the Congress would appropriate $150,000,000 as the Federal contribution to the hospital building program.

Congress did appropriate $150,000,000 for this purpose for the fiscal year 1951, but shortly before the appropriation bill was passed the Korean war broke out on June 25, 1950, and it then became immediately apparent that the general expenses of our Government would have to be cut in order to build up our defenses and expand our Army, Navy, and Air Force.

Consequently, the Congress, as a part of the appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1951, gave to the Bureau of the Budget the right to cut nondefense appropriations by a total of $550,000,000. When I voted to give the Bureau of the Budget the right to cut nondefense appropriations by a total of $550,000,000, it never occurred to me that the Bureau of the Budget would cut the appropriation for hospital construction by more than a small percentage. Instead, the Bureau of the Budget slashed the appropriation for hospital construction by 50 percent, from $150,000,000 to $75,000,000, thereby making up 13½ percent of its total savings of $550,000,000 from the hospital construction appropriation alone.

When I learned that the Bureau of the Budget contemplated cutting the hospital and health center construction funds by 50 percent, I wrote the President of the United States as follows:

SEPTEMBER 29, 1950.

Hon. HARRY S. TRUMAN,
President of the United States,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I was extremely disappointed when I learned that the Bureau of the Budget had slashed 50 percent, or $75,000,000, off of the appropriation for rural hospital construction during this fiscal year.

The question of whether or not this appropriation would be $75,000,000 or $150,000,000 was fought out on the floor of the House, where the Representatives of the American people made it abundantly clear that it was their desire to proceed with the hospital construction program as originally planned in 1949 when the Hospital Construction Act was amended.

In my judgment there is no activity of the Federal Government of more direct benefit to the health of rural America than the hospital-construction program. Local communities were led to believe a year ago when Congress authorized the $150,000,000 for hospital construction this year that the money would be forthcoming, and they in good faith made their plans accordingly.

Now with the danger of another world war facing us, rural hospitals become even more important. In the event of all-out war we can reasonably expect attacks on our large cities, and the surrounding rural hospitals may become the treatment centers for injured persons from our cities.

I sincerely hope that you may see fit to request the Bureau of the Budget to reverse its decision in this matter, and if not, I trust that you may request a supplemental appropriation for rural hospital construction when Congress reconvenes on November 27, 1950.

Thanking you, and with kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

CARL ELLIOTT.

The President's reply to my letter was as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, October 2, 1950.

MY DEAR MR. ELLIOTT: This will acknowledge your letter of September 29, requesting information about a proposed reduction in the 1951 Federal apportionment for grants-in-aid for hospital construction under the Hill-Burton Act.

As you know, the Congress, in section 1214 of the General Appropriation Act, 1951, directed that:

"Appropriations, reappropriations, contract authorizations, and reauthorizations made by this act, for departments and agencies in the executive branch of the Government, shall, without impairing national defense, be reduced in the amount of not less than $550,000,000 through the apportionment procedure provided for in section 1211 of this act."

The budgetary programs of all departments and agencies are now being thoroughly reviewed within the executive branch in order that the reductions required in section 1214 of the General Appropriation Act may be effected.

Prior to the enactment of section 1214, I had already taken steps to review all Federal programs in the construction field which require materials, supplies, and manpower with a view to curtailing or cutting back those projects which do not contribute directly to the national defense or essential civilian requirements. I originally announced this program in my message of July 19 to the Congress on the Korean situation.

In order to meet the reductions directed by the Congress and to save materials, supplies, and manpower for the defense effort, agencies of the executive branch have recently been given target figures to assist them in the execution of their 1951 budgets. The figures furnished agencies are tentative ones only, and no final decisions have been reached on the amount of curtailment for any individual program.

With respect to Hill-Burton Act funds, the Federal Security Agency for planning purposes has been supplied a target figure of $75,000,000 out of the $150,000,000 provided in the General Appropriation Act, 1951, for allotment to the States during the current fiscal year. This amount together with the $91,000,000 still available from 1950 funds would make a total of $166,000,000 available during the current fiscal year, an amount of $49,000,000 in excess of requirements for this program during fiscal year 1950. Approval of this tentative proposal would limit the number of new hospital projects which could be accepted during the current fiscal year but would not necessitate delay or cancellation of any projects which have received final approval of the Surgeon General, Public Health Service, up to this time. You may feel assured that before a final decision is reached every consideration will be given to the importance of this program in relation to other current urgent requirments of the Government.

Very sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

The 50-percent reduction was made.

In the second supplemental appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1951, we were able to obtain an additional appropriation of $10,000,000 for hospital and health center construction, making a total of $85,000,000 for the fiscal year 1951. Alabama's share of this appropriation amounts to approximately $2,900,000.

Acting under the impression that the total appropriation of $150,000,000 would be made for the fiscal year 1951, hundreds of communities throughout this country made their plans to construct their hospitals.

These plans consisted of obtaining expensive architects' drawings and specifications, the acquisition of building sites, the levy of a 4-mill tax with which to raise the local share of the costs of the project.

When the Congress failed to make the necessary appropriations to meet these plans, the entire program was thrown out of gear, projects were delayed, and many projects were discontinued altogether.

I realize that now while we are faced with the prospects of an all-out war, and while terrible, bloody, hard, cold fighting is going on in Korea that we must do everything within our power to hurriedly build up our Armed Forces, and that we must provide our fighting men with every tool which they need to discharge the obligation which history has placed on their shoulders.

To this end, I personally am willing to make every sacrifice that I may be called upon to make as an individual, and as a Member of Congress, during this emergency. I will vote only for those programs that I feel are justified in the light of the war effort which we must make.

In the over-all picture of building our defenses in preparation for a war, which I fear that Russia and her satellites will shortly force upon us, it seems to me that we can reasonably expect air attacks on our large cities and particularly on those cities which contribute heavily to the manufacture and processing of the necessities of war, such as steel, oil, shipbuilding, aircraft construction, aluminum, and several others.

At least, it seems to me that we must bear in mind that such attacks are a real possibility.

In the event of such attacks then the rural hospitals that surround such areas may well become the treatment centers for the injured persons from our cities. Thus, it is highly desirable, from a defense standpoint, that we continue, at full speed, the hospital-construction program for rural areas, not presently served by hospital facilities. The continued and improved health and medical care of our civilian population is a vital factor in national defense. The construction of badly needed hospitals and health centers is a major factor in maintaining health.

In the Seventh Congressional District of Alabama a 35-bed general hospital is presently under construction at Hamilton, Ala. A 30-bed general hospital will shortly go under construction at Vernon, Ala. A health center is under construction at Cullman, Ala.

Had appropriations for this program not been reduced, as I have outlined, the Blount County Hospital at Oneonta, Ala., the South Pickens County Hospital at

Aliceville, the North Pickens County Hospital at Reform, Ala., and the Franklin County Health Center at Russellville would now be under construction.

As it is, these hospitals and this health center have been postponed until the fiscal year 1952, which will begin July 1, 1951, to the great inconvenience of the communities involved, and in the meantime planning expenses have increased and inflation has taken its toll on the value of such construction moneys as the Congress may, in the future, provide.

As a part of my remarks, I am including a letter from Mr. Clay H. Dean, director, hospital planning division, department of public health, Montgomery, Ala., addressed to me on November 8, 1950, together with tables showing the status of the various hospital and health-center construction in Alabama, together with a narrative report dealing with some of those projects:

STATE OF ALABAMA,
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH,
Montgomery, Ala., November 8, 1950.

The Honorable CARL ELLIOTT,
United States Congressman,
Jasper, Ala.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ELLIOTT: Being aware of your interest in the Hill-Burton hospital-construction program here in Alabama and elsewhere in the Nation, we are taking this opportunity to forward you our latest summary of projects. This summary outlines in detail the current status of each project and the effect of the recent 50-percent cut in Hill-Burton funds. Copies of this information have been forwarded to the Public Health Service at their request. We sincerely hope that this data, together with other data furnished by this office, will be of some assistance to you in your efforts to achieve a restoration of these badly needed funds.

Respectfully,

CLAY H. DEAN,
Director, Hospital Planning Division.

National hospital program (Alabama) under the Public Health Service Act (title VI), as amended—Revised program for 1950 and 1951—List of all projects for which funds are to be charged to allotments for 1950 and 1951

Project No.	Location and name	Beds added	Priority	Percent complete	Federal share by fiscal years— 1950	1951	1952
	PROJECTS FINALLY APPROVED (PT. 4)						
5	Mobile, Martin de Porres Hospital	35	A	100	$9,075.01		
6	Birmingham, Crippled Children's Clinic	128	A	80	26,017.78		
7	Birmingham, St. Vincents Hospital	90	C	95	24,998.04		
14	Montgomery, St. Judes Hospital	152	A	95	12,663.33		
21	Gadsden, Etowah County Health Center		A	70	14,880.09		
12	Mobile, Mobile Infirmary	274	A	65	505,498.50	$500,000.00	$481,508.60
13	Mobile, Providence	200	A	40	1,000,000.00	300,000.00	300,000.00
15	Tuscaloosa, Druid City Hospital	241	A	15	1,000,000.00	300,000.00	624,231.54
16	Fort Payne, De Kalb County Hospital	50	A	65	213,186.67		
20	Ashland, Clay County Hospital	20	A	75	75,033.29		
22	Athens, Athens-Limestone Hospital	50	A	75	239,241.20		
25	Marion, Perry County Hospital	20	A	98	3,438.17		
27	Ozark, Dale County Hospital	50	A	55	200,000.00	86,204.00	
37	Livingston, Sumter County Health Center		A	75	48,575.13		
38	Decatur, District I Tuberculosis Sanatorium	161	A	20	300,000.00	455,479.82	
24	Hamilton, Marion County Hospital	35	A	10	250,000.00	36,362.60	
33	Union Springs, Bullock County Hospital	29	A	30	150,000.00	56,142.66	
35	Cullman, Cullman County Health Center		A	10	66,016.00		
54	Tuskegee, Macon County Hospital	32	A	100	23,780.24		
18	Sylacauga, Sylacauga Hospital Nurses Home		A	15	180,000.00	39,770.00	
17	Opelika, Lee County Hospital	70	A	5	395,000.00	258,339.70	
201	Tuscaloosa, Bryce Hospital	92	A	10	200,000.00	32,260.00	
301	Birmingham, University of Alabama Dental Clinic		A	35	200,000.00	220,810.66	
	PROJECTS INITIALLY APPROVED (PT. I)						
28	Vernon, Lamar County Hospital	30	A	XX		254,760.00	
	Total revised program (24 projects)	1,759			5,137,403.45	2,540,129.44	1,405,740.14

National hospital program (Alabama) under the Public Health Service Act (title VI), as amended—Projects postponed from 1950 or 1951 program—List of all projects originally programed for 1950 or 1951 but postponed or abandoned by reason of curtailment of 1951 contract authorization

Project No.	Location and name	Beds added	Total	Federal share	Priority	Federal fiscal year of project approval: Originally planned	Now anticipated	Site acquisition	Drawings	Local funds [1]
	PROJECTS APPROVED BY PHS (PT. I)									
23	Oneonta, Blount County Hospital	30	$365,000	$240,000.00	A	1950	1952	Owned	Working	4-mill tax.[2]
51	Huntsville, Madison County Health Center		120,000	80,000.00	A	1950	1952	do	do	Appropriation.
31	Aliceville, South Pickens County Hospital	20	265,000	174,000.00	A	1950	1952	do	do	4-mill tax.
44	Reform, North Pickens County Hospital	20	265,000	174,000.00	A	1950	1952	do	do	Do.
47	Montgomery, St. Margarets Hospital	262	3,000,000	2,000,000.00	A	1950	1953	do	do	Cash.
	5 projects	332	4,015,000	2,668,000.00						
	PENDING PROJECTS (PROGRAMED BY STATE AGENCY BUT NOT YET APPROVED BY PHS)									
30	Chatom, Washington County Hospital	20	240,000	160,000.00	A	1951	1952	do	Schematic	Appropriation.
46	Demopolis, Brian-Whitfield Memorial Hospital	24	290,000	186,666.00	A	1951	1952	do	Working	Do.
50	Moulton, Lawrence County Hospital	40	488,000	320,000.00	A	1951	1952	do	do	4-mill tax.
32	Evergreen, Conecuh County Hospital	30	335,000	220,000.00	A	1951	1952	do	Schematic	Do.
52	Tarrant City, Tarrant City Health Center		42,000	28,000.00	A	1951	1953	do	do	Appropriation.
81	Roanoke, Randolph County Hospital	35	420,000	280,000.00	A	1951	1953	do	do	4-mill tax.
86	Florence, Lauderdale County Public Health Clinic		114,000	76,000.00	A	1951	1953	do	do	Appropriation.
96	Russellville, Franklin County Public Health Clinic		108,000	72,000.00	A	1951	1953	do	do	Do.
	8 projects	149	2,037,000	1,342,666.00						
	13 projects, total projects postponed	481	6,052,000	4,010,666.00						

[1] Money is now available for each project on this sheet.
[2] County has passed and is collecting a 4-mill hospital tax. This applies in every place where "4-mill tax" is stated.

National hospital program (Alabama) under the Public Health Service Act (title VI), as amended—revised program for 1952, 1953, 1954, and 1955—list of all projects now on file in the State agency and scheduled for construction in 1952, 1953, 1954, and 1955

Project No.	Location and name	Beds added	Estimated cost		Priority	Federal fiscal year of project approval	Current status		
			Total	Federal share			Site acquisition	Drawings	Local funds
	PENDING PROJECTS (PROGRAMED BY STATE AGENCY BUT NOT YET APPROVED BY PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE)								
41	Brewton, Escambia County Hospital	35	$470,000	$280,000.00	B	1952 1955	Owned	Schematic	4-mill tax.
36	Gadsden, district IV tuberculosis sanatorium	100	1,200,000	800,000.00	A	1952 1953	Option	do	Current drive.
90	Ensley, Holy Family Hospital	60	750,000	500,000.00	A	1952 1953	Owned	do	Cash.
94	Mobile, Mobile County Public Health Clinic		421,000	280,666.66	A	1952 1953	Option		Appropriation.
97	Birmingham, Eastern Health Center		52,000	34,666.66	A	1952 1953	Owned	Schematic	Do.
100	Geneva, Geneva County Public Health Clinic		60,000	40,000.00	A	1952 1953			Do.
92	Geneva, Geneva County Hospital	40	420,000	280,000.00	A	1952 1953	Owned	Schematic	4-mill tax.
114	Fayette, Fayette County Public Health Clinic		75,000	50,000.00	A	1952 1954	do	do	Appropriation.
63	Centerville, Centerville Clinic	10	120,000	80,000.00	A	1952 1954			
56	Clanton, Chilton County Public Health Clinic		57,000	38,000.00	A	1952 1954	Owned	Schematic	Do.
116	Enterprise, Enterprise Health Center		75,000	50,000.00	A	1952 1954	do		Do.
85	Tuscaloosa, Tuscaloosa County Public Health Clinic		261,500	160,000.00	A	1952 1954	do		Sales tax.
49	Butler, Choctaw County Public Health Clinic		68,600	42,400.00	A	1952 1954	do		
45	Linden, Marengo County Public Health Clinic		92,700	61,800.00	A	1952 1954			
39	Eufaula, Barbour County Hospital	45	585,000	390,000.00	A	1952 1954			4-mill tax.
53	Dothan, Houston County Hospital	50	600,000	400,000.00	B	1952 1955	Owned	Schematic	Do.
19	Decatur, Decatur General Hospital	60	775,000	500,000.00	B	1952 1955	do		1-mill tax.
26	Mobile, district VI tuberculosis sanatorium	100	1,300,000	866,666.66	A	1952 (?)			
55	Tuskegee, Macon County Hospital		40,000	40,000.00	Hardship	1951 (?)	Owned		Hardship.
74	Mobile, Mobile Infirmary NH		670,000	446,666.66	A	1952 (?)	do	Schematic	Cash.
88	Montgomery, St. Margarets Hospital NH		135,000	90,000.00	A	1953 (?)	do		
79	Tuscaloosa, Druid City Hospital NH		463,000	294,000.00	A	1953 (?)	do	Schematic	Sales tax.
29	Cullman, Cullman County Hospital	50	600,000	400,000.00	B	1952 (?)	do		
64	Henegar, Beatty Hospital	20	240,000	160,000.00	B	1953 (?)	Option	Schematic	4-mill tax.
65	Crossville, Crossville Hospital	20	240,000	160,000.00	B	1953 (?)	Owned		
59	Columbia, Columbia Clinic	12	125,000	80,000.00	B	1953 (?)	do		
57	Piedmont, Piedmont Hospital	20	240,000	160,000.00	B	1953 (?)	do		
99	Sheffield, Colbert County Hospital	75	900,000	600,000.00	C	1953 (?)	do		
42	Jackson, Jackson Hospital	20	265,000	167,200.00	C	1953 (?)			
43	Thomasville, Thomasville Hospital	20	265,000	167,200.00	C	1953 (?)			
48	Berry, Berry Clinic	12	120,000	80,000.00	C	1953 (?)			
93	Rogersville, Rogersville Hospital	20	240,000	160,000.00	C	1953 (?)			
82	Wedowee, Wedowee Clinic	15	180,000	120,000.00	D	1953 (?)			Do.
83	Wadley, Wadley Clinic	8	60,000	40,000.00	D	1953 (?)			Do.
78	Courtland, Courtland Clinic	12	155,000	102,333.33	D	1954 (?)	Option	Schematic	Do.
84	Woodland, Woodland Clinic	8	60,000	40,000.00	D	1954 (?)			
40	Clayton, Clayton Clinic	12	144,000	96,000.00	D	1954 (?)			
68	Red Bay, Red Bay Clinic	9	126,000	84,000.00	E	1954 (?)	Owned	Schematic	Appropriation.
110	Selma, Vaughn Memorial Hospital	100	1,200,000	800,000.00	E	1954 (?)	do		
111	Decatur, district I tuberculosis sanatorium NH		180,000	120,000.00	E	1954 (?)	do		
112	Clio, Clio Clinic	6	60,000	40,000.00	E	1954 (?)			
113	Louisville, Louisville Clinic	6	60,000	40,000.00	E	1954 (?)			
80	Langdale, George H. Lanier Memorial Annex	32	360,000	240,000.00	E	1954 (?)	Owned		
	43 projects	977	14,510,800	9,581,599.97					
	PROJECTS RECEIVED AFTER SEPT. 18, 1950								
75	Montgomery, St. Judes Hospital, NH and Orthopedic	50	1,200,000	800,000.00	A	1954 (?)	do		
58	Mobile, City Hospital (X-ray)		69,000	46,000.00	C	1953 (?)	do	Schematic	Do.
91	Anniston, Anniston Memorial (Annex)	160	750,000	500,000.00	B	1954 (?)	do	do	
60	Arab, Arab Hospital	20	276,000	184,000.00	C	1954 (?)			4-mill tax.
61	Guntersville, Marshall County Public Health Clinic		126,000	84,000.00	A	1953 (?)			Do.
62	Grant, Grant Health Center		30,000	20,000.00	A	1953 (?)			Do.
87	Albertville, Albertville-Boaz Hospital	40	480,000	320,000.00	C	1954 (?)			Do.
	Projects (7)	277	2,931,000	1,954,000.00					
	Total (50) projects in category	1,247	17,441,800	11,535,599.97					

NATIONAL HOSPITAL PROGRAM UNDER THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT (TITLE VI) AS AMENDED—NARRATIVE REPORT OF PROJECTS ORIGINALLY PROGRAMED FOR 1950 OR 1951 BUT POSTPONED OR ABANDONED BY REASON OF CURTAILMENT OF 1951 CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION

GENERAL

All anticipated approval dates are based on the 50 percent contract authorization for the fiscal year 1951 and similar reductions in future fiscal years. Should the 1951 appropriation be restored and/or full appropriations maintained in the future, individual projects will be moved forward on the construction schedule insofar as funds permit.

The greater percentage of the general hospitals scheduled for current and future construction in Alabama are to be located in counties with no existing facilities and with few physicians. It is the belief of all, that, with the construction of hospital facilities, physicians will be attracted to the communities, thereby insuring adequate medical attention for the people. This has already been the case in communities where hospital facilities have been constructed.

I. Projects approved by Public Health Service (part 1)

Alabama, 23—Blount County Hospital, Oneonta, Ala.:

This facility is to be owned and operated by the Blount County Hospital Board, a public corporation under the laws of Alabama, and an agency of Blount County. Application for Federal assistance was filed with the State agency December 12, 1947. Blount County has an A priority under the State hospital plan first approved in 1947 and in subsequent revisions. The proposed facility is to be a 30-bed general hospital.

The site is owned by the county hospital board. The city of Oneonta and Blount County have agreed to install all off-site improvements such as water extensions, sewer extensions, and paved streets.

The working drawings have been completed and the final architectural review secured. The architect is now complying with the Public Health Service and State agency comments. The project could be advertised for bids at any time.

It is estimated that the project will cost $360,000, of which $240,000 is to come from Federal funds. Of the remaining funds needed, $60,000 has been allocated by the Alabama State Board of Health. The local funds in the amount of $80,000 are now available from a special 4-mill hospital tax approved by the voters of Blount County last year. The proceeds from this tax can only be used to build and maintain public hospitals in the county.

This project was scheduled for construction from the 1950 fiscal year funds and could start immediately. Due to the cut this project must be delayed until the 1952 fiscal year.

Alabama, 31—South Pickens County Hospital, Aliceville, Ala.; Alabama, 44; North Pickens County Hospital, Reform, Ala.:

These facilities are to be owned and operated by the Pickens County Hospital Association, an agency of Pickens County and incorporated under the laws of Alabama. Applications for Federal assistance were filed with the State agency on October 6, 1949. Pickens County has an "A" priority on Federal funds in that there are no hospital beds within the county. The nearest hospitals are in Tuscaloosa, Ala., and Columbus, Miss., both about 40 miles from the center of the county. The proposed facilities are 20-bed

general hospitals and will be jointly operated by the hospital association. In an effort to secure both good design and administration the association has employed an experienced hospital administrator to assist in the design and to manage the hospitals upon completion.

Both sites are now owned by the hospital association and cost $6,500. The towns of Aliceville and Reform and Pickens County have agreed to provide all necessary off-site improvements and some grading on the site proper. In several instances contracts have been awarded for this work.

The working drawings for both projects have been completed and approved by the Public Health Service and the State agency. These projects could be advertised for bids at any time.

It is estimated that each project will cost $265,000 for a total of $530,000. Of this $348,000 will come from Federal funds, $60,000 from State funds and $122,000 from a special four-mill hospital approved by the voters of Pickens County last year.

These projects were scheduled for construction from 1950 funds and could start immediately. Due to the cut in 1951 funds these projects must be delayed until 1952.

Alabama 51, Madison County Public Health Center, Huntsville, Ala.: This facility is jointly sponsored by the city of Huntsville and Madison County. The application for Federal assistance was filed on April 15, 1949. This project has an A priority, as is true of all public-health centers in Alabama. The existing health center is on the second and third floors of an old, nonfireproof theater building. Its facilities are grossly inadequate for the service that is, and could be, performed in Madison County. In addition to the normal population of the county the Redstone Arsenal has been activated thus bringing additional people to the area and increasing the workload of the county health department. Only by the construction of the new health center can both the normal and additional workload be adequately handled.

The site is now owned by the sponsors and is valued at $20,000.

The architect has carried the working drawings to about 95 percent completion. The State agency has made an informal review and the drawings should be ready for presentation to the Public Health Service within a few weeks. The project could be advertised for bids within a month.

The estimated cost of the project is $120,000. Of this amount $80,000 is needed from Federal funds. The State has allocated $20,000 and the city of Huntsville and Madison County have appropriated $10,000 each.

This project was scheduled for construction from 1950 funds. It is now delayed until 1952.

Alabama, 47—St. Margaret's Hospital, Montgomery, Ala.:

This project is for a 262-bed general hospital to replace a nonacceptable, dangerous facility in Montgomery. The existing facility is a definite fire hazard. The Sisters of Charity are the project sponsors. This facility is vital to the planned coordinate hospital system as it has been designated as the base hospital for the central Alabama area. It will provide all types of medical, surgical, and hospital care as well as training facilities for nurses and medical interns. For these reasons it has been given an "A" priority on Federal funds.

The site is now owned by the sponsors and is valued at $150,000.

The working drawings are well over half completed. This project could be advertised for bids within 3 months.

The estimated cost of the project is $3,000,000, of which the sponsors now have their funds in cash. No State funds can be allocated to this project.

This project was scheduled for construction from the 1950 appropriation. It now must be delayed until the 1953 fiscal year. The fact that the Federal share will closely approximate the 50-percent Federal allocation to Alabama complicates this project. It may be that, to avoid disastrous criticism of the hospital program, it will be necessary to postpone even further this project and to allocate the available Federal funds to tax-supported facilities. However, with the full appropriation, St. Margaret's and a number of smaller facilities could be constructed concurrently.

II. Pending projects (programed by State but not yet approved by the Public Health Service)

Alabama, 30—Washington County Hospital, Chatom, Ala.:

This facility is to be owned and operated by the Washington County Hospital Association. The application for Federal assistance was filed April 8, 1948. Washington County has been given an "A" priority on Federal funds since there are no hospital beds in the county. The nearest hospital beds are in Mobile, 60 miles away, and Grove Hill, 35 miles from Chatom.

This site is now owned by the Washington County Hospital Association and is valued at $5,000. The town of Chatom has spent considerable funds extending the water mains to the hospital site.

The architect is now working on the schematic drawings which could be submitted for approval within a few weeks. The project could be advertised for bids within 5 months.

Of the $240,000 the project is estimated to cost, $160,000 is to come from Federal funds, $40,000 from State funds and $40,000 from local sources. Washington County has appropriated this latter amount and now has the funds in cash.

This project was scheduled for construction from 1951 funds. It must now be delayed until 1952.

Alabama, 32—Conecuh County Hospital, Evergreen, Ala.:

This 30-bed general hospital is to be owned and operated by the Conecuh County Hospital Association. The application for Federal assistance was filed December 14, 1948. The county has an "A" priority since there are no acceptable beds in the county.

The site is now owned by the hospital association and was purchased at a cost of $5,000. The city of Evergreen has agreed to perform the off-site improvements as extending water mains and paving adjacent streets.

Schematic drawings have been completed and submitted to the Public Health Service for informal review. Working drawings could be completed within 4 months.

Of the non-Federal share of $110,000, one-half is to come from State and local sources. The voters of Conecuh County approved a 4-mill hospital tax last year. This tax is now being collected for hospital construction and operation. The total project cost is estimated to be $330,000.

This project was scheduled for construction from 1951 funds. It must now be delayed until 1952.

Alabama, 46—Brian Whitfield Memorial Hospital, Demopolis, Ala.:

This 24-bed general hospital is to be owned and operated by the city of Demopolis. Application for Federal assistance was filed with the State agency March 2, 1949. This project has an "A" priority since there are no acceptable hospital beds in Marengo County.

The site is now owned by the city of Demopolis and was purchased for $10,000. The city of Demopolis has employed consulting engineers to plan extension of utilities to the site. An addition access street is also planned.

Schematic drawings have been completed and approved by the Public Health Service. The architect has begun working drawings and could complete them in 2 months.

The total estimated cost is $290,000 with $46,667 from State funds and $186,666 from Federal funds. The city of Demopolis has in cash their funds in the amount of $56,667.

This project was scheduled for construction from 1951 funds. It must now be delayed until 1952.

Alabama, 50—Lawrence County Hospital, Moulton, Ala.:

This facility is to be a 40-bed general hospital and is located in a county which now has no hospital facilities. The nearest hospitals are in Decatur and Sheffield, 23 and 40 miles from Moulton. The county has an "A" priority and the facility is to be owned and operated by the Lawrence County Hospital Association. Application for Federal funds was filed with the State agency on September 1, 1949.

The site is now owned by the hospital association and is valued at $8,000. The town of Moulton and Lawrence County have agreed to provide the required utilities.

Schematic drawings have been completed and submitted to the Public Health Service for informal review. Working drawings could be completed and the project advertised for bids within 5 months.

The total cost of this project is estimated to be $488,000. Of this amount, the Federal share is $320,000, with the State providing $60,000 and the sponsor $108,000. The local share is now being raised by a 4-mill hospital tax approved by the voters last year. Bonds have been sold and the construction funds are now in a local bank. Operation funds will be provided from the tax and from hospital receipts.

This project was scheduled for construction from 1951 funds. It now must be delayed until 1952.

Alabama, 53—Tarrant City Health Center, Tarrant City, Ala.:

This project is to be a public health center to house branch offices and clinics of the Jefferson County Health Department. The present facility is located in an old converted and inadequate frame residence. Application for this "A" priority project was filed by the city of Tarrant City with the State agency on October 27, 1949.

The site, valued at $6,000, has been acquired by the city of Tarrant City. Necessary utilities are now available to the site.

Schematic drawings have ben completed and submitted to the Public Health Service for informal review. Working drawings could be completed and placed on the market for bids within 4 months.

The total cost of this project is estimated to be $42,000, with $28,000 from Federal funds and $7,000 from both the State and Tarrant City. The sponsor now has his funds in cash.

This project was scheduled for construction from 1951 funds but now must be delayed until 1952.

Alabama, 81—Randolph County Hospital, Roanoke, Ala.:

This 35-bed general hospital is to be owned and operated by the Randolph County Hospital Association. It is to be the central unit in a proposed county hospital system including three smaller units which will be supplementary to the county hospital. Randolph County has an A priority, since there are no acceptable hospital beds in the county. Application for Federal assistance was filed on November 10, 1949.

The site was purchased by the hospital association for $3,000. Utilities are to be provided by the city of Roanoke, which is now making a study of the necessary work.

Schematic drawings have been completed and submitted to the Public Health Service for informal review. Working drawings

could be completed and the project advertised for bids within 5 months.

It is estimated that this project will cost $423,000, with a Federal share of $280,000. State aid in the amount of $60,000 has been approved for this project. The local share of $83,000 is provided from revenue collected from the 4-mill hospital tax approved by the voters of Randolph County last year. Proceeds from this tax will also be used to supplement hospital revenues for operation funds.

This project was scheduled for construction from 1951 funds, but now must be delayed until 1953.

Alabama, 86—Lauderdale County Health Center, Florence, Ala.:

This public health center is to be owned by Lauderdale County, and will house the Lauderdale County Health Department. It will replace the present inadequate facilities utilized by this county agency. This project has an A priority. The recent rapid growth of this area makes adequate public health facilities of this area an urgent necessity. Application for Federal assistance was made to the State agency on December 27, 1949.

The site is owned by Lauderdale County and is valued at $20,000. It is located in the downtown area where public utilities are now available.

Schematic drawings have been completed and submitted to the Public Health Service for informal review. The working drawings could be completed and the project placed on the market for bids within 4 months.

It is estimated that the total cost of the facility will be $114,000, not including site costs. The Federal share will be $76,000 and $19,000 has been allocated by the State board of health. The local share of $39,000 is composed of $19,000 in cash and the site.

This project was scheduled for construction from 1951 funds but now must be delayed until 1953.

Alabama, 96—Franklin County Health Center, Russellville, Ala.:

This public-health center is to be owned by Franklin County and will house the Franklin County Health Department. It will replace the present inadequate facilities now used by this county agency. This project has an A priority. Application for Federal funds was filed with the State agency on December 30, 1949.

The site has been purchased by Franklin County for $12,000. Utilities are available.

Schematic drawings have been completed and submitted to the Public Health Service for informal review. The working drawings could be completed and the project placed on the market for bids within 4 months.

The total cost of this facility is estimated to be $108,000. The Federal share is $72,000 and the State is providing $18,000. Franklin County has in cash their share of $18,000.

This project was scheduled for construction from 1951 funds. It must now be delayed until 1953.

NATIONAL GUARD

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Viking Division of National Guardsmen from Minnesota and North Dakota was inducted into Federal service and will leave Sunday for Camp Rucker, Ala. Twice in 10 years Minnesota Guardsmen are leaving their homes, families, and jobs to serve this Nation in time of crisis.

It is not easy for them, nor for their families, but they do so proudly in the tradition of American men, wearing the insignia of the Forty-seventh Viking Division—a Viking helmet on the field of Thor, the mythical god of strength, the great defender and victor in battle. This patch symbolizes the Scandinavian ancestry of many Minnesotans but it is worn by men of all ancestries—the sons and grandsons of the men who built our great State.

We are particularly proud of the men of the One Hundred and Thirty-fifth Infantry Regiment of Minnesota. This regiment carries on the tradition of the famous First Minnesota Volunteer Infantry whose charge in the Battle of Gettysburg is still regarded as the most heroic in our military history. This First Minnesota Volunteer Infantry became the first group of volunteers in the Civil War and came from the then youngest State in the Union.

The young volunteers were frontiersmen who had banded together in local militias and their first camp was made only a short distance from this Chamber, on the Capitol Grounds. From here they went on to a brilliant record that reached its peak in the charge of July 2, 1863. This charge bought the time Hancock needed to reinforce his wavering line and saved the Union forces from defeat.

Other units of what is now the One Hundred and Thirty-fifth Infantry have existed since territorial days in Minnesota and served in the Civil War, Spanish American War, on the Mexican border, and in both World Wars in France, Africa, and Italy.

This week the men of Minnesota are again reminding us that the strength of a democracy is in its citizen soldiers, in the men who in our hometowns form the heart of our armies in crisis. This is a point we can well recall today.

As Americans we have been rightfully reluctant to build huge military machines. Our aim has been peace and security and a society in which free men can work and raise their families. We have fought and fought well when this goal was threatened. It is again threatened and again we must build our defenses.

But as we begin this grave task, we should remember the service of our citizen soldiers—the men who have gone in time of danger to defend our homes. They are not professional soldiers in the strict sense of that term. But they have defeated the professional armies of those who would destroy the freedom of mankind.

This should be a warning to those who think we must adopt an armed camp mentality in our time and build an enormous military machine to be maintained in peace and war as a kind of professional army. They would have us sacrifice our homes and our freedoms in the very effort to save them. To those, the One Hundred and Thirty-fifth Infantry and its history should be a lesson worth remembering.

The citizen soldiers of Minnesota have carried their share of the burden in these times and many of them are leaving their homes for the second time in 10 years. In our district they have trained at Brainerd, Long Prairie, Aitkin, Milaca, Camp Ripley, St. Cloud, Sauk Centre, Princeton, Litchfield, and Park Rapids and have given faithfully of their time as citizens.

We are intensely proud of these men from our district. I know many of them and regret to see them leave but know that in going they will acquit themselves in the best traditions of the Guard. They deserve our support and we express to them our best wishes for an early return to their homes and families.

My reason for calling the attention of the House to the induction of the Forty-seventh Division, gentlemen, is to remind all of us of our responsibility to these men and to their families. Let their going not be taken lightly for they are going in our cause—the cause of the American people.

To those who go we have a grave obligation—an obligation to them both as soldiers and as citizens. As soldiers we owe them every honest effort that we can make to achieve a just peace without the terrible suffering of war. We owe them the best of our resources so that they will be the best trained and equipped men in the world.

As citizens, we owe them fair treatment of their families. To emphasize this obligation in plain terms, I want to include here an editorial by Chuck Rathe, editor of the Sauk Centre Herald:

The call-up of the National Guard here into Federal service has rekindled fire again under an old problem when democratic armies fight, for democratic armies are citizen soldiers—at least as they go in. They have obligations of citizenship and family quite beyond those of the professional soldier.

What is pointed up here is that dependence allotments for men with families are too low. In some cases this will create hardships. Fortunately, at the moment in the Guard most of the men with families are in the upper pay grades where they'll be able to implement the incomes for their families.

Total payment to a wife of a serviceman is $85 per month, including the contribution made by the husband from his Army pay. This might be sufficient for young working wives, but the $105 available to a family with one child and the $125 a month to a wife with two children is way out of line. No extra payments are made for more than three dependents.

Wives with children can't hold down good paying jobs without upsetting routines at home and running into actually more costs of home management. Besides that, if the Army is really interested in the morale of its fighting men—and if in that group it is going to include family heads—then Congress and the rest of us had better see to it that the family left behind is adequately taken care of. A soldier can't fight intelligently worrying about whether his wife and kids are getting along on pittances.

The people of the United States might just as well begin now digging down into their pockets to maintain a fighting force of men, and one of the places to dig is to sustain their families adequately enough so that family life doesn't disintegrate under the stress of things.

We could win wars until doomsday, but we will have lost everything if we are to break family morale and ultimately the American home with parsimony.

These are some of the obligations that must be met. We are proud of our National Guard men and we are grateful to them. This means we must fulfill the responsibility we have to citizens who in time of danger become our soldiers. We owe them these things and we owe them more—we owe them our prayers for guidance to peace based upon principles of Christian justice. We must bow humbly and ask for divine guidance in the task before us. We must seek the way in the only place man has an abiding faith—in the leadership of God.

RICE PRODUCTION

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. 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 Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, our struggle against the forces of communism throughout the world involves many aspects of our own economic policy. We cannot afford to overlook a single one of these policies which might conceivably improve our position of influence as arrayed against the Communists.

Rice is the major food crop for most of Asia. If we can assure the Asiatic people of a sufficient supply of this food, we have established a tremendous bargaining power. We will have a valuable weapon for economic rehabilitation in these areas where empty stomachs have become a persuasive weapon of communism.

The countries which in the recent past have been furnishing virtually all of the Asiatic rice imports are Thailand, Burma, and Indochina. Can we take the gamble that the present tide of totalitarianism will leave them undisturbed, continuing to contribute a normal supply of rice to the world market? It would be folly to entertain such complacency. I am informed that intelligence reports continue to point up the imminent possibility of advances by the Chinese Communists into the Malay Peninsula. Even if these countries are not openly attacked, we have no assurance that internal disturbances will not violently disrupt agricultural production. This has already been the case in Indochina.

What can we do to assure ourselves of a sufficient supply of rice to meet our needs at home, the demands of our occupation in Japan, the needs of a reserve supply for the peoples of India, Pakistan, Indonesia, and the other areas hungry for rice?

The one sure answer is sharply increased American production. This can be achieved only by completely removing acreage allotments and marketing quotas for the 1951 crop. Removal must be at an early date, before the end of this month, in order that potential producers can increase their planting program.

The Department of Agriculture has the important decision to make in regard to the continuation of planting restrictions. Prudence dictates that the choice be in favor of expanded production of this important food crop.

America needs a rice reserve primarily to use as a weapon for democracy in Asia, but there is no need for a scarcity of production at home during a time we are attempting to put a brake on all inflationary price trends. Continued restriction of rice production will result in a price mounting considerably higher than parity, more than the consumer should be asked to pay.

I have been informed that the Department of State and the Defense Department have had occasion to check into the status of our rice supply, and that both Departments are concerned over the possibility of shortages developing in the non-Communist world. This foresight is to be commended. I hope the concern will be felt by those who make the decision as to the future of rice production in this country. We must rid ourselves of the concept of normal supply during this period of dire abnormality.

Only four Asiatic countries exported rice to the other countries of Asia in 1949—Burma, Thailand, Indochina, and Formosa. Their total exports were 2,900,000 tons. This country cannot afford to take action the success of which is dependent on the possibility of this normal export continuing in the face of the threat to the peace of southeast Asia. If we fail to prepare ourselves against this eventuality, we will have fallen again into the error of lack of proper foresight which has permeated so much of our Asiatic policy.

I urge the Secretary of Agriculture to take advantage of the authority accorded him under the law and remove all restrictions from rice production.

THE LATE COLONEL HENRY W. STIMSON

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I believe there is not a Member of the House who is not familiar with the life and work of the late Colonel Henry W. Stimson.

It is my privilege to announce that memorial services in commemoration of the life, character, and public service of Colonel Stimson, who died on the 22d of October, 1950, at Huntington, Long Island, N. Y., which is in the district which I represent, will be held at the National Presbyterian Church, Connecticut Avenue at N and Eighteenth Streets NW., Washington, D. C., on Sunday afternoon, January 21, at 5 o'clock.

Tribute will be paid by the Honorable George C. Marshall and the Reverend Dr. Albert J. McCartney. A bronze tablet in honor of Colonel Stimson will be unveiled by Mr. Charles W. Albers, vice moderator of the general assembly of the Presbyterian Church. All Congressman are invited to these memorial services.

INCREASE RAILWAY RETIREMENT

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced, for the consideration of the Members of the House, H. R. 1313, the purpose of which is to increase the retirement benefits of all railway employees, carrying a relative increase for the widows of railway employees. Because of the high cost of living, present retirement benefits fall far short of what they should be at the present time.

The Railroad Retirement Fund for the payment of such benefits has continued to grow until it has reached almost the $3,000,000,000 mark. Railroad men and their dependents now facing the high cost of living are entitled to relief, and it is my hope that the Congress will give them such relief by passing my bill or similar legislation in this session of the Congress.

The trust fund now reaching nearly three billion dollars is sufficient to carry a very substantial increase to the employees without any additional cost on their part or any additional contributions from the railroad companies.

Mr. Speaker, because of the present high cost of living and the increase the Congress has made in social-security benefits for other workers, many railroad workers in my district have written to me asking that action be taken in Congress to increase their retirement benefits.

After considerable study and work with the best authority I could find here in Washington, I introduced in the last session H. R. 9161 in an effort to secure greater retirement benefits for railroad workers.

This new bill, H. R. 1313, carries the same provisions as the previous bill, H. R. 9161.

Mr. Speaker, we have kept in mind in drafting this legislation that the retirement benefits must not be raised to the point where it would bankrupt or endanger the retirement fund. I feel that the increases provided in this bill are as high as it is safe to go.

The consideration of this bill will bring this urgent problem before the Congress so that hearings may be held, allowing all parties interested to be heard in its consideration, and it may be necessary to modify the proposed legislation under the light of facts developed from the testimony.

Briefly this bill will give the retired workers an increase of from 30 to 33⅓ percent. It will affect the widows in about the same ratio. It does not increase the contributions made by the employees or by railway management. It would give the same increase to those who were retired prior to the passage of the bill.

I hope it may be considered and passed by the House and sent to the Senate early in this session.

Because of the urgent necessity of the benefits so needed by the hundreds of thousands of railway employees, I hope that the proper committee of the House will give serious consideration to such legislation and that it will be favorably reported by such committee at an early

date, so that it may be considered and passed by the House and sent to the Senate early in this session.

EIGHT-POINT PROGRAM FOR SURVIVAL

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the time has come to stop, look, and listen. America is heading for danger. Washington needs a shake-up the likes of which has never been experienced before. I propose the following eight-point program for survival:

First. Get the boys out of Korea. This Congress has not declared war. The United Nations is guilty of indecision, vacillation, and pro-Russian action. Other United Nations members have made no sizeable contribution to our fighting forces.

Second. Accept former President Hoover's proposals in reference to arming Western Europe—require European nations to first undertake to defend themselves. At the present time the administration is proposing to spend $8,000,000,000 in Europe and send thousands of our boys there when to date they only have a pledge for one European division from all of Western Europe.

Third. Replace not only Secretary of State Acheson but all top echelon policy-makers and near policy-makers who have supported the pro-Russian policies evidenced in the agreements made at Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam as well as other pro-Russian programs carried on by the State Department such as encouragement to the Chinese Communists on the grounds that they were merely agrarian reformers, supporting the Russian viewpoint in reference to Japan and the resistance to the discharge of such men as Alger Hiss.

Fourth. Replace our delegates in the United Nations.

Fifth. Take out the waste, extravagance, and unnecessary spending of the Truman budget. Much of this has no relation to our defense.

Sixth. Halt expansion of the Federal Government by refusing to enact the Fair Deal as urged by President Truman, including Federal aid to education, socialized medicine, the Brannan plan, and other pet Truman schemes.

Seventh. Evidence a spirit of sacrifice on the part of everyone connected with the Government before our citizens are called upon for extreme sacrifices. Increase the work output on the part of every Government employee. Unless we save this country from financial collapse our boys will be defending a hollow mockery.

Eighth. Speed up defense production—contract-letting is lagging. Bungling and inefficiency must end.

UNITED NATIONS, KOREA, AND WESTERN EUROPE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, the proposition for peace made to China by the United Nations in order to stop the war is the most abject surrender of anything known in history. To cease fire the Communist Government of China is to be admitted to the UN and Formosa is to be given over to them.

That is all the Communists of China asked in the first place and when we make such an offer, we admit an abject surrender. The Nationalists of China are to be sold out bag and baggage, and turned over for the Communists to execute. Japan is left helpless, the Philippines are without protection. In other words we get in our boats and pull out. If that is done, the United Nations might just as well pay their hotel bills and go home, for the first attempt of the debating society has ended in a surrender dictated by Communist China.

If this plan is followed we should immediately withdraw from the United Nations and we will endeavor to run our own affairs. Russia is now in the United Nations, and we can't come to an understanding with her—Communist China now comes in. Is there any reason to believe that the peace of the world can be established with two obstructionists when we had only one before?

If this is done, the United Nations will be a cringing creature, ready and willing to bargain away any other government at any time. The whole purpose of the UN will thus be destroyed and it will lose the confidence of all nations when a question of policy is applied to that nation. One by one, the UN will transfer all countries to the dictation of Russia.

While I will do everything I can to aid and assist the Government in its joint attempt with the United Nations to prevent aggression in Korea, I will do it because we are already in. The men on the battlefield are not to blame for being there. I am not going to tell the defense forces how to run the Army, Navy, and Air Force for two reasons:

First, I do not know what should be done; and secondly, I am willing to rely on the good sense and military capacity of our own generals and war administrators.

That does not mean, however, that I, as a Member of Congress, will not raise my voice against sending troops to other sections, where we are not engaged in war. I oppose sending troops to Europe because:

First. The western countries of Europe should first show a desire to have us assist them.

Second. They should be alert to their own danger if there is any.

Third. They must do what it is possible for them to do in the way of furnishing materials and men.

Reading in the press that General Eisenhower has found that western Europe has only six divisions ready for action, makes it quite evident that no country is threatening western Europe. Russia alone has 300 divisions and 100 more among her satellites. If there was such a danger, the whole of western Europe could have been overrun since the end of the fighting in World War II. Now if western Europe feels that without further armament, they can proceed without fear of invasion, why should we be so concerned in western Europe?

To stop further entrance of this country into the affairs of the world and embroil us in costly wars, is a right and duty I have to perform, but when our men are actually in a battle, no matter how they got there, I will support them, for in doing so I am supporting my country. My criticism of further embroilment does not constitute a sabotage of our present war effort.

OUR FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, every thoughtful American is alarmed by what has happened and by what is happening in the field of foreign affairs. He demands, and very properly so, nonpartisan and realistic action from those in authority, in order to insure the security of our country and to bring about peace with honor in the world.

As a Representative from the Second District of Connecticut, I have and shall continue to analyze and consider the problems presently facing all of us on a nonpartisan basis. With the survival of our country at stake, this is clearly the time for all of us to place country ahead of party.

I have come to the conclusion that neither the President of the United States, nor our great and respected former President, Mr. Hoover, is completely realistic in his respective summation of where we are going and what we must do.

There is one point, however, in which I thoroughly agree with both of them. We must take every possible step at once to insure that this Nation shall be as strong as possible, as quickly as possible. All of us must be in agreement and united in this respect.

I certainly concur with those who believe that we cannot expect to defend the entire free world, by ourselves, against Soviet imperialism. If the other free nations wish to survive, they must do their full share of arming and defending and fighting.

The failure to date of the United Nations to recognize and denounce Communist Chinese aggression in Korea; the bloody battles being fought nearly single-handed by our boys in Korea makes me question seriously the use of the term "United Nations Forces."

I certainly concur with those who say that the United States of America cannot wrap two oceans around it and stay secure, safe, and free. It is the inescapable truth that we are part of this world and must remain that. For us, this must mean that no longer can we say that our first line of defense is on the

Atlantic, or on the Rhine, or on any one base or boundary or bastion. My own service in the United States Navy during World War II convinces me that our own defense must comprehend the entire world.

I have some sense of reassurance in the recent comments made to the press by General Eisenhower before taking up his duties as Supreme Commander in Europe. He spoke concerning the prospects for obtaining more effective cooperation from our allies, and for providing through all the nations jointly a military machine strong enough to meet the requirements of the situation in that part of the world.

I regret that while all of the partners in the Atlantic Pact are supposedly preparing to build up a unified defense system against the many and varied threats of Russian aggression, some of the partners are still supplying Russia and Communist China with rubber, tin, wool, and various other materials listed as strategic and critical of our united defense effort.

This policy of business as usual handicaps the efforts of the free nations themselves to build up their own defenses while all the time increasing the military power of our potential enemies.

In my opinion the free nations of the world should unite in a complete embargo against the Communist world. Let us put a stop to doing this kind of business with our enemies.

The North Atlantic Council has created a Defense Production Board to supervise the buying and distribution of strategic materials. This Board should immediately start to direct and control the preclusive buying of strategic materials. It must prevent sales of war-making materials to Russia and her satellites. It must prevent the partners in the North Atlantic Pact from competing with each other for scarce materials. This competitive buying of scarce and critical materials has added billions of dollars to the cost of government.

I share with General Eisenhower in the conviction that unless every sacrifice made by America is matched by equal sacrifice and equal sincerity of purpose in the other nations, our efforts for peace with honor cannot succeeed.

As a Member of the House of Representatives, I will do everything that I can—

First. To strengthen the United States militarily, morally, and spiritually.

Second. To mobilize all of the resources of this Nation to meet fully and swiftly the requirements of the emergency and to see to it that the burden of such mobilization falls as equitably as can be upon all our people.

Third. To oppose any secret commitments to any other nation.

Our unfortunate policies of the past have brought us now to the brink of world-wide disaster. We are entering a long period in which we must subject ourselves to many restrictions which we as a people would not tolerate in more peaceful times.

All of us in every walk of life, in every profession or calling, must ask this question: "Am I going to lead in the scramble for the self-protection of my own special interest, or shall I stand up and dedicate my thinking, my action, and my prayers to the protection of my country?"

Stern policies lie ahead. As a legislator it is my responsibility to insist that these policies be considered carefully in committee and the issues debated freely, fully, and without partisanship on the floor of the House.

Stern policies can be effective only if the public understands fully the reasons why these policies are needed. The people of our Republic have never been afraid of the truth.

The time is now. Our very survival is at stake.

SIDNEY RECORD-ENTERPRISE FURNISHES NEWSPAPER BY AIR MAIL TO GI'S

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

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand an air-mail edition of the Sidney Record-Enterprise. This newspaper, I believe, is the only weekly newspaper in the country which is now being printed and sent out by air mail to the boys at the front. I think this is a very fine patriotic undertaking. I also received a letter from Mr. McLaughlin, the editor, in which he said:

> I am enclosing the second issue of the regular weekly air-mail edition of the Record-Enterprise. So far as I know, this is the only weekly newspaper anywhere publishing an air-mail edition. This edition is limited to those in the service. It is published by this newspaper free and postage is paid from a fund supported by community organizations.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this enterprise and I feel it would be well if other small-town local newspapers would follow this patriotic example.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentlewoman from New York has expired.

TAX EXEMPTION FOR MEMBERS OF ARMED SERVICES

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, this morning I introduced a bill to provide income-tax exemptions for members of the Armed Forces serving outside the United States. The bill provides for total exemption for all enlisted personnel and $200 per month for commissioned officers.

There is no reason why the men who are now serving our country overseas should not be given certain tax exemptions somewhat similar to those of the last war. Basically, the same reasons which prompted such legislation then, demand it now.

Members of the House will agree that legislation of this type is the least that a grateful nation can do for those gallant and courageous men who are defending our country in places far removed from their homes and those they love dearly.

I strongly urge the House to take quick action on this measure. It will boost the morale of those who are battling the godless forces of communism for the preservation of our freedom of religion, freedom of speech, and our basic American way of life.

THE SINGLE ITEM VETO OF APPROPRIATION BILLS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, the President has presented us this week with a budget of staggering proportions for the next fiscal year. A tremendous deficit will result, unless drastic steps are taken.

It is imperative that we close the dollar gap between our Federal income and our current expenditures or we shall have an inflation of such magnitude that no amount of Federal regulation will be able to control it.

The dollar is our first line of defense. Unless we have the courage and the self-control to protect its value and its buying power, we shall have lost the very economic system which we are fighting to save. Our power to resist the Communist forces abroad will be fatally undermined, if we fail to preserve a basically sound economy here at home.

To do this will require great sacrifices on the part of each one of us. Unwelcome as new and heavier taxes are, inflation is the worst and most unfair tax of all, since it eats into the spending power of widows and pensioners trying to live on modest, fixed incomes and hits most severely the very people who are least able to afford it.

To give the President another weapon with which to fight inflation by effecting economy in our nondefense spending, I have introduced two bills, H. R. 492 and House Joint Resolution No. 24, which would permit a separate veto of specific items included in an omnibus appropriation bill. H. R. 492 would permit each item in an omnibus funds bill to be treated as a separate measure for the purpose of Presidential consideration. House Joint Resolution No. 24 proposes an amendment to the Constitution to grant specific power to the President to veto a separate item in an omnibus appropriation bill. Whether the necessary approach to this problem is by the constitutional amendment route is a debatable point. There can be little dispute, however, it seems to me, over the proposition that we should set out at once down one or the other of these alternative roads toward fiscal reform.

Although as a general principle, I am opposed to the grant of more power to the executive branch of our Government, I think that a realistic solution, such as an item veto, is perhaps the only practical way of preventing or minimizing logrolling for pet projects.

The amount of stern self-control which the Congress should use this year with respect to such traditionally larded portions of our appropriation bills as the rivers and harbors and flood-control sections may be comprehended if the figures for the lean years of World War II are used as a comparison. In 1944, only $36,800,000 was granted for flood control, and in 1945, only $50,500,000. In the same years $48,000,000 and $54,600,000, respectively, were allowed for rivers and harbors construction and improvement. Compare this with the total of $582,200,000 for these two items in last year's omnibus bill.

To accomplish real economy in Government operation requires the full cooperation of both the executive and the legislative branches of our Government. If the President is sincere in the plea he has voiced for strict economy, certainly Congress should not deny him any weapon he can employ to bring about drastic reductions in nondefense, nonessential spending. Let us open up our anti-inflation arsenal by prompt enactment of legislation to enable the President to disapprove individual expenditures in appropriation bills.

STOP SALE OF INFLUENCE ON GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, during World War II, the 5-percenters made untold thousands of dollars of the people's money in charging illegal fees.

These fees were mythical considerations and the purchase of influence by naive businessmen who came to Washington cold turkey and had trouble finding their way around.

The 5-percenters were a disgrace to the country and a menace to legitimate business. Yet, it is my understanding that they are returning to the Washington scene even more venomously for they have raised their ante. They are now demanding tribute of 10 percent and higher.

The time has come to stop these highwaymen before they do the damage which they did during the last war. Too much of the taxpayers' money went into their cavernous pockets for imaginary services. The commodity they pretend to sell is influence but only the sucker will fall for them. Nevertheless, they are making hay.

The bill which I am introducing today, if passed by Congress, will take care of these crooks. It is my hope that the House will act soon on this measure for the welfare of the entire country and for the benefit of our home defense program. The bill reads as follows:

A bill to outlaw the sale of influence by false representatives in the matter of defense orders to private business

PREAMBLE

During World War II unscrupulous men accepted 5 percent, 10 percent, and other substantial rewards from business concerns out of total amounts of contracts they were successful in negotiating with certain defense agencies within the Government.

The unscrupulous men accepting percentages of total contract sums are being replaced by even more unscrupulous men who have succeeded in some instances in inducing private business concerns to retain them as their representatives in Washington.

These unscrupulous men claim to have considerable prestige and influence with various Government officials and agree to obtain defense orders for private business concerns in return for generous drawing accounts, sumptuous lodgings and office space in Washington, and countless other endearments. They are often engaged by more than one business firm, whose officers through gullibility are victims of such false representation.

Be it enacted, etc., That—

1. Contracts with the Government for all defense orders shall be negotiated directly between a responsible officer or officers of a corporation on the one hand and a bona fide employee or executive of the United States on the other.

2. It shall be unlawful to retain, hire, or engage the services, either on a percentage basis or drawing account arrangement, of any middleman whose sole function seems to be the employing of special influence which he may profess to have with various governmental agencies or departments or individuals therein.

3. Wherever it can be proved that a middleman received pay or compensation in return for obtaining a defense contract from any agency of the Government through the use of pressure or influence, such contract shall be declared null and void.

4. It shall be unlawful to accept any sum of money as reward for influence rendered in the consummation of a Government contract or defense order.

HAZARD PAY BILL FOR COMBAT GROUND TROOPS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Speaker, in the press of yesterday Mrs. Anna Rosenberg, the Assistant Secretary of Defense, was quoted as saying that the Department of Defense will soon be requesting Congress to act on a hazardous pay bill for combat ground troops. July 19 of last year I introduced a bill for hazard pay for ground troops and reintroduced it again January 3 in the Eighty-second Congress. The bill provides $5 a day for each day a man is in a combat area. This is a bill for which a precedent has already been established. We give hazard pay in the Air Corps and in the Submarine Service.

I understand the plan of the Department of Defense is to give $50 hazard pay to enlisted men and $100 to officers. Let me say that I will oppose any effort to distinguish between officers and enlisted men when it comes to a hazard pay bonus.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. McVEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes on Friday, January 19, following the legislative business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. SADLAK asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes on Tuesday next, following the legislative business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

HEROIC TENNESSEE STEWARDESS DIES SAVING LIVES IN BURNING PLANE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a short article from the Commercial Appeal of Memphis, Tenn.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr Speaker, it is not unusual for men to rise on this floor and pay deserving tributes to our brave heroes who are now dying on foreign soil; but it is not often that a Member has the opportunity of paying deserving tribute to such an immortal heroine as Miss Mary Frances Housley, of Fountain City, Tenn., who gave her life in the flaming wreck of an airplane at the International Airport, Philadelphia, Pa., on last Sunday in attempting to save the life of a child whose charred remains were found in the arms of her dead body when the flames were finally subdued.

Someone has said that when it comes to the field of battle—

There is something of pride in the perilous hour,
Whatever be the form which death may lower,
For fame is there to tell who bleeds,
And honor's eye on daring deeds.

The soldier goes to his death trained for the conflict and steeled for the emergency by the presence and bravery of his heroic comrades.

But in this instance, a young girl, only 24 years of age, found herself involved in a horrible disaster, in which a crashed airplane burst into flames, killing 6 of the 25 passengers, and went to her death trying to save them from a horrible death.

She succeeded in leading 10 persons to safety, and then rushed back into the burning plane to try to recover two small children, when she was overcome and perished with one of the little fellows in her arms.

I am sure that every Member of this House, as well as the people of the entire country, will agree with me that a greater act of heroism was never recorded in all the annals of our country.

She deserves the highest praise and the greatest honor our Christian civilization can bestow.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. DEMPSEY] is recognized for 10 minutes.

BUDGET MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States has sent to the Congress his budget message calling for a staggering $71,600,000,000 to be spent in the fiscal year 1952. That, according to the President's message, is an increase of 78 percent over expenditures for the year ended June 30.

The President expects the new defense costs to cause a deficit of 16.5 billion dollars in 1952, if no further taxes are added. He proposes to ask new tax legislation to balance this deficit.

We have already been put on notice that this latest extraction of funds from the taxpayer's wallet is going to be a painful one. There is going to be a general "belt-tightening," and we are all going to be "taxed until it hurts."

We expected the financial burden of this defense effort to be terriffic. But there will be little or no controversy over any spending that is necessary to safeguard our freedom, or the freedom of peoples, eager like ourselves, to remain free. There can be no quibbling over dollars and cents, if the cost is essential to saving this country from communism.

In view of all this, it seems that the course of wisdom demands that we consider these matters carefully and thoughtfully. The easy way would be for us to approve any appropriations which the administration seeks, and then forget about the whole matter. That would be the easy way, but history might also show it to be the disastrous way.

We have been told, for example, that certain backward areas in the world need help in raising their standards of living in order to save them from communism. To the extent that this is desirable and can be done without lowering the standard of living here, I have very little objection.

But the proposal brings up a question. If raising the standard of living is necessary in these areas to save them from communism, how will lowering the standard of living here affect the United States?

And we certainly do face a lowering of the living standard here. New and painful taxes, coupled with our present inflationary trend, are hitting the American family in the pocketbook. The President says the taxes are necessary, but no one has said or even implied that the inflation is necessary. But it is here, and how great it becomes will depend upon our management of our Government.

Some of the Government's economic master minds have an answer for this inflationary problem.

These people believe the cure-all for inflation is to tax away the money of the men and women who have the ability to earn it. After all, they cannot be trusted with it. So these Government officials would take this money and then give it away. Now is not that simple? And it is just as stupid as it is simple. I, for one, do not subscribe to any such program.

The spot for some real spadework in inflation control is in cutting down on unnecessary Government expenditures. The time has come when the taxpayers' dollar, expended by the Government, must get its full value in purchases.

It is not my desire to cry about water that has already passed over the dam. What is past is past, and there is not anything we can do about it. But we can do better in the future. And I do believe that our responsibility as Members of Congress and as Representatives of the people of the United States should not end merely with the voting of moneys.

I believe that this responsibility extends to a watchdog role on where these funds go and whether or not they are wisely spent. In this connection, it should not be too difficult for the various committees to keep track of these matters.

Here daily we see examples of the biggest business in the world today—the United States Government—engaging in practices that would ruin any private corporation. If a purchasing agent in a private corporation made an error that cost his company several million dollars, he would be fired before the sun went down. But when it happens in Government, the administration simply asks Congress for more taxes.

It is my personal experience and observation that there is too great a gap between the procurement officers of the various agencies and those disposing of so-called surplus property. If a procurement agent is in the market for a certain item, it seems ridiculous that the General Services Administration should be disposing of the same type item at the same time.

I certainly urge that this thing be approached with a sensible and restrained attitude. This is no time for irresponsible shouting and sensationalism. One of the greatest needs is for checking into suspected waste and getting factual information, then using this information constructively.

We should strenuously avoid partisan statements, without foundation, which may cause more disunity within the country, because there is certainly too much disunity existing now. Never in my memory have people been so confused or been so eager for information and facts as they are today.

These are all matters which I believe the Congress should carefully consider, as they may seriously affect the economy of this Nation for years to come. There are so many aspects to be considered that any hasty, ill-advised action might well prove disastrous.

In working out the new tax measures it would be well for the Ways and Means Committee to remember that practically all the States depend upon certain sales taxes to support their schools, their aged, their dependent children, and other such vital services. Any crushing tax program that would seriously cut purchasing power will either curtail these vital agencies or force State legislatures to seek new sources of revenue, thereby increasing the already heavy tax burden.

In this same connection, I might call attention to the civil-defense program. We are appropriating a billion dollars a year for this purpose and we are asking the States to match the Federal help, dollar for dollar. With the people already drained until it hurts, where are the States going to raise this extra revenue?

I hope my remarks in these matters will not be construed as an effort to hamper vital defense spending. I want to put myself on record here and now that I have the utmost faith in the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, Mr. VINSON. I will vote for every dollar that Chairman VINSON and his committee believe is necessary for the defense of this Nation.

But I do not believe our obligation as Members of Congress ends when this money is appropriated. I believe it should go further, and we should know what happens to it after these departments get hold of it.

I believe the committee chairmen should keep us informed of any wastefulness or irregularities of monies appropriated. It behooves us to learn how this money is being spent, and how these supplies are being used. It doesn't seem sensible for Congress to sign a blank check for waste and stupidity.

Nor does it seem sensible that one Government agency should be giving away surplus commodities while another agency is buying those self-same items on the open market at inflated prices. Some of these people should wake up and look around outside of their own little agency's world; they might find a lot of interesting things.

There should be a closer integration between agencies. They should begin to realize that they are not separate entities. They are all a part of the Government of the United States. And if they don't realize this and start pulling together, there may be no jobs, no Government, and no United States.

This country can be ruined more surely by waste, extravagance, resultant inflation, and financial bankruptcy than by any armed assault of Soviet Russia. It is our obligation, as Representatives of the people of these United States, to see that this does not occur.

The American people realize the danger to this country. They realize that defense will cost money and blood, and they are ready to pay that price. But, if my mail is an indication, they are getting sick and tired of seeing millions and billions tossed around by irresponsible people here in Washington as though it is small change.

Our President has told us that the cost of rearmament will be high, and that the people must be "taxed until it hurts." If the people know that this money, due to be so painfully extracted, is being well and wisely spent, it might serve to alleviate some of the pain.

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

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. My distinguished colleague has made a very forceful statement motivated by a genuine concern on his part, a concern which I am sure stems from his long experience as wartime Governor of our fair State during the last war. May I say to the gentleman that I think his statement is very appropriate at this time and it is worthy of our most careful consideration. It reflects quite accurately what the people are thinking about and what they are talking about.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I thank the gentleman.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, during roll call No. 5 I was unavoidably detained.

Had I been present I would have voted "aye."

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] is recognized for 1 hour.

THE INTERNATIONAL SITUATION

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, at this hour when fate interposes a serious challenge to America's destiny we have the obligation, each in his own way, of proving up the democratic processes and validating our democratic values.

For upon what we do and say here, upon how America acts in this era of crisis, largely depends the survival of that which history records as Western Civilization, a span of centuries in the annals of humankind that has brought the world its greatest progress, enlightenment and spiritual enrichment.

In our approach to a discussion of the international situation, which has brought America and the Free World sharply up with the realization that its very existence as such is jeopardized, we would do well not to lose sight of several vital and simple fundamentals, and to dwell upon them despite all the complexities which surround them. We must not be lured by the temptations of obstructionism, no matter how beguiling, away from the central issues at stake.

Perhaps it will assist us in our discussion if we attempt to set forth, at the beginning, the more imperative of the questions requiring debate and solution. And quickly before I undertake this task of orientation, I wish to avail myself of the privilege of paying tribute to the members of this House and the other body for the profound and serious and sincere way in which they have embraced the subject of debate on our foreign policy. All of us as servants and as citizens can well be proud, I feel, of the honesty of purpose, the patriotic motivation and intellectual honesty which have characterized the continuing discussion of the great issues which demand our attention, and are equally insistent of constructive solution.

Those who do not understand America—and what dictator ever did?—will be quick to sense in these discussions an imagined gain through what they erroneously believe to be a tragic disunity in the American front, all the time never realizing that what really is at work is the alchemy of democratic action: clarifying, solidifying, catelyzing until the articulated American conscience makes itself felt in action—devastating to tyrants.

The whole tone and temper of this debate has been admirably established on a high plane by the President, who in his state of the Union message eloquently reaffirmed for all the world to read—even those who run on the road that leads to disaster—America's total dedication to freedom and to peace—and of this Nation's firm intent never to abandon those goals even should their pursuit carry us through the carnage and ruin and agonies of war. Similarly, as I have said before, all the discussants have spoken in the same vein and by their conduct and contributions have strengthened the resolve of America to fulfill the role which destiny has alloted to her.

There is no disagreement as to purpose—the pursuit of peace in a free world—there is no disunity on the need of stern and decisive action to achieve our ends. There exists only differences on the methods to be adopted and steps to be taken best calculated to meet the situation. And therein, I submit, is a considerable area for wide and honest differences of opinion. It remains our task to resolve the differences in ways that will not vitiate our purpose, weaken our resolve, dissipate our strength, or invite failure.

Accordingly, I proceed to the heart of the matter.

This is not the first time in history that a nation, an alliance, a civilization, has been challenged by threatening forces.

Of those challenged, some nations and civilizations survived, others fell as wheat before the sickle.

The test stone in all cases was the response the nation or civilization made to the challenge.

In all too many instances decay had set in and ruin was a guest in the house long before the threat knocked at the door.

I know it is not necessary to illustrate this with a long list of examples. Grade-school histories are replete with one example after another.

So we would do well, in the present situation, to consult the historic parallels. I will return to this later on, but now I would like to press on to the immediate problem at hand.

Much of our difficulty and that of the democratic world derives from the fact that we have not truly understood the nature of the enemy. We have not comprehended that Soviet Russia is not just another state, a foreign power, rather it is the seat of a revolution of nihilism, a godless state, conceived in atheistic revolt against the democratic world, and dedicated to the enslavement of the peoples of the world on the one hand and the utter destruction of everything of Judeo-Christian civilization extant.

Now these are not idle phrases spoken for rhetorical effect. These are not something conjured up to make an impressive looking indictment. These are not words to be utilized upon a privileged forum. No, they are a factual representation of the spirit, arms, and avowed objectives of Soviet imperialism, and in a hundred different ways and words—the Soviets' own words—we have proof. We will never be wholly prepared to deal with the threat posed to our survival as a free and independent people until we truly understand the menace of the communistic revolution in all its diabolical assault on western civilization. When we know it for what it is we can meet it and counter it in its every phase, in its manifold and insidious war against the democratic world.

One of our first and most costly mistakes was the belief that in the war against Hitler the Soviets were our allies. That brief partnership in arms, a partnership, incidentally, in which American aid accounted for approximately 70 percent of Russian war matériel, was instead only an arrangement in which America and her allies and Russia had a common enemy. We thought we had an ally in Russia, but she never validated that contract because all the time she had a mental reservation and there was no marriage. This became all too apparent even before the fighting was over. Stalin went into one of his famous about-faces when it became apparent the fury of the Nazi war machine was broken and spent. Do not take my estimate of this. Instead I give you the official Soviet documentation on this development in the Soviet revolution against western civilization:

> The fact that the Soviet Union and the greatly shaken capitalist countries showed themselves to be in one powerful camp, ranged against the Fascist aggressors, showed that the struggle of two systems within democratic camp was temporarily alleviated, suspended, but this of course does not mean the end of this struggle.

These are Varga's words found in Features of Internal and Foreign Policies of Capitalists Countries in Epoch of General Crisis of Capitalism, World Economy and Politics, No. 6, June 1946, page 11. I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, it is one of the early postwar manifestations of a revival of the doctrine of impossibility of peaceful coexistence of the USSR with capitalism.

The writings and official documents of communism are replete with declarations of war against the capitalist world. Take the words of Lenin in his paper entitled "Tactics of the Russian Communist Party," report to the Third Congress of Communist International, July 5, 1921. Lenin at that time said:

> Dictatorship is a state of war. We are precisely in such a state. There is no military invasion at present; but we are isolated. * * * Until the final issue is decided, the state of awful war will continue.

Now to those who may say that all of this was uttered some 30 years ago, I hasten to reply that such source material is constantly being issued and reissued down to the present day as advice and guidance for Communists everywhere. This particular gem was published in Selected Works, International Publishers, New York, 1943, volume IX, page 242. As you can readily see it advises party workers that the struggle against the opposition would continue with violence until the latter was destroyed. No relaxation of the dictatorship could be expected until security was attained.

So that we may be on guard and alert in any dealings with the Soviets it is well to have this slant, which again, is from their own official writings: "The time has fully matured when it is absolutely necessary for every Communist Party systematically to combine legal with illegal work." Here is the policy of planned deceit, the official sanctioning of illegality as an instrument of Soviet aggrandizement. Again, let us take the subject of truth. Here I quote:

> The idea that the truth remains the truth is admissible in a philosophical club, but in the party, the decisions of the Congress are obligatory also upon those who doubt the correctness of a decision. Our party is strong through the fact that the decisions of the majority are obligatory upon all not only in form, but in substance.

Here we have the key of the performances of Communist spokesmen throughout the world who speak the pieces dictated by Moscow no matter what the object situation. It is the source and origin of the big lie technique. Through its adoption, the Soviets have been able to bring about, for many practical purposes, a debasement of language, a convenient dodge which enables them to create and spread confusion, arm their propaganda guns to the full and carry on the great sham at the United Nations.

All of this is very important, for Red propagandists understand that once an impression is established it remains in the mind long after the reason for its formation has been forgotten. The Soviet propagandists know that most people seldom revise attitudes once accepted on the basis of apparent evidence even when they later learn that the evidence was false. The victim has been attitudinalized.

In this respect much harm has been done in America by Communist sympathizers who used places of influence and strategic placement to poison the fountain-springs of our intellectual and cultural life, to shape and mould public opinion in ways that have proved detrimental to our own best interests.

It is worthy of note in this connection that although a considerable section of American public opinion was encouraged to the belief that the Communist movement in China was purely of national origin and represented not a Moscow-inspired revolt, but rather the instinctive groupings of Chinese "agrarians," the Soviets as far back as 1928 had outlined a nine-point program to win over the Chinese. The nine points, as published in Theses on the Revolutionary Movement in the Colonies in 1928 and representing the Theses and Resolutions of VI Congress of Communist International, 1928, were as follows:

First. Overthrow of imperialist domination.

Second. Confiscation of foreign enterprises and banks.

Third. Unity of the country, with recognition of the right of each nationality to self-determination.

Fourth. Overthrow of the power of the militarists and the Kuomintang.

Fifth. Establishment of the power of Soviets', of workers', peasants', and soldiers' representatives.

Sixth. The 8-hour working day, increase of wages, assistance to the unemployed, and social insurance.

Seventh. Confiscation of all lands of big landlords, land for peasants and soldiers.

Eighth. The abolition of all governmental, militarist, and local taxes; a single progressively graduated income tax.

Ninth. Alliance with the USSR and the world proletarian movement.

Yes, these are the means through which Moscow sought for years to gain control of China. It is not too far a step from that crafty beginning to the shooting in Korea where American boys are dying from Chinese Communist arms, while Chiang remains a virtual prisoner in Formosa.

I would ask that you consider carefully for a moment that nine-point program which Moscow used as the catch-all for suckers in the Soviet's planned program to gain control of China. Sprinkled in with the outright Soviet pitches are some attractive social-economic devices which were calculated to attract the confused and frustrated youth of China. In the manipulation of such a situation, the Soviets have shown themselves able practitioners. The sad and sorry part of the whole business, however, is that such promises are only a snare and delusion, for once the tenacles of Soviet imperialism get into a nation's economy and the agents of Moscow come into political control of a state, the pledges for peace, democracy, and equity become a cruel hoax and all the horror apparatus of the police state goes into operation.

As a matter of fact, one of the most grievous crimes of Soviet imperialism is what the Soviet aristocracy has done and is doing to the Russian people and the various nationals of the captive states. The record of inhumanities, deprivations, torture, mental cruelties, and vicious exploitation of the little people of Russia and the satellites under Stalin's regime is something which virtually defies comprehension. Think for a moment of the famines in the liquidation of the Kulaks, the ever-recurring purges which wipe out whole rows in the Soviet hierarchy, the pilloring and persecution of intellectuals and scientists, the lamentable fate of deviationists. In all the history of mankind, there is nothing to equal this record of brutality and mass murder. I would urge each and everyone of you to read Suzanne Labin's Stalin's Russia, wherein this gifted French writer gives you an appraisal of Russia by taking the Soviets at their own words, using official documents, publications, and utterances to put together the dark picture.

Never let us be deceived by the false-faces and the fronts the Soviets may put on. We would do well to hearken well to the words of Benjamin Gitlow, one time highly placed American Communist, who later "did time," when he warns in his book, The Whole of Their Lives:

> The Communists took Marxism out of the realm of utopian idealism and political abstraction to build a powerful world revolution movement so fluid and flexible, so devoid of illusions, moral scruples and ideals, that often the erroneous conclusion was reached that the Communist movement had departed from its basic principles and abandoned communism altogether.

No, we must never forget that the men in charge of Soviet imperialism, the masters of the Kremlin are true sons of revolution who arrived at their present position of Soviet eminence through intrigue, treachery, and violence.

Bear in mind constantly that the members of the Politburo obviously possess in high degree four fateful traits of character:

In the first place they are able and vigorous.

In the second place they are devoted singlemindedly to the cause of communism. They are fanatics.

In the third place, they are ruthless. Their fanaticism is matched only by their ruthlessness.

In the fourth place, they are realistic. Being what they are explains what they have done.

They have tightened their control on the so-called heartland of Eurasia. They have stimulated and encouraged and directed their counterparts in Korea and China. They have carefully timed an offensive against Indochina and all of this fits into a pattern just as does their move against Tibet. On the one hand, America is committed heavily of her total military strength in Korea, leaving Japan for the moment without any substantial strength military-wise. In such vacuums, Communist propagandists have an ideal field for operations. The aggressions in Korea and against Tibet have not been lost upon India, while the action in Indochina has kept the French well occupied, placing a strain upon France's military manpower and treasury. England of course has been kept apprehensive by the exposed condition of Hong Kong, and the peoples of the Philippines and the nations of southeast Asia, in the throes of movements sparked by nationalistic stirrings, are being subjected to the raw fundamentals of grim power politics.

Before getting down to a consideration of specifics to meet this growing threat and expanding menace, I would like to stress that it is the worst kind of superficial thinking for any of us or any nation to proceed on the assumption and base policy on the belief that Asia is divisible from Europe or that the enveloping global struggle can be segmented, cut in parts and pieces, and one continent closed off in our thinking or in the life processes while we devote ourselves to what we may consider a more urgent section of the globe. No it is all one big struggle, there are many theaters but they are all part of the one contest. What happens here in Washington today has its effect in Formosa as it does in London. Science has made a neighborhood of the world. Time and space are being destroyed in many aspects by the onward rush of scientific achievement. The sensitive fabric of the modern world is such that a development in one place may have profound reaction somewhere thousands of miles away. Just remember the slogan of the aviation industry: "No spot on earth is more han 48 hours away from your local airport." Radio, television, wireless, all the marvels of modern communication, have helped knit up the world into a community of interest.

So in the development of a foreign policy and in shaping up of military forces for its implementaion we must not make the serious mistake of separationist thinking. When we have thought this out thoroughly and completely and traced out all its ramifications then we will be self-convinced of the utter futility and mistakenness of anything that savors of isolationism.

It would help us in this debate if we forthrightly admit that ours is to be a policy of enlightened self interest. Certainly it is to our self interest to fight to defend Europe just as it is to our

interest to attempt to stem the tide of Red aggression in Asia, or wherever it breaks out violently.

Now the cry will come back that we cannot be everywhere at all times in strength and rather than dissipate our substance in ill-considered military actions we should husband our resources and wait until the day when we are better fortified. We or our allies are not ready, we are told, and therefore we should do nothing whatsoever that might get the Kremlin mad at us.

This is merely a modified form of appeasement. What are we and the free world to do—crawl on our bellies like reptiles because the Kremlin commands more divisions and has more tanks ready to commit to action? The one thing that Soviet imperialism despises above everything else is weakness and a cringing spirit. Man has come to a sad estate, indeed, if at the price of saving his carcass he is ready to sacrifice his honor, his dignity and his freedom. Now the fact of the matter is that his love of liberty and devotion to freedom are truly his greatest weapons and in the long run, no matter what the odds, the human spirit will win out over tyranny.

We have had and are having our reverses in Korea and we daily hear the question asked: Why are we fighting there? We had no business there. Well I for one, and in saying this I am mindful of the great sacrifices that America has put into that military campaign, I for one say, though the way may be bloody and heartbreaking, time will bear out the wisdom and efficacy of the decision to have endeavored to call a halt to communism expansion then and there. The free world must have the will to survive or it will perish.

Before we become overwhelmed with contemplations of reverses, we would do well to go back a few pages in history and remember the days when Hitler was taking countries without firing a shot, and later how his mechanized hordes swept to the channel and the odds on him were long, indeed—but there he met an opponent who never entertained even a notion of defeat, who forged armament from his very spirit, who was prepared to fight to the death but never surrender—and then you know how the fight to hold on developed until the democratic world rose in its might as the moral opinion of liberty-loving people everywhere swelled the forces of righteousness and Hitler's chance had passed.

How well I recall the dismal prophets of the pre-Munich days who warned against taking on the arms of the Reich, for the Luftwaffe, we were told, constituted an armada that would wipe its opponents off the face of the earth. These are things to remember at this hour whenever so many are prone to summon the counsels of despair.

There is a tendency, and it is a serious error, I feel, in casting up an appraisal of the global situation, to place too much stress upon the strength and resources of the enemy while at the same time marking down our own assets and those of our allies. I say this in face of the evidence that I have recounted at length as to the nature of the enemy, but I am convinced that we are doing our cause a gross disservice when we develop and foster the myth of invincibility of the enemy, when we fail to point up positively our own strengths.

In the first place we and our allies have great superiority in those technological facilities and skills which go into the massing of economic power for armament to conduct a war successfully. We are better fortified in materials and resources. We have greater productivity per capita, considerably higher standards of living, stronger incentives, and a long, magnificent tradition of freedom.

Of course, I am well aware that this kind of emphasis without critical study of the situation can easily lead us into error, for while we and our allies greatly outstrip the Soviets in the matter, say, of steel production, the fact remains that Russia is putting much more of its lesser steel output into armament than are we. So we have the task of quickly and efficiently making the most of what we have both as to manpower and material goods so that the potentials of the free world will be realized speedily and the threat confronting it diminished.

There is another consideration, however, that is the nub of the matter: If the Soviets move against Western Europe and overpower it, then the factors which made for the advantages of the Atlantic Pact nations will be decisively and dangerously reversed, and the edge will be Russia's by an impressive margin. This is what we must not lose sight of for an instant as we proceed through the days in a discussion of the situation.

The prize in Western Europe:

Population:	
Atlantic Pact nations plus West Germany	216,000,000
Soviet Union and European satellites	285,000,000
United States and Canada	164,000,000
Armies (manpower):	
Atlantic Pact nations plus West Germany	900,000
Soviet Union and European satellites	3,700,000
United States and Canada	1,132,000
Navies (tonnage):	
Atlantic Pact nations plus West Germany	1,500,000
Soviet Union and European satellites	450,000
United States and Canada	1,800,000
Air Forces (aircraft):	
Atlantic Pact nations plus West Germany	8,000
Soviet Union and European satellites	28,000
United States and Canada	28,500
Steel (tons per year):	
Atlantic Pact nations plus West Germany	46,000,000
Soviet Union and European satellites	28,000,000
United States and Canada	93,000,000
Coal (tons per year):	
Atlantic Pact nations plus West Germany	420,000,000
Soviet Union and European satellites	400,000,000
United States and Canada	500,000,000
Crude oil (barrels per year):	
Atlantic Pact nations plus West Germany	7,400,000
Soviet Union and European satellites	316,000,000
United States and Canada	2,525,000,000
Electricity (kilowatt-hours):	
Atlantic Pact nations plus West Germany	178,000,000,000
Soviet Union and European satellites	100,000,000,000
United States and Canada	352,000,000,000
Motor vehicles (annual output):	
Atlantic Pact nations plus West Germany	1,500,000
Soviet Union and European satellites	465,000
United States and Canada	8,000,000

—From Pathfinder, January 10, 1950.

Properly considered the debate on foreign policy should not be primarily concerned with military strategy or tactics but others have seen fit to introduce this aspect as a prime subject so we must of necessity meet their arguments head-on.

Considering the military policy suggestions of the retreatists, we might well invoke Pareto's dictum:

> Let us have theoretical theories and practical practices for practical theories and theoretical practices are an abomination.

It is generally taken for granted by the people of the United States and the world that America's superiority in A-bombs is the element in the international situation which may be best calculated to serve as a deterrent to Russia launching an all-out war. Winston Churchill has given this as his strong belief. It is a logical assumption. There are other handles to the question, however: One is that the Russians are generally supposed to be making rapid strides in the manufacture of A-bombs. Another is that whereas the United States would never use the bomb first, there is no such moral deterrent in the Soviet ethic, so that brings us to the point that with a disproportionately smaller number of A-bombs, Russia, striking first, could do much to nullify our advantage of a larger A-bomb stock. Our military people generally impute to the Russians the military capability of delivering the bomb against prime targets in the United States.

Our answer to this threat is the Strategic Air Command. We have built this service well. We will build it bigger and better. We have the means and the capacity to strike devastating blows against an enemy that hits America's homeland.

Students of military science should ponder well before taking any action which will compel the United States to use this retaliatory force. Fortunately we have the strongest Navy afloat. And we do not propose to leave it in a static state; it is being added to; there is room for improvement in the submarine field, and this matter is not being neglected. Together with our allies, and even allowing for the supposedly vast extension of Russia's undersea components, we have and should be able to maintain control of the seas. In a war of continents this would be a marked advantage, although

we are not going to forget that the enemy would be working along interior lines.

In our projections, giving ourselves the best of it in the air and on the seas, I do not for the life of me understand how men versed in statecraft, history, and even possessing a smattering of military knowledge would propound the proposition that we can seek refuge in those elements and practically dissolve ground forces. As a matter of fact, military history points up one moral, and that is that all arms are essentially accessories to the main element of decisiveness: the battlefield. Wars only progress and are won as men on the battlefield move forward, take enemy territory, destroy enemy forces, ultimately break the will of civil populations to persist in fruitless conflict, until eventually the victor's ground forces occupy and control the enemy's homeland. This is a classic and fundamental military concept.

Because I regard this aspect of the debate of such over-riding importance, I am going to impose upon your indulgence and quote at some length on this point in the hope that there may be punctured finally and completely the fallacious notion that because a power is strong in the air and the seas ground forces are dispensable.

A recognized military historian, Col. S. L. A. Marshall, now editor of the Detroit News, writing on the subject, Battle Command in Future War, had this to say:

> The battlefield is the epitome of war. All else in war, when war is perfectly conducted, exists but to serve the forces of the battlefield and to assure final success on the field.
>
> It is on the battlefield that the issues of war are decided. Yet it may well occur in the struggle between nations that such a preponderance of power will be achieved by one side or the other, or such destruction will be worked on one body or the other either by weapons of the air or by a naval blockade, as to virtually predetermine the results of the battlefield.
>
> Even so, the contests between land armies will continue to be the concluding act in war. Without this conclusion military victory will not be achieved.
>
> The greater becomes the emphasis on weapons whose destructive power is aimed at the civil society, the more certain it is that the battlefield will continue as the area of final decision in war. This trend cannot be reversed. It can be ended only when the mortal dangers to all civil populations are so universally recognized, and that recognition is so directly reflected in the policies of the various states and the attitudes of their peoples, as to end war itself.
>
> The mobilizing of all national forces and resources in war does not lessen the decisive importance of all that occurs on the battlefield. Nor can the evolution of new weapons establish a form of war in which military decision is foreseeable and the danger of stalemate can be reckoned avertable, without full preparation to engage the land forces of the enemy with forces of the same sort.
>
> The over-all effect of the changing pattern of war, as it is superinduced by the character of the new weapons, is to promote an ever increasing involvement of national forces and national prestige. This in turn makes more critical the events of the battlefield. For it should be noted that all military power is dependent of the civil will. It is the nation, and not its army, that makes war. But when all the forces of a society are directed toward the shaping of a decisive instrument in war and the cutting edge of the instrument fails on the field of battle, the result is not alone the defeat of an army, but the envelopment or dissolution of a society.

And then this pertinent discourse on the subject of decision:

> What is decision? It cannot be a matter of counting the totals of dead on the contending sides, nor yet of measuring how the preponderance of force is weighted within the victorious side. It implies a final determination of the issue. Decision is obtained by those who survive and not by those who die in striving for it. It is an act which enables the establishment of tranquility and the restoration of political action. It is an advance on Richmond, not a Gettysburg, a bold stroke across a bridge at Remagen, not a landing on the coast of Normandy.
>
> In total war, decision recedes farther and farther into distance until one final act brings about quick collapse and submission of the force protecting the enemy interior. Be the chaos of the defending civilization ever so great, as long as there remains an organized will to resist, defeat is not insured. The final act will always be an act of the battlefield, whether the ground forces which achieve it move by overland transport, or by sea or by air.
>
> Air power is essential to national survival. But air power, unsupported by the forces of the battlefield, is a military means without an end.

And so, in my humble judgment, it would be tragic short-sightedness for us to short-change the very decisive element of ground forces just because we were strong in other branches of the military. And by the same token it would be monumental folly and akin to courting disaster to endeavor by legislative fiat to tie the hands of the Commander in Chief and our military leaders from placing those ground forces in those parts of the world where they are best calculated to meet the threat of Soviet expansionism.

Inasmuch as this subject was the spark which set off this debate in the first place, I am sure you will abide with me until I have thoroughly and I hope, effectively, dealt with this phase of the question.

There can be no fundamental objection to the approval of a resolution having to do with the use of troops overseas if this resolution would not seek to order or direct the President in any particular way, but would express the belief of the Congress that the dispatch of troops to foreign soil would be desirable. Such an action would give congressional participation in the decision, but would not give the Congress any veto power, either assumed or actual. The President clearly has a constitutional right to send troops for these purposes without consultation. I cannot agree with the argument that the Congress has the right to flatly direct the President to make no troop commitments until and unless Congress has given its explicit consent. The United Nations Charter and the North Atlantic Treaty, by due constitutional process, are now the law of the land. There is merit to the position that in view of the fact that the other body was assured that the United States would not be called upon to provide soldiers in advance of an actual attack that the Executive should consult with the Congress before sending troops overseas whether or not he had a legal right to act alone, at least as such action implements these treaties.

The House has time and again stated its willingness to listen to the advice of the chiefs of the Armed Forces on all matters of troop disposition for the national defense. I believe the Executive has done and will do so. That being the case, the Executive would hardly act under implied power unless after the advice of the defense chiefs in the interest of the national security; and, if that is so, very few Members of Congress would care to superimpose their contrary opinion. Why then, other than for academic reasons, select this hour for a vitriolic and tumultous debate as to which comes first, the chicken or the egg?

In view of the long series of precedents of the implied power of the President with reference to the dispatch of troops to foreign soil, the Coudert resolution amounts to a request for a vote of lack of confidence in the Executive during a period of grave national emergency—and if that is the purpose—I challenge the gentleman to unmask his attack and introduce a resolution which asks such a vote and let that issue be met head-on.

There is no basis for the assumption that in advance of aggression the President would not ask the approval of Congress to send additional troops to Europe.

In the face of world events there is no margin for error. All doubts must be resolved against the creation of a constitutional crisis at this time.

Down through our history there is precedent after precedent for the Chief Executive acting quickly and directly in committing our Armed Forces to action in the national interest. In this connection, Edward S. Corwin, the recognized expert in this field, in his volume The President: Office and Powers, dealing with the Presidency from 1787 to 1948 has this to say on this subject:

> But the President may also make himself the direct administrator of the international rights and duties of the United States, or of what are adjudged by him to be such, without awaiting action either by the treaty-making power or by Congress, or by the courts.

One President after another has availed himself of this prerogative.

Upwards of 140 separate instances of such direct Presidential action are cited in James Grafton Rogers' volume entitled "World Politics and the Constitution." They start with the undeclared naval war with France from 1798 to 1800, down through Caribbean engagements from 1814 to 1825, including the Barbary wars, various landing of marines in numbers in many countries, military encounters with Mexico, naval demonstrations of Commodore Perry against Japan, military action against China in 1854, again in 1855 and 1856, numerous actions against South American countries, incidents in Korea in 1871, and again in 1888, and so on down to the

action taken in connection with the Philippine Insurrection in 1899–1901.

During the first three decades of the twentieth century at least a score of such direct military engagements were taken in the protection of American interests in the international field by direct authority vested in the Presidential office. Similarly in the years from 1940 through 1941 this country undertook a series of vital steps, geared to foreign policy and in the national interest, upon Presidential initiative, including the exchange of destroyers for British bases, the United States occupation of Greenland, the occupation of Iceland. Not the least of such steps was the Presidential order to the Navy to patrol ship lanes to Europe in an effort to check the Nazi submarine menace.

Let it be noted that all actions taken in regard to commitment of our Armed Forces abroad are not done arbitrarily or capriciously but only after the most serious and profound consideration and upon the advice of our military and congressional leaders and in consultation with the State Department.

I see nothing reflecting upon the proper exercise of proper Executive power, by having the President go before a joint session of the Congress and tell them that a certain set of circumstances demands a troop movement. It is interesting to observe that down through the pages of American history the action of the Congress with reference to war has always been to declare that a state of war exists and never to actually declare war. This undoubtedly has resulted in the fact that the Congress was presented with a fait accompli at the moment of its action, but, nevertheless, this legal fact does exist. In this debate I am concerned deeply with avoiding acrimonious debate which will show the world that the forces of democracy are divided and permit the world to conclude that the forces of communism are united.

It must not be forgotten that the President has certain constitutional duties and prerogatives which he has sworn to uphold to meet such a crisis that exists.

I do not argue against debate. The debate in itself may be desirable, but all of the facts pertinent to the issue should be made known and available to all factions and all views on all sides of the debate by the President, and with particular reference to the European situation, by General Eisenhower when he returns from Europe. I think this vital to the course of the debate and to the tone of the debate in order to prevent any participant from alarming the country by saying that facts have been concealed and that information has been withheld. I believe that at this point everything is being done to advise all concerned.

To underestimate the danger existing at this time to our way of life would be tragic, but I repeat, for the purpose of emphasis, in this debate we must show the world that we will not have a violent, bitter division. That we are not engaged in personalities and that this great debate will be held, by the debaters, at the level of the great decision that must be made.

Pertinent to this discussion, especially in the matter of committing American military strength to the defense of Europe, are the following remarks by the distinguished French journalist, Bertrand De Jouvenel, now visiting in the United States—what I quote is part of a letter he recently wrote to the editor of the Wall Street Journal:

> As of today, the potential force of the non-Soviet world is very superior to that of the Soviet world, while the actualized force of the Soviets is the greater. Now the main interest of the Soviets is to get into a position where the potential force of the non-Soviet world shall have so dwindled and that of the Soviet world so waxed that it shall have become impossible to challenge them. And the value of the Soviets' actual ready-to-march forces lies precisely in their ability to discourage resistance on the several points which are the objectives of their political offensive.
>
> May I say, with all respect to the personalities of ex-President Hoover and Senator TAFT, that the policy they advocate is precisely that which serves the purpose of Soviet expansion, since it would clear the way for the Russian advance, estopped only by the risk of war with the United States.
>
> If I understand the Senator's statement aright, he would not put troops into Europe but he would go to war in the case of invasion by Russia. This position was at one time that of the American Government. It had to be abandoned because the Europeans said they were unwilling that American support should manifest itself in the shape of bombing as soon as the Russians were in. Indeed this form of protection is apt to throw the Europeans into the arms of Russia. The policy advocated tends to dishearten the Europeans—"The United States is not going to defend us, therefore all that if left is to make a deal with Stalin"—and to pave the way for the political conquest of Western Europe. And a political conquest of Western Europe, that is with the consent of governments, also delivers to the enemy the vast resources of the African colonies and dependencies.

And on my own, may I add that the greatest deposits of uranium and cobalt are said to be in Africa.

Well, the logical question is, Where do we go from here?

First and foremost we should at every turn and in every way possible make known to the Soviet imperialists and to our friends in the world that we will have no part of appeasement in any shape, way, or form. The President has bravely and wisely and in a statesmanlike way taken the lead in this respect, and all Members of Congress should sustain him in this regard no matter in what other political areas they may have differences with him.

Secondly, we know we are confronted with a dangerous menace in the form of Soviet imperialism, which is committed to the enslavement of the free world and the destruction of the very foundations of western civilization.

Knowing this, we must say without any reservations that we will take any and all such steps necessary to thwart this conspiracy against humanity no matter what the costs, and furthermore, once we have marshaled our strengths, we will move out in ways to make our program one of positiveness, so that all peoples no matter how small in the global scheme may have a chance to pursue their destinies in peace.

Naturally in this grand offensive we want the moral support and such aid as they can give of our democratic friends in the world, and they can be assured that on our part there will be no turning back, no hedging, and no mean bookkeeping. We will do our part; they in turn must do theirs. And no amount of sophistical equivocation is going to substitute for earnest, all-out compliance with the grand strategy of the free world.

So we should, as I see it, take adequate measures to fortify Western Europe, including the rearming of Germany as an independent state—all or any part of her that will agree, so as to prevent the prize of the industrial Ruhr falling into Soviet hands. Yugoslavia, Turkey, and Greece shall be invited to join. We should, without any further delay, take steps looking to putting arms into the hands of Spain so that the west may have the comfort and practical advantage of a bastion behind the Pyrenees in the event the Russians move out upon Western Europe. At the same time every step should be taken to insure the solidity and democratic strength of Central and South America. Our outposts in Alaska must be readied without delay and not a single moment lost in rushing to completion the vital radar screen. At home, civil defense should have a high priority. We face a generation of partial national mobilization.

Getting around to the Pacific, we must proceed with a program for Japan that will bring that country back into the family of nations as an independent power, and thus have a people able to protect their homeland in this day of brutal aggression. We should make it possible for the Japanese leaders to facilitate rearmament.

Not the very least of the things which need to be done in this enveloping global conflict is the further strengthening and expanding of our propaganda arm. Already we have been treated to notable improvement in this vital campaign. Nothing should be left undone that will enable us to bring America's story to the world, especially to those captive people who are behind the iron curtain.

Never let us forget that the American record in the attempted conquest of peace is a proud and a luminous one. We have crusaded for the objective of a just and equitable peace. We should not forget and we should not let the world forget that when we offered the Marshal plan for the rehabilitation and reconstruction of Europe we barred no nation—Russia itself was offered the chance to participate in its benefits. Neither should we forget or allow the world to forget that Molotov marched out of the meeting taking the representatives of Poland and Czechoslovakia with him.

And in the reckoning on the assets and liabilities of the European scene we would do well to remember that in many captive countries there are strong underground movements, the members of which have never accepted the yoke of the foreign dictator, and in the event of

a general war the Soviets would have to deal with this inspired army. Poland does not forget the slaughter of Warsaw, made possible by Soviet trickery. In one country after another in Central and Eastern Europe the fires of freedom may be banked but they have not expired. It is to this audience that we must continue to get our message across. So propaganda becomes a major instrument for us, just as the Russians have long employed it. Walter Winchell was right when in his broadcast of Sunday, January 12, 1950, he said:

Poland, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia will join any invasion army against Russia.

The advancement of such a program on the international front naturally imposes certain heavy strains upon the home front, and I am well aware that our military effort can only be as effective as our national economy is sound. I, for one, do not subscribe to the proposition that what is here proposed is going to bankrupt the Nation. I am convinced that we can meet this threat and rise to this occasion—no, I say that the American economy has in it such dynamic potentials that, if we set our sights high enough and our efforts are sparked by genuine patriotism, we cannot only astonish the world once again but we can equally surprise ourselves. And by so doing, by applying ourselves diligently, unselfishly, and earnestly to the task at hand we will be spiking the Communists' guns by demonstrating to the world that not only is capitalistic democracy not decadent but on the contrary is virile, competent, productive, and offers man the best chance of happiness and security here on earth.

Now I have spoken at considerable length here today and I am deeply in your debt for the favor of the time allotted me and for your generous attention. I know the world is weary of dialectics—it hungers for simple truths and a chance for life in surroundings of true peace.

I want to say that the thing we must avoid above everything else is a mean retreat into negative escapism. That way lies disaster. The United States has never flinched in the face of threats. And America is not now going to sell its soul to the devil.

If I do nothing else here today, I hope I can impart to you the conviction that despite our shortcomings and in the face of human mistakes, and no matter how deadly the crisis, the American Republic and its democratic colleagues throughout the world were never better fortified to carry their principles forward into genuine achievement, no matter what the threat, what the obstacles, or what the opposition.

And finally, I will raise this point before others among you do: in all that I have said I have spoken in a way and tone that would seem to imply the inevitability of war—and to this and to you I make answer.

That it is only by a true understanding of the enemy and a knowledge of what he is up to and a quick moving on our part and by our friends to fill the vacuums in the international field that we stand any chance of achieving a condition worthy of the name of peace, and of winning the war if all decent efforts fail.

So I end with the note that we are engaged in a fight for all that is good and we will succeed in that great endeavor with God's help.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. REAMS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to explain my absence from the Chamber during the roll call on the bill, H. R. 1001. I was present during the debate and was called from the Chamber. I was in the Capitol, but did not hear the bells ring for the roll call.

I wish to state, had I been present I would have voted "aye" on the roll call.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUTLER] is recognized for 15 minutes.

DEFEAT IN DETAIL

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I am not an expert on military affairs but have common sense and try to use it to the best of my ability for the good of our country and the American way of life. So this is my analysis of the present situation we find ourselves in.

The phrase "defeat in detail" is very well known to every student of military science. Before I go further into the text of this speech, I should like to place myself clearly and unequivocally on record as being in favor of appropriating and expending every dollar needed to properly prepare this country and its people for any eventuality. By this I mean not only our military expenditures for the Army, Navy, and Air Corps but also for civil defense.

If one studies the campaigns that were carried out by the Maccabeeans, Alexander the Great, Hannibal, Caesar, or in more modern times, Napoleon, in each instance, when faced by a coalition of his enemies, each one of these leaders, by properly maneuvering his forces, before his enemies joined forces, was able to decisively defeat his opponent, "in detail."

It is time for us to face the facts and to realize that Russia and our enemy, world communism, intends to defeat us in the same pattern, and up to this point they have succeeded. We have committed ourselves in Korea with "too little," and now the administration is again asking us to commit ourselves in Europe with "too little."

I want to contain and fight communism wherever it may rear its ugly head, but I am opposed to the dissipation of our strength in a series of actions which can lead to only disastrous results.

Before committing a single additional American boy to the European area I wish to ask our Secretary of Defense the question: "How many divisions must we have in Europe in order to contain the Russians?" And when the answer is given to us, I state here and now, that I am opposed to committing one single soldier of our country until such a time that we know that, if necessary, we can commit the power needed to bring us a decisive victory. If we cannot place such forces and resources in the field, then all the fighting and dying by our heroic forces will surely have been in vain, as it has been in Korea.

I feel that we are entitled to know how many troops our allies will put in the field, and I also want to know that they will put them in the field NOW. It would be very unfortunate for our commanders to depend upon the help of 40, 50, or 100 divisions of our allies in Europe and find that when they are needed they exist only as "paper divisions." Until such a time that this situation is clarified I believe it is improper on the part of anyone to send any further troops abroad.

Since the close of hostilities, we have expended billions upon billions to aid the nations of Europe, and what have we in return? Government after government which have failed or refused to bring their people face to face with reality. Many of these governments seem to feel that our purse is bottomless. As practical men we know that is not so.

If we are to continue spending these fabulous amounts of money let us get back something—some value received.

I have great confidence in General Eisenhower. But I also believe our staff should have something to say about the method of training the forces of our allies—I know our staff officers can greatly help in the proper organization of these forces.

Gentlemen, we know our enemy is morally bankrupt. All we have to do is listen to the rantings of the representatives of Russia and its satellites in the United Nations, and we know that they twist all facts to suit their purpose. The policy of "the big lie" is staring us in the face again, and all for the same vicious purpose.

If we must fight this cancer in the world body alone, then let us face the fact squarely. If we are going to have help from our allies, let us make certain that this help is sincere and effective, and can actually be given.

These are facts which we must discover today—a year from today it may be too late.

Winston Churchill, in his book, Their Finest Hour, reports the conversation with General Gamelin, Commander in Chief of the French Armies, on May 15, 1941. The general had reported the breakthrough north and south of Sedan and the rush of German armor toward the coast of Abbeville. When the General stopped talking Winston Churchill asked:

"Where is the strategic reserve?"

General Gamelin turned and with a shake of the head, and a shrug, said:

"Aucune"—None.

"I was dumbfounded. It had never occurred to me that any commanders having to defend 500 miles of engaged front would have left themselves unprovided with a mass of maneuver."

Gentlemen, we can take heed of Mr. Churchill's words. We are engaged on a global front, and we are expending our strategic reserve in a series of local actions. We cannot permit this to go on.

I have great confidence in our American soldiers, and in our great industrial machine behind them. I should like to point out that our great plants are doing a magnificent job, turning out the finished products we need to reequip our

armed services. I should like to pay special tribute to men like Larry Bell, who have lived with this situation night and day, to expedite the entire program. People like Mr. Bell have given more of their nerve and sinew than it seems that the human body can stand—but thanks to great men like him we shall succeed.

Gentlemen, the decisions which we are making in these grave days shall not affect only ourselves or a portion of our people. These decisions will affect freedom-loving people throughout the world, and our posterity.

God grant that we make these decisions right, conserve our strength, strengthen our sinews, and then if we must, strike decisively.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. NORBLAD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances, in each to include extraneous material.

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

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial from the Quincy Herald-Whig, of Quincy, Ill.

Mr. HARDY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mr. BUCHANAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include some price trend tables.

Mr. SIKES (at the request of Mr. McMULLEN) was given permission to extend his remarks and include a speech.

Mr. YORTY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. DOYLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a communication from the Library of Congress giving an outline of the relief portraits in the redecorated Chamber of the House of Representatives, notwithstanding the fact that it will exceed two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $270.

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

Mr. ADDONIZIO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mr. BURNSIDE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. CLEMENTE (at the request of Mr. DELANEY) was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article entitled "The Air-Ground Program," notwithstanding the fact that it is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $287.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in connection with the letter he received from Maj. William P. McCahill, national executive director of the Marine Corps Reserve Officers Association.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BURDICK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a short letter from a farmer in North Dakota about the high cost of bread.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks and include a newspaper editorial.

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

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

Mr. COUDERT (at the request of Mr. REED of New York) was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article from the New York Times.

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

Mr. PATTERSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include extraneous matter.

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

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

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a resolution adopted by the Midcentury White House Conference on Children and Youth, notwithstanding that it exceeds the limit and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $205.

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

Mr. HORAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include two letters.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

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

Mr. MORANO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article on the Chinese Red Army by Father Raymond J. DeJaegher.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. O'TOOLE (at the request of Mr. MURPHY), for an indefinite period, on account of official business.

To Mr. WHARTON (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for 3 days, January 17 to 20, 1951 on account of illness.

To Mr. RABAUT, for the balance of this week, on account of death in his family.

To Mr. LANE (at the request of Mr. MURPHY), for January 17, 1951, on account of illness.

To Mr. CHELF, for 2 weeks, on account of illness in family.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McMULLEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 11 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Friday, January 19, 1951, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

81. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of Panama Railroad Company for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1950, pursuant to the Government Control Act (31 U. S. C. 841) (H. Doc. No. 44); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed.

82. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of Federal Crop Insurance Corporation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1950, pursuant to the Government Control Act (31 U. S. C. 841) (H. Doc. No. 45); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed.

83. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for the greater security and defense of the United States against attack, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

84. A letter from the vice admiral, United States Coast Guard, transmitting a report showing contracts negotiated by the Coast Guard for experimental, development, or research work or for the manufacture or furnishing of supplies for experimentation, development, research, or test, pursuant to the provisions of section 2 (c) (11) of the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947, Public Law 413, Eightieth Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

85. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal and lists or schedules covering records proposed for disposal by certain Government agencies; to the Committee on House Administration.

86. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report by the Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, on findings and recommendations relative to localities which would be most suitable for the establishment of additional fish hatcheries and rearing ponds in the Great Lakes area, pursuant to Public Law 249, Eighty-first Congress; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

87. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the laws relating to mineral entry on the tribal lands on the Papago Indian Reservation in Arizona, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Public Lands.

88. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting one copy each of certain legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Croix, pursuant to section 16 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States, approved June 22, 1936; to the Committee on Public Lands.

89. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated November 10, 1950, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Four Pole Creek, W. Va., authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on July 24, 1946; to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

Mr. RANKIN: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 1. A bill to authorize the payment by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs of a gratuitous indemnity to survivors

of members of the Armed Forces who die in active service, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 6). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R. 1600. A bill to create the Small Defense Plants Corporation and to preserve small-business institutions and free, competitive enterprise; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RIEHLMAN:

H. R. 1601. A bill to create the Small Defense Plants Corporation and to preserve small-business institutions and free, competitive enterprise; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HILL:

H. R. 1602. A bill to create the Small Defense Plants Corporation and to preserve small-business institutions and free, competitive enterprise; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. EVINS:

H. R. 1603. A bill to create the Small Defense Plants Corporation and to preserve small-business institutions and free, competitive enterprise; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

H. R. 1604. A bill to create the Small Defense Plants Corporation and to preserve small-business institutions and free, competitive enterprise; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BURTON:

H. R. 1605. A bill to create the Small Defense Plants Corporation and to preserve small-business institutions and free, competitive enterprise; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BATES of Kentucky:

H. R. 1606. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, to provide increased retirement benefits for post-office inspectors and those who have been transferred to a supervisory or administrative position; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BOGGS of Delaware:

H. R. 1607. A bill to amend section 3469 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code to provide that the tax imposed on the transportation of persons shall not apply to transportation on boats for fishing purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1608. A bill authorizing transmission in the United States mails of personal mail addressed by individuals in the military and naval service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1609. A bill relating to the salaries and expense allowances of the President, Vice President, and the Speaker and Members of Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 1610. A bill to empower the Supreme Court of the United States to promulgate a code of ethics for attorneys at law practicing before the Federal courts of the United States and its Territories; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1611. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to support research and training in poliomyelitis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DOUGHTON:

H. R. 1612. A bill to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 1613. A bill to amend section 2863 (d) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended by Public Law 448, Eighty-first Congress; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FORD:

H. R. 1614. A bill to amend the Bankruptcy Act to provide that receivers and trustees in proceedings under chapter XI shall receive compensation on the same basis as those in proceedings under chapter X; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1615. A bill to provide income-tax exemptions for members of the Armed Forces serving cutside the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 1616. A bill to amend subsection (f) of section 12 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan:

H. R. 1617. A bill to stabilize prices, prevent inflation, and control production; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

H. R. 1618. A bill conferring jurisdiction on the United States District Court for the Northern District of California to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims of the State of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 1619. A bill to amend section 3250 of the Internal Revenue Code, relating to special taxes on the sale of liquor; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1620. A bill to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LANTAFF:

H. R. 1621. A bill to provide that no economic or financial assistance shall be furnished to foreign countries which permit the exportation of strategic war materials to Russia and Russia's satellites, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LECOMPTE:

H. R. 1622. A bill relating to the computation of the income-tax deduction for depreciation of farm machinery acquired for seasonal use; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 1623. A bill to advance in grade, time in grade, and rate of compensation certain postal employees of Japanese ancestry who were evacuated from military areas during World War II; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

H. R. 1624. A bill to grant certain benefits provided for veterans of World War II to persons on active service with the Armed Forces during the military, naval, and air operations in and around Korea, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1625. A bill to provide for flood-control improvements on the Middle Fork of the Flathead River in the vicinity of Belton, Mont.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 1626. A bill to provide for the installation of improvements and facilities needed for the protection, development, and utilization of Federal resources affected by dam and water reservoir projects constructed by the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 1627. A bill to provide lump-sum life indemnity payments for survivors of members of the Armed Forces who die while on active duty, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1628. A bill to provide for the acquisition of land and the construction thereon of buildings and appurtenances essential for forest-fire-control operations of the Forest Service, United States Department of Agriculture, at or near Missoula, Mont., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 1629. A bill to promote the rehabilitation of the landless Indians of Montana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 1630. A bill to provide for the establishment and operation of a mining research station in the vicinity of Missoula, Mont., for investigation of methods of mining the ores and other mineral raw materials of the Northwest, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H. R. 1631. A bill to set aside certain lands in Oklahoma, formerly a part of the Cheyenne-Arapaho Reservation, and known as the Fort Reno Military Reservation, for the Cheyenne-Arapaho Tribes of Indians of Oklahoma, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 1632. A bill to authorize the leasing of restricted Indian lands for public, religious, educational, recreational, business, and other purposes requiring the grant of long-term leases; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 1633. A bill to amend the act of June 21, 1934 (48 Stat. 1185; 43 U. S. C. sec. 871a), entitled "An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents to the numbered school sections in place, granted to the States by the act approved February 22, 1889, by the act approved January 25, 1927 (44 Stat. 1026), and by any other act of Congress"; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 1634. A bill designating Indian Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1635. A bill to promote the rehabilitation of the Indians of western Oklahoma, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MURDOCK:

H. R. 1636. A bill to provide an accelerated program for surveying and mapping of the United States, its Territories and possessions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 1637. A bill to provide a comprehensive and adequate water resources basic-data program; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 1638. A bill to facilitate the management of the national park system and miscellaneous areas administered in connection with that system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. PRESTON:

H. R. 1639. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code entitled "Judicial Code and Judiciary" by adding a new section thereto known as section 1732-b to permit the photographing, microfilming, or photostating of original business records and the introduction of the same in evidence after the destruction of the originals; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. R. 1640. A bill to authorize the upper Marias unit as a part of the Marias division of the Missouri River Basin project, Montana, all-American tunnel route, for irrigation and reclamation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 1641. A bill to prohibit the purchase by the Federal Government of prison-made goods which compete with goods made by free labor; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 1642. A bill to preserve the scenic beauty of the Niagara Falls and River and to authorize the construction of certain public works on that river for power and other purposes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 1643. A bill to provide for the greater security and defense of the United States

against attack, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WELCH:

H. R. 1644. A bill to provide additional incentives for the discovery of a cure for cancer, heart disease, and poliomyelitis; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 1645. A bill to repeal the proviso against the filling of the vacancy in the office of district judge for the Eastern and Western Districts of Missouri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YORTY:

H. R. 1646. A bill to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 1647. A bill to rescind the order of the Postmaster General curtailing certain postal services; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BEALL:

H. R. 1648. A bill to authorize the Federal Security Administrator to bring to Washington, D. C., theater productions of land-grant and State, and other accredited colleges and universities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BENTSEN:

H. R. 1649. A bill authorizing the United States Commissioner, International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, to acquire and improve a town site in Zapata County, Tex., for the relocation of communities in said county to be inundated by the waters of the Falcon Dam and Reservoir, being constructed in cooperation with Mexico under the water treaty of February 3, 1944; providing for the construction of a water and sewer system for such town site, for the relocation and construction of certain public buildings, and for the relocation of cemeteries; and providing for the exchange and conveyance of such properties in full or part payment for property to be acquired in connection with such reservoir; authorizing appropriations therefor; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BYRNE of New York:

H. R. 1650. A bill to amend the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to provide for the adjudication by a commissioner of claims of American nationals against the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics," approved August 4, 1939; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. R. 1651. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory and supplementary thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAMP:

H. R. 1652. A bill to raise revenue; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 1653. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLEMENTE:

H. R. 1654. A bill to provide for the construction of a Veterans' Administration hospital in Queens County, N. Y.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DAWSON:

H. R. 1655. A bill to authorize and direct the Administrator of General Services to transfer to the Department of the Army certain property in St. Louis, Mo.; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. DENTON:

H. R. 1656. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate barbers in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved June 7, 1938, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL:

H. R. 1657. A bill to outlaw the sale of influence by false representatives in the matter of defense orders to private business; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYS of Arkansas:

H. R. 1658. A bill to provide for a Delegate in the House of Representatives from the District of Columbia; for a Board of Education of the District of Columbia to be elected; and for reorganization of the executive departments of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. McGUIRE:

H. R. 1659. A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 1660. A bill to provide for the receipt and adjudication of the claims of survivors of members of the Armed Forces of the United States who, as prisoners of war, were illegally killed in the Korean theater; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H. R. 1661. A bill to provide the privilege of becoming a naturalized citizen of the United States to all immigrants having a legal right to permanent residence, to make immigration quotas available to Asian and Pacific peoples, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan:

H. R. 1662. A bill to amend the act of July 6, 1945, as amended, so as to reduce the number of grades for the various positions under such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RAINS:

H. R. 1663. A bill to authorize the Federal Works Administration, as an adjunct to the Federal public-works program, to make loans and grants for the construction, remodeling, improvement, and extension of school facilities; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 1664. A bill to amend section 3672 of the Internal Revenue Code relating to requirement of filing notice of lien for taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1665. A bill granting pensions to veterans of World War I and their widows and dependent children equivalent to the pensions granted to veterans of the war with Spain and their widows and depenent children; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1666. A bill providing for the insurance, by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, of membership share balances in Federal credit unions; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 1667. A bill to amend the Career Compensation Act of 1949 to provide that certain service rendered by disabled retired officers be computed as double time for retirement pay; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1668. A bill to amend Veterans' Regulation No. 1 (a) to establish the job objective of certain veterans serving as apprentice barbers; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1669. A bill to extend pension benefits to persons who served on certain vessels operated by the Army during the war with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, and the China Relief Expedition; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WHITAKER:

H. R. 1670. A bill to amend section 402 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to confectioneries containing alcohol; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 1671. A bill to provide identification buttons for persons rejected for service in the Armed Forces by reason of physical defects; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. NELSON:

H. J. Res. 111. Joint resolution authorizing the International Joint Commission to make a survey to determine the most economical and most feasible plan for the construction of the proposed Passamaquoddy tidal power project at Passamaquoddy Bay in the State of Maine and the Province of New Brunswick, and authorizing the appropriation of not to exceed $3,900,000 to defray the cost thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HILLINGS:

H. J. Res. 112. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to joinder of the United States in suits in the United States Supreme Court for adjudication of claims to waters of the Colorado River system available for use in the lower Colorado River Basin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YORTY:

H. J. Res. 113. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to joinder of the United States in suits in the United States Supreme Court for adjudication of claims to waters of the Colorado River system available for use in the lower Colorado River Basin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. J. Res. 114. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to joinder of the United States in suits in the United States Supreme Court for adjudication of claims to waters of the Colorado River system available for use in the lower Colorado River Basin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H. J. Res. 115. Joint resolution for the establishment of a commission to study the need for simplification, modernization, and consolidation of the public-land laws, to make appropriate recommendations for an effective public-land-law system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. J. Res. 116. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to joinder of the United States in suits in the United States Supreme Court for adjudication of claims to waters of the Colorado River system available for use in the lower Colorado River Basin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNE of New York:

H. J. Res. 117. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim the first Monday in February of each year as National Children's Dental Health Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FELLOWS:

H. J. Res. 118. Joint resolution authorizing the International Joint Commission to make a survey to determine the most economical and most feasible plan for the construction of the proposed Passamaquoddy tidal power project at Passamaquoddy Bay in the State of Maine and the Province of New Brunswick, and authorizing the appropriation of not to exceed $3,900,000 to defray the cost thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

H. Con. Res. 37. Concurrent resolution inviting the democracies which sponsored the North Atlantic Treaty to name delegates to a federal convention; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McKINNON:

H. Con. Res. 38. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President exercise now powers granted him by section 402 of Defense Production Act of 1950; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H. Con. Res. 39. Authorizing the Select Committee to Investigate the Use of Chemicals in Food Products to have printed for its use additional copies of certain hearings; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BARDEN:

H. Res. 73. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Education and Labor to conduct studies and investigations relating to

matters coming within the jurisdiction of such committee under rule XI (1) (g) of the Rules of the House; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H. Res. 74. Resolution to continue the authority of the Select Committee To Investigate the Use of Chemicals in Food Products; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. McGUIRE:

H. Res. 75. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study to determine an appropriate design for the flag of the United States should the Territory of Alaska or the Territory of Hawaii, or both, be admitted to the Union; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 76. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 75; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. R. 1672. A bill for the relief of Bank of America National Trust and Savings Association; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 1673. A bill for the relief of Carmela Malinconico; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1674. A bill for the relief of Giacinta Traversa Usellini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1675. A bill for the relief of Renato Usellini, Giuseppina B. Usellini, Chiara Usellini, and Ildebrando Usellini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEALL:

H. R. 1676. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth Sabow; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1677. A bill for the relief of Lester M. Scott and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1678. A bill for the relief of Edward E. Harriman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENDER:

H. R. 1679. A bill for the relief of Ai-Ming Cheng, Lilly Chen, and Yao Cheng; to the Committee on the Judiciary,

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H. R. 1680. A bill for the relief of Speros Psaros; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 1681. A bill for the relief of Mariana de Rojas (nee Mariana Lopez); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 1682. A bill for the relief of Capt. Marciano O. Garces; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin:

H. R. 1683. A bill for the relief of Mitsuko Sakata Lord; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1684. A bill for the relief of Teruko Okuaki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1685. A bill for the relief of Ramakant Pandurang Patil; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 1686. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Grace Lydia Anderson Clark; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 1687. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Arthur Bravo, Sr.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 1688. A bill for the relief of James J. Lieberman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOLLIVER:

H. R. 1689. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth Poeschel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H. R. 1690. A bill for the relief of Carl M. Campbell, James R. White, and Frederick J. Powers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1691. A bill for the relief of Sylvio Latino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOODWIN:

H. R. 1692. A bill for the relief of Chester A. Macomber; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN:

H. R. 1693. A bill for the relief of Luigi Galzerano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HART:

H. R. 1694. A bill for the relief of Emile Druyts, also known as Augustinus Julius Emile Druyts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1695. A bill for the relief of Ceslawa Druyts nee Plichta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 1696. A bill for the relief of Jack Warner and family; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEE:

H. R. 1697. A bill for the relief of John Tzanavaris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 1698. A bill for the relief of Catherine B. Molostvoff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLUCZYNSKI:

H. R. 1699. A bill to adjust the status of a displaced person in the United States who does not meet the requirements of section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGUIRE:

H. R. 1700. A bill for the relief of S. Francis Liu and Victor Liu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGUIRE (by request):

H. R. 1701. A bill for the relief of Charles H. Whitford; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

H. R. 1702. A bill to provide for the lump-sum payment of the national service life insurance granted the late Alfred G. Semsack to the designated beneficiaries thereof; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H. R. 1703. A bill for the relief of J. L. Brooks; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1704. A bill for the relief of Jack Stuckey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1705. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Oklahoma, to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims of individuals against the United States; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 1706. A bill for the relief of Thomas J. Morris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan:

H. R. 1707. A bill for the relief of Frederick George Boughton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. R. 1708. A bill for the relief of Togo S. Furumura; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1709. A bill for the relief of Frank S. Emi; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. REAMS:

H. R. 1710. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marie Weir; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 1711. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Margaret D. Surhan; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1712. A bill for the relief of Andrew Berger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIBICOFF:

H. R. 1713. A bill for the relief of Maria Schianca Lanterna; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1714. A bill for the relief of Agostino Carnevale Schianca; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 1715. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Fusako Hayashi Kimoto and Shirley Mariko Kimoto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1716. A bill for the relief of Paul I. Courtright; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1717. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Adelaide Dibbs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1718. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Tomiko Munakata Millhollin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1719. A bill for the relief of Elfriede Erika Hecker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1720. A bill for the relief of Hertha Catharina Schriefer and Gerda Schriefer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1721. A bill for the relief of Richard E. Coffman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 1722. A bill for the relief of Louise Leitzinger and her daughter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIGGLESWORTH:

H. R. 1723. A bill for the relief of George Economos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. J. Res. 119. Joint resolution for the relief of certain creditors of the Norwood Pulp & Machinery Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

11. By Mr. FINE: Petition of the Civil Service Leader, a weekly of New York, N. Y., urging Congress to provide by statute that pensioners under public retirement systems be given the same exemption as is granted now, or may be granted in the future, either by law or ruling, to retired members and survivors under social security; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

12. By Mr. LESINSKI: Resolution of the Metropolitan Detroit Association of School Administrators to go on record urging Congress of the United States to place building materials for school facilities high in the priority list in event that it becomes necessary for the Congress or the administration to establish priorities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

13. Also, resolution of the Detroit and Wayne County Federation of Labor urging its Representatives and Senators in Congress and the President of the United States to reinstitute the same type and form of insurance given to the servicemen of World War II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

14. Also, resolution adopted by the city council of the city of Wyandotte, Mich., praying relief for service men and women from the burden of paying excise taxes on transportation tickets purchased by them; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

15. By Mr. MACHROWICZ: Petition of Metropolitan Detroit Association of School Administrators, Detroit, Mich., urging the Congress to place building materials for school facilities high on the priority list should it become necessary for the Government to establish such priorities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.