By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 2501. A bill for the relief of Alexander George John McKerrow and George Edgar McKerrow; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEDRICK:

H. R. 2502. A bill for the relief of Sarah Kabacznik; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 2503. A bill for the relief of Maria Rosa Bardales Arias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2504. A bill for the relief of Benjamin F. Burkwitt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2505. A bill for the relief of Carl Weitlanner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 2506. A bill for the relief of Masunari Saito and Isao Saito; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGRATH:

H. R. 2507. A bill for the relief of the estate of Victor Jacobowitz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGREGOR:

H. R. 2508. A bill for the relief of Kay Adel Snedeker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. R. 2509. A bill for the relief of First Lt. Henry S. Watcke; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 2510. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Beverly Brunell Roth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARDIE SCOTT:

H. R. 2511. A bill for the relief of Paul Dacut or Pawlo Dacsuk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2512. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Di Rosa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEED:

H. R. 2513. A bill for the relief of Harry E. Wilson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOOD of Idaho:

H. R. 2514. A bill for the relief of Maria Theresa Stancola; 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:

38. By Mr. BUSH: Petition of the Rotary Club of Montgomery, Pa., urging that the State and Federal Governments take immediate action in the construction of flood-control devices in the valley of the West Branch of the Susquehanna River; to the Committee on Public Works.

39. By Mr. CANFIELD: Resolution adopted on January 25, 1951, by the board of directors of the Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers of Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware, requesting the Members of Congress and all Federal agencies governing the control of such supplies, equipment, and transportation that they give full consideration to the necessary requirements of the industry; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

40. Also, telegram from the executive committee of the Greater Paterson Council of Churches, urging the prompt sending of needed grain to India as the most dynamic thing democratic America can do both morally and diplomatically; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

41. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Dr. A. Albers, president, Ostasiatischer Verein Hamburg-Bremen E. V., relative to the fate and welfare of those German nationals who have been driven from their homes and have been deprived of their property; to the Committee on Armed Services.

SENATE

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 1951

(Legislative day of Monday, January 29, 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:

O merciful God whose law is truth and whose statutes stand forever, we beseech Thee to grant unto us, who in the morning seek Thy face, the benediction which a sense of Thy presence lends to each new day. Unite our hearts and minds to bear the burdens that are laid upon us. Grant us this day the grace to live on the altitudes of our aspirations. As servants of Thine and of the Nation and of the peoples of this shattered earth, stricken, bleeding, starving, save us from false choices and guide our hands and minds to heal and bind and build and bless. 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 Monday, February 5, 1951, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 2141. An act to extend for 2 years the existing privilege of free importation of gifts from members of the Armed Forces of the United States on duty abroad;

H. R. 2192. An act to amend section 313 (b) of the Tariff Act of 1930; and

H. R. 2268. An act to authorize the payment of interest on series E savings bonds retained after maturity, and for other purposes.

MEETING OF COMMITTEE DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service was authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to present petitions and memorials, submit reports, introduce bills and joint resolutions, and offer other routine matters for the RECORD, without debate and without speeches.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

THE NEW JERSEY RAILROAD TRAGEDY

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to address myself for 2 minutes to New Jersey's tragedy of Tuesday evening, the railroad wreck in which 83 people gave their lives, and countless others were seriously injured.

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

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, at the outset I desire to express my deepest sympathy to those who have suffered in any manner therefrom, and particularly to those who have lost forever the loved ones whose lives were taken in this needless tragic catastrophe.

I might say, Mr. President, that among those whose lives were snuffed out in this horrible accident was Mr. George McCarter, one of New Jersey's leading lawyers and the son of one of New Jersey's greatest of all time attorneys general.

Throughout the history of mankind, there have been similar tragedies. Some have been the result of unknown causes. I dare say that God in his wisdom has purposely visited some of them upon defiant violators of his laws. But for the most part, I am sure that they have been the result directly or indirectly of the hapless errors of judgment on the part of responsible authorities in every given instance.

That New Jersey's tragedy on Tuesday was one of the worst in railroad history, no one can gainsay or deny.

Mr. President, I shall withhold judgment upon the major factors which contributed to this awful miscarriage of safety principles, those principles to which our Nation has in more recent years dedicated so much of its resources at all levels of government for proper solutions. I am sure that the pending hearings in New York City before the Interstate Commerce Commission will bring to light those errors of human judgment and whatever there may be of mechanical fault involved. I am sure that justice, as we practice it, will properly adjudge any who may be guilty of wanton negligence.

But, sir, there is one factor which the people of America should not overlook or forget in the immediate catastrophe. We know that selfish labor interests are conducting a railroad strike in what has come to be a most crucial period of the Nation's history. We know that precious lives of American mothers' sons are being sacrificed in Korea for our free way of life; we know that the current strike runs directly counter to all of the things in which we believe and for which we happily contribute in these most critical times, and as to the tragic call upon innocent lives in New Jersey's costly disaster, we know that without the strike, the death toll would have been materially reduced. The facts in this connection speak for themselves without regard to the mechanical and human failures involved.

No one can deny that an overcrowded train is a hazard. No one can deny that, but for the strike, there would have been fewer passengers on the fateful train which was to bring so much sorrow to so many.

Mr. President, were I a party to the current strike, I would always wonder to

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

the end of my time whether or not I had contributed to the sorrow and misery which must necessarily follow in the wake of New Jersey's tragedy of Tuesday evening.

Perhaps it takes such things to awaken us to a full consciousness of our responsibilities to each other and to the Nation.

I fervently hope that at least this shocking incident will cause every selfish interest in the country to pause and give thought to the indirect contributions which it is so easily possible for them to make to tragedy when they disregard the Nation's basic needs.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with what my distinguished colleague has said with regard to the tragic disaster in New Jersey. I appreciate what he has said, and I join with him in the sympathy he has expressed and in the tenor of his remarks.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I thank the Senator.

ANNOUNCEMENT AS TO LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS NEXT WEEK

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I wish to make an announcement. Some of our good friends on the other side of the aisle feel that they need a week to try to convince the people that their party should have a little more consideration than it has had in the past. I agree that it will take that long, and longer, for them to do so. Inasmuch as there is important committee work to be done, which can be done next week, I thought we should accommodate them, and give them that opportunity. I am sorry we cannot give them longer, because I am sure they need longer. However, I wish to announce that there will be no votes on any controversial matters next week. Therefore they can feel free and at ease to go out and do what they can for a lost cause.

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

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I wish to thank the majority leader for his very forthright statement. I appreciate that type of leadership. In the past it has been a leadership of indecision. We never knew whether there would be an important vote or not. I thank the distinguished majority leader and compliment him on his fairness in stating that next week there will be no vote on a controversial matter.

If I may be permitted to say a word further, we did pretty well in 1950, with the time allotted to us. Perhaps in 1952, as a result of the Senator's fairness, the American people will do a wonderful job, and produce the result which we anticipate. So I thank the Senator for the extra days he is giving us during the Lincoln's Birthday season.

Mr. McFARLAND. I may say to the distinguished minority leader that I find that the more time our friends on the other side of the aisle have, the worse they do. That is one reason why I am willing to be liberal. I desire to be fair with the Senator and let him know my reasons.

Mr. WHERRY. We thank the Senator for his kindness. If the best he can do is to give us a week, we appreciate that, and we will let the people decide. They will be the judges of who does well and who does not do well. I am satisfied that we made a great start in 1950, and I think we are going to do a wonderful job in 1952.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It was stipulated that there be no debate during the morning hour proceedings.

Mr. McFARLAND. I did wish to state that some bills may be taken up during the latter part of the week, but if there is any controversy over them, and any Senator wishes to have them go over, they will go over.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

REPORT OF AIR COORDINATING COMMITTEE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 55)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith for the information and consideration of the Congress the annual report of the Air Coordinating Committee for the calendar year 1950.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 8, 1951.*

REPORT OF ECONOMIC COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 52)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States of America:

I am transmitting herewith the tenth report of the Economic Cooperation Administration created by the Foreign Assistance Act of 1948 (Public Law 472, 80th Cong.), approved April 3, 1948.

The report covers activities under the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 (title I of Public Law 472) as amended, as well as the programs of economic aid to China and the general area of China under the China Area Aid Act (title II of Public Law 535, 81st Cong.), and to the Republic of Korea under the provisions of the Foreign Aid Appropriation Act of 1949 (Public Law 793, 80th Cong.) and Public Laws 430, 447, and 535, Eighty-first Congress.

There is included in the appendix a summary of the status of the United States foreign relief program (Public Law 84, 80th Cong.) and the United States foreign-aid program (Public Law 389, 80th Cong.).

This report covers the quarter ended September 30, 1950.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 6, 1951.*

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred, as indicated:

INCREASE IN CERTAIN ANNUITIES UNDER FOREIGN SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY SYSTEM

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to make certain increases in the annuities of annuitants under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS APPLICABLE TO VIOLATIONS OF PASSPORT LAWS

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to change from 3 years to 10 years the statute of limitations, applicable to violations of the passport laws and the laws relating to the falsification of evidence of citizenship (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO ACT PROVIDING CODIFICATION OF NAVIGATION LAWS RELATING TO ADMEASUREMENT, ETC.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, recommending legislation to revise, consolidate, and codify the navigation laws relating to admeasurement, documentation, entry, clearance, coastwise trade, foreign trade, and United States fisheries, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL DEVELOPMENTS, CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT, CALIFORNIA

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to undertake certain additional developments in connection with the Central Valley project, California, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ACTIVITIES OF TEMPORARY AND CERTAIN OTHER EMPLOYEES OF BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation relating to the activities of temporary and certain other employees of the Bureau of Land Management (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

LAWS ENACTED BY MUNICIPAL COUNCILS OF ST. THOMAS AND ST. JOHN AND ST. CROIX, V. I.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of laws enacted by the Municipal Councils of St. Thomas and St. John and St. Croix, V. I. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

LETTER FROM SPEAKER OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF SAMOA TO GOVERNOR OF AMERICAN SAMOA

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a copy of a letter from the speaker of the house, Legislature of American Samoa, to the Governor of American Samoa, dated December 11, 1950, relating to the administration of the government of American Samoa (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

VIOLATION OF LAW AGAINST INCURRING OBLIGATIONS ABOVE EXPENDITURES

A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, relating to a technical violation of law against incurring obligations above expenditures authorized by section 1211 (i) (2) of Public Law 759, approved September 6, 1950; to the Committee on Appropriations.

PROGRESS REPORT ON IMPROVEMENT OF FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAYS

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a progress report on the improvement of Federal-aid highways, for the fiscal year ended June 30,

1950 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Works.

DETAIL OF OFFICERS OF ARMED FORCES TO DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE IN CONNECTION WITH CIVIL AVIATION

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the detail of officers of the Armed Forces in any duty or position with the Department of Commerce in connection with the work of promoting civil aviation (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF ADMINISTRATOR, FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the first part of the annual report of the Federal Security Agency, fiscal year 1950 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

STATEMENT OF EXPENDITURES BY UNITED STATES COURT OF CUSTOMS AND PATENT APPEALS

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement of expenditures of appropriations for the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1950 (with an accompanying statement); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

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 (with accompanying papers); 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.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Indiana; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Senate Enrolled Joint Resolution 1

"Whereas both Houses of the Eightieth Congress of the United States of America, at the first session of such Congress, by a constitutional majority of two-thirds of each House thereof, made a proposition to amend the Constitution of the United States in the following words, to wit:

"'Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the terms of office of the President

"'*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein)*, That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"'"ARTICLE —

"'"SECTION 1. No person shall be elected to the Office of the President more than twice, and no person who has held the Office of President, or acted as President, for more than 2 years of a term to which some other person was elected President shall be elected to the Office of the President more than once. But this article shall not apply to any person holding the Office of President when this article was proposed by the Congress, and shall not prevent any person who may be holding the Office of President, or acting as President, during the term within which this article becomes operative from holding the Office of President or acting as President during the remainder of such term.

"'"SEC. 2. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress"'; Therefore be it

"*Resolved by the General Assembly of the State of Indiana:*

"SECTION 1. That the said proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America be, and the same is hereby, ratified by the General Assembly of the State of Indiana.

"SEC. 2. That certified copies of this preamble and joint resolution be forwarded by the Governor of this State to the Secretary of State at Washington, D. C., to the Presiding Officer of the United States Senate, and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States.

"JOHN A. WATKINS,
"*President of Senate.*
"W. O. HUGHES,
"*Speaker of House of Representatives.*
"Approved January 31, 1951.
"HENRY F. SCHRICKER,
"*Governor of the State of Indiana.*"

A joint resolution of the legislature of the State of Montana; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"House Joint Resolution 1

"Joint resolution of the House of Representatives of the Thirty-second Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, the senate concurring, ratifying proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the terms of office of the President of the United States

"*Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the Thirty-second Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana (the senate concurring therein)*:

"Whereas by joint resolution of the Senate and House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America the following article was proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

"'ARTICLE —

"'SECTION 1. No person shall be elected to the office of the President more than twice, and no person who has held the office of President, or acted as President, for more than two (2) years of a term to which some other person was elected President shall be elected to the office of President more than once. But this article shall not apply to any person holding the office of President when this article was proposed by the Congress, and shall not prevent any person who may be holding the office of President, or acting as President, during the term within which this article becomes operative from holding the office of President or acting as President during the remainder of such term.

"'SEC. 2. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths (¾) of the several States within seven (7) years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress'; and

"Whereas it is provided by the above articles that it shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislature of three-fourths (¾) of the several States: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Montana (the senate concurring therein)*, That the foregoing proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America be, and the same is hereby ratified by the Thirty-second Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That certified copies of this joint resolution be forwarded by the Governor of this State, to the Secretary of State of the United States of America, to the President of the Senate, and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States.

"ORY J. ARMSTRONG,
"*Speaker of the House.*
"PAUL CANNON,
"*President of the Senate.*"

A resolution adopted by the City Council of Baltimore, Md., relating to the burning of the Hawkins Point Ammunition Pier in Baltimore; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A resolution adopted by the executive council of the American Federation of Labor, urging an all-out effort for complete mobilization, and so forth; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Business and Professional Women's Club, Ashland, Ky., relating to the use by the enemy in Korea of arms manufactured in the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"Senate Memorial 2

"Memorializing the President of the United State to immediately go on record as favoring the establishment of a Veterans' Administration intermediary hospital and rehabilitation center at Truth or Consequences (Hot Springs), N. Mex., with a strong department of physical medicine

"*Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico:*

"Whereas the late President of the United States, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, knowing from his own experience the value of physical medicine and after a survey of the possibilities of Truth or Consequences (Hot Springs), N. Mex., gave his moral support for the establishment of a hospital with a strong department of physical medicine; and

"Whereas Mr. Roosevelt, then President of the United States, when informed that there were a large number of veterans from various sections of the United States here "on their own" to regain their health though there were no Veterans' Administration facilities available, the President of the United States brought the matter to the attention of General Hines and asked him to survey the possibilities at Truth or Consequences (Hot Spring), N. Mex., for a Veterans' Administration hospital, with a strong department of physical medicine; and

"Whereas the Disabled American Veterans, the American Legion, and the Veterans of Foreign Wars, each in their respective department and national conventions, endorsed the establishment of a Veterans' Administration Hospital at Truth or Consequences (Hot Springs), N. Mex., for the benefit of their disabled comrades: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico*, That the President of the United States be and he is hereby memorialized to take immediate and proper action as has been resolved by the national conventions of the Disabled American Veterans, the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars by going on record as favoring the establishment of a Veterans' Administration intermediary hospital and rehabilitation center at Truth or Consequences (Hot Springs), N. Mex., with a strong department of physical medicine, and to request

the Veterans' Administration to take immediate action to establish this much needed facility.

"TIBO J. CHAVEZ,
"President, Senate.
"NATALIE S. BUCK,
"Chief Clerk, Senate.

"Approved by me this 30th day of January 1951.

"EDWIN L. MECHEM,
"Governor, State of New Mexico."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"Senate Joint Memorial 2

"Memorial by the Twentieth Legislature of the State of New Mexico memorializing the Congress of the United States, and the New Mexico Representatives therein, to oppose the drafting of 18-year-old youths

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico:

"Whereas it is contemplated that a bill be presented to the Congress of the United States changing the age of drafting men from 19 to 18 years of age; and

"Whereas the drafting of 18-year-olds will interrupt the Nation's youth and the completion of their high-school education; and

"Whereas the United States has a great source of youth to meet the demands of a sufficient Army for the prosecution of the defense of the United States and of any offensive in other parts of the world; and

"Whereas the drafting of 18-year-olds at this time would have a serious effect on the morale of the people: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Congress of the United States and the Members thereof from New Mexico, are hereby respectfully memorialized and urged to defeat any proposed bill which would require the drafting of 18-year-old youths; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be sent to the President of the United States, to the Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Member of the House of Representatives from New Mexico.

"TIBO J. CHAVEZ,
"President, Senate.
"NATALIE S. BUCK,
"Chief Clerk, Senate.
"CALVIN HORN,
"Speaker, House of Representatives.
"SANTOS QUINTANA,
"Chief Clerk, House of Representatives."

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

RESOLUTION OF MILITARY ORDER OF THE PURPLE HEART

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, a few days ago a group of combat-wounded veterans met in convention at Indianapolis, Ind. The convention was officially for the third zone conference of the Military Order of the Purple Heart. The third zone consists of the States of Indiana, Wisconsin, Michigan, Illinois, Kentucky, and Ohio. However, members of the organization from almost every State of the Union were represented.

The convention considered and unanimously adopted a resolution which I consider to be of the utmost importance, especially in view of the fact that it comes from young men who have been tested in battle and not found wanting. While I highly admire a number of other veterans' organizations, this one stands out specially. Each of these young men has been wounded in combat and knows whereof he speaks. I should like to have the resolution appropriately referred and inserted in the body of the RECORD at this point. It deals with the theft of secrets from the Pentagon. It covers the recommendation of these combat-wounded veterans as to what action should be taken by the Justice Department and by the Pentagon, having to do with the theft and publication by an alleged columnist.

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

RESOLUTION PASSED BY THE MILITARY ORDER OF THE PURPLE HEART

Whereas Drew Pearson has lead a smear attack against so many national and international figures who have attempted to fight communism, some of the subjects of his smear attacks being Gen. Douglas MacArthur, James V. Forrestal, Chiang Kai-shek, the various heads of the Un-American Activities Committee, and Senator Joe McCarthy; and

Whereas Pearson has recently been conducting a campaign in his column to discredit the generals in charge of our troops in Korea, as well as the GI's doing the fighting; and

Whereas the Secretary of the Army has stated in a letter that Pearson has been publishing in his column secret military information which indicates that there is a spy in the Pentagon stealing these secrets and passing them to Pearson; and

Whereas it appears that if Pearson has access to the secret information as stated by the Secretary of the Army, he undoubtedly has access to unlimited numbers of like secret documents; and

Whereas this organization feels that this constitutes the gravest threat to our national security and endangers the lives of every member of our Armed Forces, as well as those being drafted: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Military Order of the Purple Heart in convention assembled for the third zone conference at Indianapolis, Ind., this 4th day of February 1951, go on record as demanding that every facility of our Intelligence Service be put to work to immediately find the spy who is stealing military secrets and that then criminal prosecution be immediately commenced against him and against everyone else who has violated our espionage laws by working with this spy.

DRAFTING OF FARM LABOR—RESOLUTION OF WISCONSIN DAIRYMEN'S ASSOCIATION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have received from B. R. Dugdale, secretary of the Wisconsin Dairymen's Association, a resolution adopted by the seventy-ninth convention of that group on an issue affecting every American farmer; namely, selective service. I know that this resolution expresses the views of countless farmers throughout America, as well as their organizations. I ask unanimous consent, therefore, that the resolution be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Senate Armed Services Committee.

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

RESOLUTION ON DRAFTING OF FARM LABOR

Agriculture, particularly the production of dairy, livestock, and poultry products is a basic industry essential to national defense and the preservation of the moral and physical strength of America and her free world democratic allies. Consideration must be given to the fact that reserve supplies of dairy and livestock products are diminishing. A decided shift away from milk and dairy production toward grain and other types of mechanized farming that can utilize import labor, is already in evidence.

Dairy, livestock, and poultry operations require workers of special experience, skill, and aptitude. Selective-service boards should recognize these facts and in the interest of national welfare and defense, retain such essential farm workers on the basis of volume of production and giving consideration to each individual case on the basis of history of farm work and critical family situation.

We believe there should be greater uniformity among the various draft boards in considering these principles. We insist that bona fide farmers be included in the membership of selective-service boards.

In view of the importance of the dairy, livestock, and poultry industry and the threat to sustained production, we recommend that selective-service legislation be enacted as soon as possible to remedy the present threat to our Nation's food emergency.

PRIORITY FOR SCHOOL BUILDING MATERIALS — RESOLUTION OF BOARD OF EDUCATION, SHOREWOOD, WIS.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the educators of Wisconsin, like those of the other States of the Union, are deeply concerned lest in the situation of tightening supplies of building materials the schools of this Nation be forgotten and not be provided with adequate wherewithal to meet increasing enrollments. I have this morning received from one of the school boards of my State in Shorewood, Wis., a resolution urging that there be allocated sufficiently high priorities so that schools can obtain necessary building materials, equipment, and so forth, to handle their problems. I thoroughly agree with the sentiment expressed in this resolution and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 4, VILLAGE OF SHOREWOOD, MILWAUKEE COUNTY, WIS.

Whereas ODM and NPA are apparently ignoring the schools in planning the Nation's defense; and

Whereas to house schools and keep them running we must have priorities for necessary materials and equipment; and

Whereas schools face greater loads than ever before and are being called upon for use and services in the civil-defense program of the Nation; and

Whereas an educated soldier is vital to national security; and

Whereas an educated and resourceful people are necessary for national survival: Be it

Resolved by this board, That the White House, Congress, and defense officials be advised to place a vigorous emphasis on the importance of a high standard of education for both military achievement and industrial production, and that recognition be given to the basic needs of schools over the Nation in meeting the greater enrollments and demands on school plants and facilities for civil-defense and related mobilization programs, and that competent educational consultants and administrators be

used by NPA in planning school priorities, and that speedy implementation of these suggestions be initiated by those entrusted with the grave responsibilities for planning for defense and mobilization; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to (1) the President of the United States; (2) all Members of the Senate and House from Wisconsin; (3) Charles E. Wilson, Director, Office of Defense Mobilization; (4) William Henry Harrison, Administrator, National Production Authority; (5) Earl J. McGrath, United States Commissioner of Education.

Passed and adopted this 26th day of January 1951.

HERMAN W. PFEIL,
District Clerk, Board of Education, Shorewood School District No. 4, Shorewood, Wis.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. ELLENDER (for Mr. AIKEN), from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S. 271. A bill to authorize the transfer to the Vermont Agricultural College of certain lands in Addison County, Vt., for agricultural purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 80).

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

S. Res. 53. Resolution to investigate personnel needs and practices of the various governmental departments and agencies; without amendment (Rept. No. 81), and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

TEMPORARY PERSONNEL FOR COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I report an original resolution (S. Res. 71), and I submit a report (No. 89) thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and, under the rule, the resolution will be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The resolution (S. Res. 71) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings and making investigations as authorized by subsection (1) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, or by sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the period ending on January 1, 1952, to make such expenditures, and to employ upon a temporary basis such professional, administrative, and clerical personnel as it deems advisable.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $125,870, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

REPORT ON LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS IN EAST COAST OIL TANKER INDUSTRY—INDIVIDUAL VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 82)

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, pursuant to Senate Resolution 140, Eighty-first Congress, I submit a report on labor-management relations in the east coast oil tanker industry, including the individual views of the senior Senator from Ohio. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed with the individual views.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and, without objection, printed as requested by the Senator from Montana.

INVESTIGATION OF ORGANIZED CRIME IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE—APPREHENSION OF CERTAIN PERSONS AS WITNESSES

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, from the Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce, I report an original resolution providing for apprehension of certain persons as witnesses, and I submit a report (No. 83) thereon. I ask that the resolution be placed on the calendar for the information of the Senate. I hope that before the resolution is called up that some of the persons named may come out of hiding and make themselves available to the committee. I expect to call the resolution up at an early date. This committee has followed the recommendation of the Committee on the Judiciary and has asked the Sergeant at Arms to subpena the witnesses in addition to other extensive efforts to subpena them.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 65) was ordered to be placed on the calendar, as follows:

Whereas the Special Senate Committee to Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce has reported to the Senate that subpenas have been issued for Rocco Fischetti, Charles Fischetti, Murray L. Humphreys, Jacob Guzik, William G. O'Brien, John Angersola alias King, Moe Dalitz alias Davis, Samuel T. Haas, Morris Kleinman, Louis Rothkapf alias Rhody, Samuel "Gameboy" Miller, Morris "Mushy" Wexler, Samuel Tucker, George Angersola alias King, John Croft, James Brink, and Louis Levinson, and that these persons are important witnesses, necessary to the successful conclusion of inquiries being conducted by that committee pursuant to Senate Resolution 202, Eighty-first Congress, and that the said persons have not been located for service despite diligent search on the part of persons employed by the committee, and peace officers assisting the committee and that thereafter new subpenas calling for the appearance of these persons were handed to the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, pursuant to the policy recommendation of the Judiciary Committee of the Senate, with the request that he endeavor to make service of these subpenas through all the facilities at his command, and that the Sergeant at Arms, after using great diligence in endeavoring to locate the said witnesses and to serve them, has reported to the chairman of the committee that he had been unable to effectuate service; and that the committee has reasonable cause to believe and does believe that the named persons will not appear in response to subpenas but are in hiding or have left the United States in order to evade the service of subpenas upon them and will continue to be unavailable for service of subpenas upon them in order to avoid testifying before the committee; and

Whereas the appearance and testimony of the witnesses named before is material and necessary in order that the committee may properly execute the functions assigned to it and may obtain information necessary as a basis for proposed legislation: It is therefore

Resolved, That the President of the Senate issue warrants commanding the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, or such persons as may be deputized by him, to take into custody the bodies of Rocco Fischetti; Charles Fischetti; Murray L. Humphreys; Jacob Guzik; William G. O'Brien; John Angersola, alias King; Moe Dalitz, alias Davis; Samuel T. Haas; Morris Kleinman; Louis Rothkapf, alias Rhody; Samuel "Gameboy" Miller; Morris "Mushy" Wexler; Samuel Tucker; George Angersola, alias King; John Croft; James Brink; Louis Levinson; and to bring the said persons before the Special Senate Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce at Washington, D. C., or if the said committee be no longer in existence when the arrest is made, before the bar of the Senate or such appropriate standing committee as the Senate may designate, then and there to answer such questions pertinent to the matter under inquiry as the said special committee, the Senate itself or such appropriate standing committee as the Senate may designate;

That, for the purpose of executing warrants issued in accordance with this resolution the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate may by all-inclusive order or orders deputize all law-enforcement officers of the Federal Government; and

That the Special Senate Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce, the Senate itself or such appropriate standing committee as the Senate may designate, may discharge any of the persons taken into custody under the authorization of this resolution upon proper assurance by recognition, or otherwise, that he will appear to give testimony when required to do so. The committee, the Senate, or such appropriate standing committee as the Senate may designate, may require such assurances as it deems necessary, not to exceed $25,000 for any one witness.

For the purpose of discharging any person from custody and ordering assurances, one member of the said committee, or of an appropriately designated standing committee of the Senate, shall be a quorum.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following my remarks short statements prepared by the staff of the committee as to the background of the persons involved, and why they have been sought, be printed in the body of the RECORD.

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

The statements are as follows:

CHARLES AND ROCCO FISCHETTI

Both Charles and Rocco Fischetti have been leading members of the Capone syndicate in Chicago for the better part of 30 years.

Charles Fischetti particularly is today unquestionably one of the most important underworld characters in the Nation. He has been arrested numerous times. In 1933 he and Murray Humphreys were taken into custody and questioned with reference to the murder of the secretary of the Hoisting and Portable Engineers' Union, Local 569. He has maintained close contact with such syndicate members in Chicago as Jacob Guzik, Rocco de Stefano, Paul Ricca, and Tony Accardo. He and Tony Accardo joined together in their flight to Mexico to avoid the committee's subpenas.

Charles Fischetti has also been associated with John and Fred Angersola, of Cleveland. He was active in the gambling games conducted in the Wofford Hotel in Miami, Fla., along with Joe DiCarle of the Cleveland syndicate, Joe Massei of Detroit, and Joe Adonis. Charles Fischetti has also been associated with Jack Dragna, prominent west-coast

hoodlum. He was picked up in a car with Dragna upon returning from a gambling ship off the coast of California.

There was strong indication that he and his brother, Rocco, loaned $300,000 to the Flamingo Hotel venture in Nevada. They are linked to the venture by Barney Ruditsky, who handled bad checks for the Flamingo during "Bugsy" Siegel's regime. Ruditsky claimed that the Fischettis, "Longy" Zwillman of the New York-New Jersey gang, "Nig" Rosen of Philadelphia, and Louis Shomberg have money in this hotel. Charles Fischetti was also reported to have been associated with Virginia Hill, "Bugsy" Siegel's ex-girl friend.

It is alleged that Charles and Rocco Fischetti were involved in two notorious gambling spots near Chicago—the Vernon Country Club and Ralph's Place. Charles Fischetti also has an interest in the 229 Club and the Black Hawk Club in Chicago. The committee has been unable to find out the nature of these clubs because of Fischetti's flight from the committee's subpena.

Rocco Fischetti is closely identified with the activities of his brother, Charles, in gambling ventures in Cook and Lake Counties in Illinois. He was once the bodyguard of John Capone.

MURRAY (THE CAMEL) HUMPHREYS

Humphreys has been a long-time leading member of the Capone syndicate. He was considered the strong-armed man of Al Capone. He was arrested on numerous occasions in connection with labor racketeering, gambling, and vice activities.

He was named in an injunction with other syndicate members as having attempted to take over the Bartenders and Beverage Dispensers Union, Local 278, in Chicago; he was questioned along with Charles Fischetti regarding the murder of the secretary of the Hoisting and Portable Engineers' Union, Local 569; he was described in 1933 by the chief investigator for the State's attorney's office as public enemy No. 1 and the czar of business rackets in Chicago. He was indicted by a Federal grand jury in July 1933, along with Al Capone and 22 others on charges of conspiracy to dominate the cleaning and dyeing industry and carbonated beverages and linen-supply industries through kidnaping, strikes, bombings, and acids; he was sentenced to 18 months in the penitentiary and fined $5,000 for tax evasion. He has a close association with top Capone syndicate members, Paul Ricca, Louis Campagna, the Fischettis, and Jacob Guzik. He and Guzik were reported to be the brains behind the wire-service deal, which sought to push Continental Press out of business.

His name (or rather one of his aliases—J. Harris) was found in "Mo Mo" Adomo's confidential address book, which was seized by Los Angeles police, and which contained the names of leading hoodlums throughout the country. Adomo is Dragna's first lieutenant on the west coast. In 1947 Humphreys was reported to have been in Los Angeles, along with Jacob Guzik, to see Dragna about continuing to take the Capone syndicate wire service—Trans-American.

JACOB GUZIK

Guzik was referred to as the business manager of the Capone syndicate in Capone's heyday. He was accused by James Ragen, Sr., of having tried to muscle into Continental Press, along with other Capone syndicate members—Tony Accardo and Murray Humphreys. Ragen made this statement to the State's attorney's office because he was afraid of his life. Shortly after he made his statement, he was shot and later died. The Capone syndicate then formed its own news service—Trans-American Publishing and News Service, Inc. Guzik was reported to be the brains in back of this deal.

Guzik was sentenced to 5 years in the penitentiary and fined $7,500 for income-tax evasion in 1930. In 1940, he was indicted for violation of the Federal Communications Commission Act with other syndicate members—Frank "Chew Tobacco" Ryan and Hymie "Loud Mouth" Levin.

Guzik and Murray Humphreys were reported to have gone to Los Angeles in 1947 to see Jack Dragna about retaining the Capone syndicate racing news service.

Guzik has been closely affiliated with all the leading members of the Capone syndicate, including John Patton, Frank Nitti (both of whom are now dead), the Fischettis, Paul Ricca, Louis Campagna and, especially Tony Accardo. Guzik today is Accardo's partner in the policy racket in Chicago.

WILLIAM G. (BUTSY) O'BRIEN

Butsy O'Brien (alias William Keough) was formerly the southeastern representative of Moe Annenberg's Nation-wide news service with headquarters in Miami. In 1940, O'Brien was named in a Federal indictment for being involved in schemes to take over this news service, which was abandoned by Moe Annenberg. Named with him in this indictment were such individuals as Arthur V. (Mickey) McBride, Thomas F. Kelly and Mushy Wexler of Cleveland, William Molasky of St. Louis, James Ragen, Sr., of Chicago, and others.

O'Brien is the Florida chief of Continental Press' outlet in Florida—Intrastate News. Through his service, the S. & G. Gambling Syndicate received their racing information. It was this service that was involved in the cut-off in 1949 when the Capone mob muscled into S. & G. It will be recalled that S. & G didn't receive renewed service until after Harry Russell, the Capone mob's representative, was made a partner in the syndicate. O'Brien is the individual who actually ordered the cut-off.

JOHN ANGERSOLA AND GEORGE ANGERSOLA

John Angersola (alias John King) has been closely associated with criminal syndicate members in the Cleveland area and in Florida. More recently he has moved his operations principally to Florida, but before that he and Alfred Polizzi—notorious Cleveland hoodlum—were actively engaged in the slot machine and gambling rackets in Ohio and Kentucky.

Angersola is also closely tied in with Alfred Polizzi in the ownership of valuable real estate in the Miami, Fla., area, and he is intimately connected with prominent hoodlums throughout the country by virtue of his interest in such various hoodlum hotel hangouts as the Wofford, Grand, and Raleigh Hotels in Miami, Fla.

The Wofford Hotel, the well-known meeting place for hoodlums from all over the country, has included among its owners John Angersola, two relatives of his—Otto Lorentzen and John Cardone—Max Marmorstein, a hotel manager and real estate operator from Cleveland, and Frank Erickson and Anthony Carfano, from New York.

Angersola was also associated in gambling games at the Wofford with Little Augie Pisano and Mike Coppola of New York, Joe Massei and Joe Burnstein of Detroit, Charles Fischetti of Chicago, Angelo DiCarlo of New York, and Willie Weisberg of Philadelphia.

John Angersola is one of the creditors in the Grand Hotel in Miami which his brother Fred is connected with and which is another hoodlum haunt, and he also loaned $25,000 to Thomas Cassara toward the building of the Raleigh Hotel in Miami.

George Angersola has been closely tied in with his brother John's gambling activities, both in Cleveland and in Florida. While he is not reflected in the ownership of the Wofford Hotel, he has been one of its frequent patrons along with well-known hoodlums from all over the country.

MOE DALITZ (ALIAS DAVIS)

Dalitz is a leading member of the Cleveland syndicate, although he was one of the few who have managed to avoid a police record. However, his association with syndicate members dates back 20 years or more.

Dalitz, along with another leading syndicate member, Lou Rothkapf, was implicated in the famous murder of a Cleveland City councilman, William Potter, in 1931. It was alleged that Potter was killed because he was about to expose a tie-in between city officials and an advertising company operated by Dalitz.

Dalitz and other syndicate members have been connected with such notorious gambling clubs in Ohio and northern Kentucky as the Mounds Club, the Pettibone Club, the Jungle Inn, the Beverly Hills Club, the Lookout House and the Richmond Country Club, among others.

The syndicate has been able to control the actions of law-enforcement officials to such a degree that their illegal operation is continuing almost unmolested.

Dalitz and his associates also own the fabulous Desert Inn in Las Vegas, Nev. Dalitz is treasurer of the inn. Dalitz has been and still is in a number of legitimate businesses in the Cleveland area.

SAM HAAS

Known as the lawyer for the Cleveland syndicate, Haas has managed to avoid a police record. However, he is closely tied in with the syndicate in its gambling and business ventures.

His name has come up in connection with the Desert Inn, the Cleveland syndicate's famous gambling joint in Nevada, and with certain juke box distribution companies, later found also to be handling slot machines.

Haas also owns valuable property in the Palm Beach, Fla., area—the same area in which Arthur McBride of Cleveland owns a large amount of property. Haas owns the property on which the Palm Beach Ambassador is located. This hotel was built by Burnstein Bros., of Cleveland. One of the officers of Burnstein Bros. is Allard Roen. Roen was the recipient of telephone calls from a west coast gambler, believed to be Mickey Cohen.

MORRIS KLEINMAN

Kleinman, another leading member of the Cleveland gambling syndicate, is an ex-pugilist and ex-bootlegger with a prison record which includes a 3-year stint in jail for income tax evasion.

He has been associated with other syndicate members in all their important gambling operations and in their ties with leading hoodlums throughout the country.

Kleinman is vice president of the Desert Inn in Las Vegas, the inn is controlled by the Cleveland syndicate.

LOUIS ROTHKAPF (ALIAS RHODY)

Rothkapf, an important member of the Cleveland syndicate, has been identified with all the syndicate's principal gambling operations in Ohio and Nevada.

He has been in close touch with Abner Zwillman, big east-coast gambler, and with Mickey Cohen and Jack Dragna on the west coast.

SAMUEL "GAMEBOY" MILLER

Another member of the Cleveland Syndicate, Miller is closely identified with the syndicate in its widespread profitable gambling operations.

He has appeared to be the syndicate's representative in an important Florida gambling operation—the Island Club—which is located at Sunny Islands Casino in Dade County. He is associated in this venture

with Samuel P. Cohen, of the S. & G. Syndicate, Herbert Manheim, of the Detroit gambling fraternity, and Jack Friedlander, a New Jersey lieutenant of Longie Zwillman.

MORRIS "MUSHY" WEXLER

Wexler, a friend and long associate of Arthur McBride's, today owns the Empire News Service, Continental Press' outlet in Ohio. The Empire News Service is the lifeblood of the illegal bookmaking business in Ohio. Wexler also owns a racing stable and has a famous restaurant in Cleveland.

Wexler, in 1939, was indicted with McBride, James Ragen, Sr., William Molasky, of St. Louis, and others for conspiracy to carry from one State to another a list of prizes drawn or awarded by a lottery in violation of the criminal code.

SAMUEL TUCKER

Tucker has long been identified with all the principal gambling operations of the Cleveland Syndicate. In 1930, he was indicted along with Dalitz and Kleinman for operating a huge rum running ring. He is a stockholder in the Desert Inn at Las Vegas.

JOHN CROFT, JAMES BRINK, AND LOUIS LEVINSON

These individuals are local northern Kentucky gamblers, who were taken in as minor partners by the Cleveland Syndicate when it moved into the Newport-Covington, Ky., gambling clubs. The fact that the Cleveland syndicate took in these minor gamblers indicates a new trend in the methods used by the large gambling syndicates. In the old days these small-time gamblers would probably have been shot.

CITATION OF JOSEPH AIUPPA, ALIAS ANTON PALUNAS, ALIAS JOEY O'BRIEN, FOR CONTEMPT

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, from the Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce, I report an original resolution citing Joseph Aiuppa, alias Anton Palunas, alias Joey O'Brien, for contempt of the Senate, and I submit a report (No. 84) thereon. I ask that the resolution be placed on the calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and the resolution will be placed on the calendar, as requested by the Senator from Tennessee.

The resolution (S. Res. 66) was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the President of the Senate certify the report of the Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce of the United States Senate as to the refusal of Joseph Aiuppa, alias Anton Palunas, alias Joey O'Brien, to answer certain questions and his failure to produce certain records in response to subpena duly issued, before the said special committee, together with all the facts in connection therewith, under the seal of the United States Senate, to the United States attorney for the northern district of Ohio to the end that the said Joseph Aiuppa, alias Anton Palunas, alias Joey O'Brien, may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

CITATION OF JOSEPH DECARLO, ALIAS "THE WOLF," ALIAS DICARLO, FOR CONTEMPT

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, from the Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce, I report an original resolution citing Joseph DeCarlo, alias "The Wolf," alias DiCarlo, for contempt of the Senate, and I submit a report (No. 85) thereon. I ask that the resolution be placed on the calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and the resolution will be placed on the calendar, as requested by the Senator from Tennessee.

The resolution (S. Res. 67) was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the President of the Senate certify the report of the Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce of the United States Senate as to the refusal of Joseph DeCarlo, alias "The Wolf," alias DiCarlo, to answer certain questions and his failure to produce certain records in response to subpena duly issued, before the said special committee, together with all the facts in connection therewith, under the seal of the United States Senate, to the United States attorney for the northern district of Ohio, to the end that the said Joseph DeCarlo, alias "The Wolf," alias DiCarlo, may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

CITATION OF JAMES LICAVOLI, ALIAS JACK WHITE, FOR CONTEMPT

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, from the Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce, I report an original resolution citing James Licavoli, alias Jack White, for contempt of the Senate, and I submit a report (No. 86) thereon. I ask that the resolution be placed on the calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and the resolution will be placed on the calendar, as requested by the Senator from Tennessee.

The resolution (S. Res. 68) was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the President of the Senate certify the report of the Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce of the United States Senate as to the refusal of James Licavoli, alias Jack White, to answer certain questions and his failure to produce certain records in response to subpena duly issued, before the said special committee, together with all the facts in connection therewith, under the seal of the United States Senate, to the United States attorney for the northern district of Ohio, to the end that the said James Licavoli, alias Jack White, may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

CITATION OF PETER TREMONT FOR CONTEMPT

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, from the Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce, I report an original resolution citing Peter Tremont for contempt of the Senate, and I submit a report (No. 87) thereon. I ask that the resolution be placed on the calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and the resolution will be placed on the calendar, as requested by the Senator from Tennessee.

The resolution (S. Res. 69) was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the President of the Senate certify the report of the Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce of the United States Senate as to the refusal of Peter Tremont to answer certain questions and his failure to produce certain records in response to subpena duly issued, before the said special committee, together with all the facts in connection therewith, under the seal of the United States Senate, to the United States attorney for the northern district of Illinois, to the end that the said Peter Tremont may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

CITATION OF DAVID N. KESSEL FOR CONTEMPT

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, from the Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce, I report an original resolution citing David N. Kessel for contempt of the Senate, and I submit a report (No. 88) thereon. I ask that the resolution be placed on the calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and the resolution will be placed on the calendar, as requested by the Senator from Tennessee.

The resolution (S. Res. 70) was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the President of the Senate certify the report of the Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce of the United States Senate as to the refusal of David N. Kessel to answer certain questions and his failure to produce certain records in response to subpena duly issued, before the said special committee, together with all the facts in connection therewith, under the seal of the United States Senate, to the United States attorney for the northern district of California, to the end that the said David N. Kessel may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

ADDITIONAL REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT IN EXECUTIVE BRANCH

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, I submit an additional report on civilian employment in the executive branch of the Federal Government for the month of December 1950, and in accordance with the practice of several years' standing, I request that it be printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks, together with a statement by me.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD

Civilian employment in the executive branch of the Federal Government increased 21,415 during the month of December, bringing the total to 2,184,693.

The December civilian employment by the Military Establishment totaled 988,441, and in the civilian agencies the total was 1,196,252.

There was a net decrease in the civilian agencies during the month, resulting primarily from a seasonal decrease of 1,535 in the Department of Agriculture.

Civilian employment by the Military Establishment increased by 21,520, including an increase of 880 detailed to the mutual defense assistance program.

Among the new emergency agencies in December the National Production Authority was employing 789; the Defense Transportation Administration was employing 31;

the Economic Stabilization Agency was employing 225; the Federal Civilian Defense Administration was employing 99; and the Office of Defense Mobilization was employing 8.

These figures were published today in a compilation of personnel reports submitted by the various agencies of the Government to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures. The same reports showed the civilian payroll in the executive branch during November totaled $611,027,000, an increase of $8,000,000 over the payroll costs in October.

PERSONNEL AND PAY SUMMARY

(See table I)

According to monthly personnel reports for December 1950 submitted to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures:

Department or agency	Civilian personnel in executive branch			Payroll (in thousands) in executive branch		
	In December numbered—	In November numbered—	Increase (+) or decrease (−)	In November was—	In October was—	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
Total	2,184,693	2,163,278	+21,415	$611,027	$602,668	+$8,359
1. Agencies exclusive of National Military Establishment	1,196,252	1,196,357	−105	344,062	341,555	+2,507
2. National Military Establishment	988,441	966,921	+21,520	266,965	261,113	+5,852
Within the National Military Establishment:						
Office of the Secretary of Defense	1,958	1,942	+16	844	787	+57
Department of the Army	433,998	425,100	+8,898	108,711	106,646	+2,065
Department of the Air Force	186,359	183,505	+2,854	51,379	50,695	+684
Department of the Navy	366,126	356,374	+9,752	106,031	102,985	+3,046

MUTUAL DEFENSE ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

Table V on page 10 shows personnel counted in tables I, II, III, and IV who are assigned to the mutual defense assistance program by the Commerce and State Departments, Economic Cooperation Administration, and the component units of the National Military Establishment, together with their pay.

TABLE I.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during December 1950, and comparison with November 1950; and pay for November 1950, and comparison with October 1950*

Department or agency	Pay (in thousands of dollars)				Personnel			
	October	November	Increase	Decrease	November	December	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except National Military Establishment):								
Agriculture	$21,459	$21,082		$377	74,285	72,750		1,535
Commerce [1 2 3]	17,730	17,893	$163		56,574	56,819	245	
Interior	18,211	17,997		214	59,840	59,429		411
Justice	10,203	10,687	484		27,264	27,609	345	
Labor	2,308	2,216		92	6,473	6,430		43
Post Office	129,665	129,869	204		494,937	495,278	341	
State	7,675	7,997	322		25,053	25,474	421	
Treasury	28,605	29,331	726		87,596	87,877	281	
Executive Office of the President:								
White House Office	149	149			329	324		5
Bureau of the Budget	255	257	2		505	510	4	
Executive Mansion and Grounds	17	18	1		78	73		5
National Security Council [4]	9	9			17	17		
National Security Resources Board	240	[5] 241	1		490	409		81
Council of Economic Advisers	22	22			36	38	2	
Commission on Renovation of the Executive Mansion	2	3	1		5	7	2	
Emergency agencies (1950–51):								
Defense Transport Administration		4	4		17	31	14	
Economic Stabilization Agency	3	19	16		96	225	129	
Federal Civil Defense Administration [6]						99	99	
Office of Defense Mobilization [7]						8	8	
Postwar agencies:								
Displaced Persons Commission	112	114	2		294	312	18	
Economic Cooperation Administration	1,675	1,729	54		4,918	5,016	98	
Motor Carrier Claims Commission	9	9			15	15		
Office of the Housing Expediter	900	911	11		2,621	2,530		91
Philippine Alien Property Administration	9	8		1	58	58		
Philippine War Damage Commission	115	103		12	304	72		232
War Claims Commission	34	33		1	111	113	2	
Independent agencies:								
American Battle Monuments Commission	67	69	2		639	639		
Atomic Energy Commission	1,976	1,997	21		5,090	5,107	17	
Civil Aeronautics Board	261	248		13	567	567		
Civil Service Commission	1,179	1,216	37		3,669	3,719	50	
Export-Import Bank of Washington	62	67	5		124	128	4	
Federal Communications Commission	508	512	4		1,239	1,232		7
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	414	416	2		1,089	1,076		13
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	177	185	8		328	333	5	
Federal Power Commission	303	309	6		722	735	13	
Federal Security Agency [8]	10,003	10,187	184		34,865	34,891	26	
Federal Trade Commission	287	287			623	623		
General Accounting Office	2,678	2,653		25	7,093	7,041		52
General Services Administration	6,919	7,145	226		26,478	26,878	400	
Government Printing Office	2,613	2,506		107	7,174	7,173		1
Housing and Home Finance Agency	5,111	5,027		84	14,266	14,187		79
Indian Claims Commission	7	7			10	11	1	
Interstate Commerce Commission	830	836	6		2,050	2,077	27	
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	2,446	2,527	81		7,346	7,360	14	
National Capital Housing Authority	87	88	1		319	322	3	
National Capital Park and Planning Commission	2	3	1		19	19		
National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission	24	14		10	24	8		16
National Gallery of Art	84	83		1	300	319	19	
National Labor Relations Board	550	576	26		1,487	1,557	70	
National Mediation Board	62	69	7		114	113		1

[1] Includes temporary employees (enumerators, supervisors, and clerks) engaged in taking the Seventeenth Decennial Census as follows: November, 408; December, 347; a decrease of 60.

[2] December figure is exclusive of 285 seamen on the rolls of the Maritime Administration and their pay.

[3] Includes 789 employees for the National Production Authority, an increase of 137 over the November total of 652.

[4] Exclusive of personnel and pay of the Central Intelligence Agency.

[5] Includes $48,042 obligated for Civil Defense Office before Federal Civil Defense Administration was established.

[6] New agency established under authority of Executive Order No. 10186, dated Dec. 1, 1950, activated Dec. 1, 1950.

[7] New agency established under authority of Executive Order No. 10193, dated Dec. 16, 1950, activated Dec. 21, 1950.

[8] Includes personnel and pay for Howard University and Columbia Institution for the Deaf.

TABLE I.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during December 1950, and comparison with November 1950; and pay for November 1950, and comparison with October 1950*—Continued

Department or agency	Pay (in thousands of dollars)				Personnel			
	October	November	Increase	Decrease	November	December	Increase	Decrease
Independent agencies—Continued								
National Science Foundation [9]						24	24	
Panama Canal	$3,053	$3,202	$149		20,223	20,137		86
Railroad Retirement Board	677	666		$11	2,126	2,117		9
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	1,509	1,525	16		3,517	3,454		63
Securities and Exchange Commission	453	460	7		1,054	1,054		
Selective Service System	1,360	1,396	36		7,212	7,466	254	
Smithsonian Institution	172	180	8		564	571	7	
Soldiers' Home	109	109			735	735		
Tariff Commission	99	98		1	214	212		2
Tax Court of the United States	55	57	2		132	133	1	
Tennessee Valley Authority	4,699	4,428		271	14,850	15,161	311	
Veterans' Administration	53,312	54,213	901		188,178	187,550		628
Total, excluding National Military Establishment	341,555	344,062	3,727	1,220	1,196,357	1,196,252	3,255	3,360
Net change, excluding National Military Establishment			2,507				105	
National Military Establishment:								
Office of the Secretary of Defense [10]	787	844	57		1,942	1,958	16	
Department of the Army:								
Inside continental United States	96,195	98,288	2,093		380,693	389,134	8,441	
Outside continental United States	10,451	10,423		28	44,407	44,864	457	
Department of the Air Force:								
Inside continental United States	45,653	46,022	369		158,016	160,808	2,792	
Outside continental United States	5,042	5,357	315		25,489	25,551	62	
Department of the Navy:								
Inside continental United States	96,502	99,306	2,804		330,138	338,254	8,116	
Outside continental United States	6,483	6,725	242		26,236	27,872	1,636	
Total, National Military Establishment	261,113	266,965	5,880	28	966,921	988,441	21,520	
Net increase, National Military Establishment			5,852				21,520	
Grand total, including National Military Establishment	602,668	611,027	9,607	1,248	2,163,278	2,184,693	24,775	3,360
Net increase, including National Military Establishment			8,359				21,415	

[9] New agency established under authority of Public Law 507, 81st Cong., dated May 10, 1950, activated Dec. 12, 1950.

[10] Includes 18 employees assigned to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and 223 employees assigned to Munitions Board Cataloging Agency.

TABLE II.—*Federal personnel inside continental United States employed by executive agencies during December 1950, and comparison with November 1950*

Department or agency	November	December	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except National Military Establishment):				
Agriculture	71,808	70,333		1,475
Commerce [1 2 3]	52,860	53,141	281	
Interior	53,257	52,976		281
Justice	26,774	27,112	338	
Labor	6,338	6,298		40
Post Office	493,098	493,440	342	
State	9,039	9,213	174	
Treasury	86,844	87,123	279	
Executive Office of the President:				
White House Office	329	324		5
Bureau of the Budget	506	510	4	
Executive Mansion and Grounds	78	73		5
National Security Council [4]	17	17		
National Security Resources Board	490	409		81
Council of Economic Advisers	36	38	2	
Commission on Renovation of the Executive Mansion	5	7	2	
Emergency agencies (1950-51):				
Defense Transport Administration	17	31	14	
Economic Stabilization Agency	96	225	129	
Federal Civil Defense Administration [5]		99	99	
Office of Defense Mobilization [6]		8	8	
Postwar agencies:				
Displaced Persons Commission	102	103	1	
Economic Cooperation Administration	1,189	1,203	14	
Motor Carrier Claims Commission	15	15		
Office of the Housing Expediter	2,595	2,503		92
Philippine Alien Property Administration	2	2		
Philippine War Damage Commission	6	35	29	
War Claims Commission	102	104	2	
Independent agencies:				
American Battle Monuments Commission	17	17		
Atomic Energy Commission	5,085	5,102	17	
Civil Aeronautics Board	553	553		
Civil Service Commission	3,665	3,716	51	
Export-Import Bank of Washington	123	127	4	
Federal Communications Commission	1,214	1,207		7
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,089	1,076		13
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	328	333	5	
Federal Power Commission	722	735	13	
Federal Security Agency [7]	34,567	34,588	21	
Federal Trade Commission	623	623		
General Accounting Office	7,093	7,041		52
Independent agencies—Continued				
General Services Administration	26,415	26,819	404	
Government Printing Office	7,174	7,173		1
Housing and Home Finance Agency	14,169	14,088		81
Indian Claims Commission	10	11	1	
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,050	2,077	27	
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	7,346	7,360	14	
National Capital Housing Authority	319	322	3	
National Capital Park and Planning Commission	19	19		
National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission	24	8		16
National Gallery of Art	300	319	19	
National Labor Relations Board	1,473	1,543	70	
National Mediation Board	114	113		1
National Science Foundation [8]		24	24	
Panama Canal	621	619		2
Railroad Retirement Board	2,126	2,117		9
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	3,507	3,444		63
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,054	1,054		
Selective Service System	6,976	7,227	251	
Smithsonian Institution	556	563	7	
Soldiers' Home	735	735		
Tariff Commission	214	212		2
Tax Court of the United States	132	133	1	
Tennessee Valley Authority	14,850	15,161	311	
Veterans' Administration	186,653	186,045		608
Total, excluding National Military Establishment	1,137,519	1,137,646	2,961	2,834
Net increase, excluding National Military Establishment			127	
National Military Establishment:				
Office of the Secretary of Defense	1,940	1,957	17	
Department of the Army	380,693	389,134	8,441	
Department of the Air Force	158,016	160,808	2,792	
Department of the Navy	330,138	338,254	8,116	
Total, National Military Establishment	870,787	890,153	19,366	
Net increase, National Military Establishment			19,366	
Grand total, including National Military Establishment	2,008,306	2,027,799	22,327	2,834
Net increase, including National Military Establishment			19,493	

[1] Includes temporary employees (enumerators, supervisors, and clerks) engaged in taking the Seventeenth Decennial Census as follows: November, 408; December, 347; a decrease of 60.

[2] December figure is exclusive of 285 seamen on the rolls of the Maritime Administration.

[3] Includes 789 employees for the National Production Authority, an increase of 137 over November total of 652.

[4] Exclusive of personnel of the Central Intelligence Agency.

[5] New agency established under authority of Executive Order No. 10186, dated Dec. 1, 1950, activated Dec. 1, 1950.

[6] New agency established under authority of Executive Order No. 10193, dated Dec. 16, 1950, activated Dec. 21, 1950.

[7] Includes personnel for Howard University and Columbia Institute for the Deaf.

[8] New agency established under authority of Public Law 507, 81st Cong., dated May 10, 1950, activated Dec. 12, 1950.

TABLE III.—*Federal personnel outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during December 1950, and comparison with November 1950*

Department or agency	November	December	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except National Military Establishment):				
Agriculture	2,477	2,417		60
Commerce	3,714	3,678		36
Interior	6,583	6,453		130
Justice	490	497	7	
Labor	135	132		3
Post Office	1,839	1,838		1
State	16,014	16,261	247	
Treasury	752	754	2	
Postwar agencies:				
Displaced Persons Commission	192	209	17	
Economic Cooperation Administration	3,729	3,813	84	
Office of the Housing Expediter	26	27	1	
Philippine Alien Property Administration	56	56		
Philippine War Damage Commission	298	37		261
War Claims Commission	9	9		
Independent agencies:				
American Battle Monuments Commission	622	622		
Atomic Energy Commission	5	5		
Civil Aeronautics Board	14	14		
Civil Service Commission	4	3		1
Export-Import Bank of Washington	1	1		
Federal Communications Commission	25	25		
Federal Security Agency	298	303	5	
General Services Administration	63	59		4
Housing and Home Finance Agency	97	99	2	
Independent agencies—Continued				
National Labor Relations Board	14	14		
Panama Canal	19,602	19,518		84
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	10	10		
Selective Service System	236	239	3	
Smithsonian Institution	8	8		
Veterans' Administration	1,525	1,505		20
Total, excluding National Military Establishment	58,838	58,606	368	600
Net decrease, excluding National Military Establishment			232	
National Military Establishment:				
Office of the Secretary of Defense	2	1		1
Department of the Army	44,407	44,864	457	
Department of the Air Force	25,489	25,551	62	
Department of the Navy	26,236	27,872	1,636	
Total, National Military Establishment	96,134	98,288	2,155	1
Net increase, National Military Establishment			2,154	
Grand total, including National Military Establishment	154,972	156,894	2,523	601
Net increase, including National Military Establishment			1,922	

TABLE IV.—*Industrial employees of the Federal Government inside and outside continental United States employed by executive agencies during December 1950, and comparison with November 1950*

Department or agency	November	December	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except National Military Establishment):				
Commerce	1,364	1,287		77
Interior	4,902	4,700		202
State	560	495		65
Treasury	8,321	8,385	64	
Independent agencies:				
Atomic Energy Commission	116	119	3	
General Services Administration	97	120	23	
Panama Canal	1,536	1,516		20
Smithsonian Institution	8	8		
Tennessee Valley Authority	8,317	8,518	201	
Total, excluding National Military Establishment	25,221	25,148	291	364
Net decrease, excluding National Military Establishment			73	
National Military Establishment:				
Department of the Army:				
Inside continental United States	206,722	212,409	5,687	
Outside continental United States	24,378	24,849	471	
Department of the Air Force:				
Inside continental United States	89,294	90,738	1,444	
Outside continental United States	18,829	18,746		83
Department of the Navy:				
Inside continental United States	221,607	227,924	6,317	
Outside continental United States	19,666	21,240	1,574	
Total, National Military Establishment	580,496	595,906	15,493	83
Net increase, National Military Establishment			15,410	
Grand total, including National Military Establishment	605,717	621,054	15,784	447
Net increase, including National Military Establishment			15,337	

TABLE V.—*Federal employees assigned to mutual defense assistance program*

Department or agency	Civilian personnel			Payroll (in thousands)		
	In December numbered—	In November numbered—	Increase (+) or decrease (−)	In November was—	In October was—	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
Total	28,259	27,379	+880	$7,990	$7,947	+$43
Commerce Department	1	1		1	1	
State Department	251	243	+8	102	83	+19
Economic Cooperation Administration	17	11	+6	8	6	+2
Office of the Secretary of Defense	41	41		17	17	
Department of the Army	23,930	23,404	+526	6,871	6,791	+80
Department of the Air Force	1,003	1,116	−113	258	285	−27
Department of the Navy	3,016	2,563	+453	733	764	−31

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. LODGE:

S. 808. A bill for the relief of Sisters Adelaide Canelas and Maria Isabel Franco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LODGE (for himself and Mr. PASTORE):

S. 809. A bill to waive certain requirements of the naturalization laws in the case of persons whose sons or daughters have served in the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 810. A bill for the relief of Howard I. Smith;

S. 811. A bill for the relief of Mitsuko Sakata Lord; and

S. 812. A bill for the relief of Ramakant Pandurang Patil; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska:

S. 813. A bill to provide for disposition of inherited interests in the estates of deceased Indian allottees; and

S. 814. A bill to provide for disposition of inherited interests in the estates of deceased Indian allottees under jurisdiction of the Winnebago Indian Agency in Nebraska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McFARLAND:

S. 815. A bill to erect a suitable shrine on the U. S. S. *Arizona* at Pearl Harbor in memory of the crew killed in the Japanese attack on December 7, 1941; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. YOUNG:

S. 816. A bill for the relief of Kay Adel Snedeker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ECTON:

S. 817. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the States of Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming to negotiate and enter into a compact

for the disposition, allocation, diversion, and apportionment of the waters of the Columbia River and its tributaries, and for other purposes; and

S. 818. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Ellsworth Schroeder; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

S. 819. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Dolores Hogan; and

S. 820. A bill for the relief of Nicolas Echevarria; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S. 821. A bill for the relief of Wong Woo, also known as William Curtis;

S. 822. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Robert M. Sternberg;

S. 823. A bill for the relief of Arthur Lilienfeld; and

S. 824. A bill for the relief of Gertrud Lomnitz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILGORE (for himself and Mr. NEELY):

S. 825. A bill to provide a transcontinental superhighway with alternate sections; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 826. A bill to provide free postage for members of the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 827. A bill for the relief of Fred P. Hines; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THYE:

S. 828. A bill for the relief of Berta Gomes Leite; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (by request):

S. 829. A bill to amend section 207, title II, part I, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 830. A bill to recognize nonprofit, nonpolitical veterans' organizations for purposes of bestowing upon them certain benefits, rights, privileges, and prerogatives; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 831. A bill to amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944, as amended, so as to provide for designated representatives thereunder of certain veterans' organizations; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(Mr. CASE introduced Senate bill 832, to reduce the annual leave of Federal officers and employees to 15 days during the continuance of the existing national emergency, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAYBANK:

S. 833. A bill to coordinate the small-business activities of the Government and achieve full utilization of independent small-business enterprises in the national defense program; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MUNDT:

S. 834. A bill to declare that the United States holds certain lands in trust for the Oglala Sioux Tribe of the Pine Ridge Reservation in the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 835. A bill for the relief of Sook Kat; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. HUMPHREY also introduced Senate bill 836, to establish a temporary National Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, which was referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 837. A bill to provide funds for cooperation with the public school authorities of Valencia County, N. Mex., in the construction and improvement of public school facilities; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(Mr. CAIN introduced Senate bill 838, to provide for per capita distribution of tribal funds of the Colville Indians, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. CAIN also introduced Senate bill 839, for the relief of Alice Ibrahim Hannan Ibrahim, Yacoub Mayous Muhannad Eiliyan, Afifeh Michail Jiries Issa Matar, Ellen Issa Zakaria, Ruth Naomi Schut, and Roseileen Schut, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. CAIN also introduced Senate bill 840, for the relief of Harue Sato, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. RUSSELL (by request):

S. 841. A bill to make certain revisions in titles I through IV of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, as amended, and for other purposes;

S. 842. A bill to authorize the transfer of certain military prisoners and confinement facilities to the control and management of the Attorney General; and

S. 843. A bill to authorize advances for clothing and equipment to cadets at the Military Academy and to midshipmen at the Naval Academy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(Mr. CASE introduced Senate Joint Resolution 31, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide representation in the electoral college for the District of Columbia and certain Territories of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

REDUCTION OF ANNUAL LEAVE OF FEDERAL OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to reduce the annual leave of Federal officers and employees to 15 days during the continuance of the existing national emergency, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the bill together with a statement by me explaining the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the full statement will be printed in the RECORD, as requested by the Senator from South Dakota.

The bill (S. 832) to reduce the annual leave of Federal officers and employees to 15 days during the continuance of the existing national emergency, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. CASE, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

That from and after July 1, 1951, and during the continuance of the present national emergency proclaimed by the President on December 16, 1950, annual leave with pay shall be granted and allowed to civilian officers and employees of the Government of the United States whose appointments are on an annual or monthly basis at the rate of not to exceed 15 working days per annum. No such annual leave shall be accrued and carried forward from one fiscal year to another fiscal year, but shall be taken and used during the fiscal year in which the same shall be earned from and after July 1, 1951: *Provided*, That nothing herein contained shall be construed as affecting any annual leave that has heretofore been or shall be accrued to and including June 30, 1951.

SEC. 2. All laws and parts of laws in conflict herewith are hereby suspended during the continuance of the existing national emergency proclaimed by the President by Proclamation No. 2914 of December 16, 1950.

The statement presented by Mr. CASE is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CASE

Today, I am introducing in the Senate a companion bill to that introduced by the Honorable CHARLES VURSELL in the House of Representatives to make the annual leave privileges of regular Federal employees the same as that of postal employees during the declared national emergency.

This bill will save from $200,000,000 to $250,000,000 per year during the national emergency.

The terms of the bill cut back the present 26-day annual leave for nonpostal employees to the 15-day leave rights of the postal employees. It does not affect the 500,000 postal workers who have never had more than 15 days annual leave with pay. It does not affect sick leave.

When one remembers that the 15 days leave means the working days of three 5-day weeks, this does not seem an unfair request to make during a national emergency. This bill does not affect existing law which provides increased pay for overtime above 40 hours.

The accumulation of accrued leave from year to year has created a liability against the Government of $581,000,000 today. That is a real national debt not shown in Treasury figures. It is a bill the Government must pay under the law. The proposal which Mr. VURSELL and I have made would prevent that amount from growing by requiring that annual leave must be taken in the year for which it accrues. The purpose of establishing leave was to increase efficiency. The Government does not get that increased efficiency when leave is permitted to pile up and become simply a new debt.

I feel sure that the great rank and file of the citizens of the country, if they could speak, would say that they see no reason why nonpostal employees should receive 26 days of leave, not counting sick leave, when postal employees receive only 15. This proposal should be adopted for the national emergency.

TEMPORARY NATIONAL COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to establish a temporary National Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, and I ask unanimous consent that a statement by me explaining the purposes of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 836) to establish a temporary National Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

The statement presented by Mr. HUMPHREY is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUMPHREY

I am again introducing a bill to create a temporary bipartisan National Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. This bill is identical with one introduced by me last year with the cosponsorship of 41 Senators.

The volume and complexity of relationships between the Federal Government and State and local governments will be substantially increased as a result of the defense mobilization program. I, therefore, feel it is extremely essential that the establishment of a National Commission on Intergovernmental Relations not be delayed, and that the Commission be instructed to submit its report as well as its recommendations as soon as possible. Federal activity in the fields of defense housing, supply and distribution of farm labor, emergency maternity and infant care, maintenance of community facilities, payments in lieu of taxes, employment administration, and civilian defense will account for this increase in conflicts between levels of government.

It was the Hoover Commission's specific recommendation that such a Commission be established not only because Federal-State relations is a question of our federal system of government, but also to accomplish its other recommendations in an adequate and orderly manner. Although the Hoover Commission recommended that such a Commission be of a continuing nature, I feel it is only fair that the Congress have an opportunity to review such a Commission's work before establishing it on a permanent basis; and, therefore, the bill which I have introduced provides for a temporary Commission. I do not, however, wish this to be interpreted as precluding the temporary Commission's becoming a continuing one if that should prove desirable.

I anticipate that this bipartisan Commission would divide its recommendations into two categories: those affecting the present emergency and those of a permanent or nonemergency character. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations in the Eighty-first Congress, at which time extensive hearings were held, I can say that the testimony was both unanimously and enthusiastically in favor of the establishment of such a Commission.

DISTRIBUTION OF TRIBUNAL FUNDS OF COLVILLE INDIANS

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for per capita distribution of tribal funds of the Colville Indians, and I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with a statment by me explaining the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 838) to provide for per capita distribution of tribal funds of the Colville Indians, introduced by Mr. CAIN, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to distribute per capita to the enrolled members of the Colville Indian Tribe who are living at the date of such payment all funds on deposit in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of such tribe on the date of enactment of this act.

SEC. 2. Amounts paid to members of the Colville Tribe under this act shall not be subject to any lien or other claim arising prior to the date of such payment.

The statement presented by Mr. CAIN is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CAIN

Under the terms of an act of the Congress dated February 12, 1929, there was established in the United States Treasury a fund to be held in trust for the Colville Indian Tribe of Washington State. This fund has increased through timber sales, grazing fees, and accrued interest to the sum of $1,498,905.25 as of February 8, 1951. This money, on deposit with the United States Treasury, to the credit of the enrolled members of the Colville Tribe, is drawing interest as provided in the statute at the rate of 4 percent per annum, payable semiannually.

On November 21, 1950, a Senate subcommittee held a public hearing in Spokane, Wash., on legislation then pending pertinent to the Colville Tribe. As part of the official record of that hearing, there was introduced a petition, signed by 599 members of the Colville Tribe. I quote in part from that petition, which, Mr. President, may be found in its entirety in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 22, 1951, on page 491:

"Whereas $1,600,000 of Colville Indian funds is now in the hands of the United States Government from the sale of timber and the leasing of grazing lands;

* * * * *

"It is therefore necessary for the undersigned to take action by this petition for the purpose of distributing the above funds for the general benefit and welfare of the whole tribe; and therefore, the undersigned hereby petition Congress to authorize the distribution of said fund by a per capita payment to the Colville Indian Tribe.

"CHRISTINE WILLIAMS
(And 598 others)."

I am informed that the 599 petitioners, who ask that the money now held for their account in the United States Treasury be distributed to them, comprise a majority of the adult members of the tribe presently living on the reservation.

Therefore, first because these tribal members have petitioned the Congress for this per capita payment, and secondly, in behalf of the American taxpayer, who has and presently pays annual interest on this trust fund in the amount of $60,000, the junior Senator from Washington believes the bill just sent to the desk for appropriate reference to be in the public interest, and commends its serious consideration to his colleagues.

ALICE IBRAHIM HANNAN IBRAHIM, ET AL.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill for the relief of Alice Ibrahim Hannan Ibrahim, Yacoub Mayous Muhannad Elliyan, Afifeh Michail Jiries Issa Matar, Ellen Issa Zakaria, Ruth Naomi Schut, and Roseileen Schut, six children who are refugees from the Palestine war. I ask unanimous consent that a statement by me explaining the bill, and an article from the Yakima Republic by Ray Ruppert, which gives a good summary of this case be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill and statement presented by the Senator from Washington, together with the article from the Yakima Republic will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The bill (S. 839) for the relief of Alice Ibrahim Hannan Ibrahim, Yacoub Mayous Muhannad Elliyan, Afifeh Michail Jiries Issa Mater, Ellen Issa Zakaria, Ruth Naomi Schut, and Roseileen Schut, introduced by Mr. CAIN, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Alice Ibrahim Hannan Ibrahim, Yacoub Mayous Muhannad Elliyan, Afifeh Michail Jiries Issa Mater, Ellen Issa Zakaria, Ruth Naomi Schut, and Roseileen Schut, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees and head taxes. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota officer to deduct the required number from the appropriate quota or quotas for the first year that such quota or quotas are available.

The statement presented by Mr. CAIN is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CAIN

The bill provides for the relief of six children who are refugees from the Palestine war. They were brought to this country in 1948 by Mrs. Dorothy J. Schut and her husband, now deceased, from an Arab village where all six were wandering half starved as homeless waifs. The Schuts brought the children to Yakima, in my State of Washington, after untold and unbelievable hardships, and together with their own three children have raised them as their own. In the 3 years that these children have lived for the first time in their lives in peace, security, and with enough to eat, they have developed from frightened, hopeless little wanderers into bright-eyed, happy, well-adjusted children. Mrs. Schut wants them to stay with her in America until they are grown and educated to be able to take care of themselves and to be able to share their knowledge and training with those in their homeland, where she plans eventually to return them, and to go herself to reestablish the orphanage she and her late husband founded in 1945 near Bethlehem and ran against superhuman odds for 3 years.

The children are in the United States on refugee permits and paroled to Mrs. Schut. Since 1948 she has been working to change the children's status. Time and again she has appealed the decisions of the Immigration Service and several times the Government has extended the children's paroles. The Government has now refused further extension, and unless this bill is passed, Mrs. Schut will travel 9,000 miles to return these children to a war-ridden country to face a tragic future.

The Immigration Service is not, from my study of the case, to be criticized for denying an extension of the children's paroles. The Immigration Service is doing only what the law requires.

My hope is that the Congress will recognize the extraordinary character of the case which involves these six children, and that an exception to the law will be granted.

These children are as close to her heart as her own. "These are my children," she said. "Jackie came to me when he was 2 days old; Ruthie, a few months. I have no wish to keep them in America, to rear them in luxury. I want to return them to their own people to share what they learn. And I want to go with them. But not yet. Not when there is war and poverty and misery in their own land and before they are ready to help their own. Give me 10 years. Give me time to raise these children whom I found as waifs. Let me send them to American schools, train them to be nurses, cooks, and

mechanics. Then let me take them back to their homeland, living testimony to the greatness of America. Don't send these children now back to a land where Jew and Arab still fight and where these children will face death."

What more convincing testimony could we have than Mrs. Schut's appeal for permission to keep and raise these children in America than this? Testimony of her willingness to make happy, well-adjusted adults out of six tragic little souls whom she has saved and whom she plans in the future to return to their homeland, prepared to take their places in life and in their country which so sorely needs the kind of persons she is raising them to be.

The article from the Yakima Republic by Ray Ruppert is as follows:

BRAVE WOMAN BATTLES FOR REFUGEE CHILDREN

(By Ray Ruppert)

Uncle Sam wrote a short, although not unkind, letter to Mrs. Dorothy J. Schut, of Yakima, last week. He told her that the six refugee children she rescued 3 years ago from war and misery in Palestine must be returned to that unhappy land immediately.

The letter was neither unexpected nor welcome. If Mrs. Schut does what the letter says she must do, she will trek again 9,000 miles from Yakima to a village near Jerusalem. The worst she can expect there for her six waifs is death and the best is hunger and sickness and poverty.

THE SHADOW OF DEATH

Mrs. Schut is a brave woman. Many times she has passed through the valley of the shadow of death. She has not yet abandoned her 3-year tug-of-war with immigration authorities over the future of "her" children.

The situation is this: The six Palestinian children, ages 3 to 21, live with Mrs. Schut and her own children, Donna Mae, 12, and Alfred, 20, at 203 South Hillcrest Avenue.

Mrs. Schut's husband died a year and a half ago of tropical dysentery, contracted in Palestine.

The household is supported by Alfred, who works in a fruit warehouse, and by the help of friends who give Mrs. Schut fruit and vegetables and old clothing for the children.

Mrs. Schut brought the children into the United States from Palestine in 1948 as refugees from the bitter Arab-Israeli war then raging. They were to have visitor's permits, but in the confusion of war the children were admitted as refugees and paroled to Mrs. Schut. This meant the waifs could stay only until their h meland stabilized enough for them to return.

Since 1948 Mrs. Schut has been battling to change the children's status. Time and again she has appealed decisions of the Immigration Service and several times the Government has extended the refugee children's paroles.

Confronted now with a letter which appears to be Uncle Sam's last word, Mrs. Schut today is debating the wisdom of going to the Nation's Capital for a personal appeal from the apparently final unhappy decision of the Immigration Service.

What she can tell the authorities is this: "Give me 10 years. Give me time to raise these children whom I found as waifs. Let me send them to American schools, train them to be nurses and cooks and mechanics. Then let me take them back to Palestine, living testimony to the greatness of America. Don't send these children now back to a land where the Jew and Arab still fight and where these children will face death.

THESE, MY CHILDREN

"These are my children. Jackie came to me when he was two days old; he couldn't be closer to me if he were my own. Ruthie was with us since the time she was only a few months old. Roseileen and Nadiah and Alice and Helaniah are as close to me.

"I have no wish to keep them in America, to rear them in luxury. I want to return them to their own people, to share what they learn. And I want to go with them. But not yet. Not when there is war and poverty and misery in their land and before they are ready to help their own."

Probably she will tell the story as it began and as it happened.

The village of Beit Jala (bay jella) sits across the highway from Bethlehem, 6 miles from Jerusalem. The land is bare of trees and brings to mind the barren Yakima hills. In the summer, the sun burns, and in winter cold rain soaks the hills. There is no heat in the flat-topped, whitestone houses clustered on the hillside. The children grow up hungry, stomachs distended by malnutrition, lungs weakened by the wet cold of winter.

To this place came Mr. and Mrs. R. W. Schut in 1945 to found the Palestine Orphanage and Refugee Society. It was for them the beginning of a dream long delayed by World War II. When they came to Beit Jala, "it was like coming home," Mrs. Schut said. But they soon found in the people and the streets and the smells that they were in a far off land.

Life in Beit Jala was not easy. There were many children without homes or families. In time, the orphanage had 30 children of all ages, colors and sizes to care for. "We were new, we didn't know and we just went ahead," Mrs. Schut said. The orphanage took in infants, something other orphanages would not do.

Food was a problem. Mrs. Schut, reluctant to talk about those days for fear she will be misunderstood and thought a sympathy-seeker, can be drawn out. She said the rice they got wouldn't be pig food in this country. Before it was cooked, she picked out the match sticks, crumpled cigaret packs and things I won't mention." The flour, "when we had flour," was sifted through a fine screen. "That took out the big worms. The little ones just went through and we baked our bread."

Despite the handicaps, the orphanage did well. Mr. and Mrs. Schut were missionaries without a tie to any denomination. Donations from home kept them going and they were sustained by strong faith. They were sure they were under divine protection, that tomorrow's bread would come. Who can deny this faith, after hearing Mrs. Schut's story?

The orphans, the waifs, the unwanted lost the bow in their legs caused by malnutrition. Their limbs straightened and strengthened.

In the fall of 1947, the United Nations partitioned the Holy Land in hope of bringing peace between the Israelis and the Arabs. The partition deepened the hatred between the people.

"You could feel the tension grow day after day. You couldn't step out on your balcony without becoming a target for a bullet."

A curtain of fear and hate wrapped around the orphanage. The children could not travel the 6 miles to Jerusalem to school because a sudden curfew might leave them stranded away from home. Mr. Schut could not go abroad because his blond hair and blue eyes might lead the Arabs to think him a European Jew.

TRAPPED IN JERUSALEM

The fierce fighting between the Jews and Arabs, heated by the partition, boiled over when the British planned to withdraw their troops from the Holy Land. England had been holding Palestine under a League of Nations mandate for 30 years; the mandate ended on May 14. Months before that time, guerrilla war flared. There was no peace. No one knew his enemies or his friends.

Mrs. Schut and 18-year-old Helaniah, the oldest among the orphans, journeyed to Jerusalem on Easter of 1948 to complete papers at the American Consulate. An outburst of fighting cut the two women off in the Holy City for 4 days. They lived in a small, dark room in a Russian orthodox convent, next door to the headquarters of the Arab Legion.

Three artillery pieces mounted atop the legion headquarters barked and boomed through the night. Return fire from Jewish forces plunked into the convent walls. Mrs. Schut heard that the orphanage had been raided—that her husband and her son and all the children had been slain.

The Arabs overran Jewish settlements and the Israelis irregulars raided Arab towns. The people of the villages came to the orphanage and asked the Schuts if they could not take this boy or that girl, who belonged to their village, home for a holiday. In time, Mrs. Schut learned that the people of the village simply wanted to be together when they died. The village would be raided and the orphan, home for a holiday, would be among the victims.

So many things happened then that it is difficult to say which happened first. Mr. Schut became gravely ill with tropical dysentery. He became a burden on Mrs. Schut, already heavily laden with the care of nearly 30 orphans. It was decided that her husband and her daughter should return to the United States. Until she saw them again in Yakima half a year later, Mrs. Schut was not certain that they had not been killed before they left Palestine.

ARABS SPARE LIFE

They had a close call. Riding in a TWA station wagon to catch an airplane, Mr. Schut, Donna Mae, and an American newspaperman were engulfed suddenly by a band of roaming Arabs. The Arabs talked excitedly. Donna Mae, who speaks Arabic, began to cry.

"What are they saying, Donna Mae?" asked the newspaperman.

The girl sobbed, "They are going to kill us and take the car."

"Donna Mae," instructed her father, a calm person, "tell them that we will take them wherever they want to go, that we are going home to mama and that your daddy is very ill."

This appealed to the Arabs. They piled into the station wagon and asked to be taken to a battlefield; they were in a hurry to join the fighting.

Suspicion and fear and hate seeped through the land. Life was cheap and quickly taken. Mrs. Schut passed through an Arabian guard post without question. On her return, the guard had changed and strangers were at the gate. The Arabs were, in her words, "on me right now, with their knives ready to take me right there."

Mrs. Schut believed she was going to die. She said a prayer, a bit for herself but mostly for the orphan children at Beit Jala. Her murmured words were picked up by an Arab who took pride in the smattering of English he knew. He misunderstood her. He told his companions, "Let her go. Her skin's too tough."

The Arab States invaded Palestine on May 1, 2 weeks before the British were to pull out. The sniping, guerrilla fighting became open war. The American consulate at Jerusalem told Mrs. Schut that she should leave but she wouldn't abandon her orphans. Finally, she was ordered out for her own safety and to avoid any incidents involving an American citizen.

In the meantime, she had obtained (she thought) visitors permits for six children. Had she begun sooner she might have gotten permits for more children. As it was, she handed out the other orphans to families to care for and arranged to flee from Beit Jala.

They hired a Diesel truck, used for motor freight through the mountains. Providence was with them. The British delayed their departure by a day, just enough time for Mrs. Schut to take her party out first. After

the Tommies pulled out, roads were mined, bridges blown up and escape impossible.

BULLETS HIT TRUCK

The truck rumbled out of Beit Jala on May 14 to begin an 8-hour trip that took 3½ days. The heavy vehicle lumbered along a hillside road to Jerusalem between battling Arabs and Israelis. A tarpaulin across the back of the truck was bullet-riddled. Mrs. Schut cradled Ruthie, age 9 months in her arms in the cab. In the back, Alfred flung his body across the waifs to protect them from the gunfire.

Running this gantlet of fire, the truck reached Jerusalem. The holy city was caught in the agony of battle. The Jewish militia, Haganah, fought the Transjordan legion in a house-to-house street fight. Mrs. Schut counted 300 bodies in the streets of Jerusalem as they passed through. They were not beyond the range of bullets until passing Jericho, they crossed the border into Transjordan.

At every village, they were stopped, searched, questioned, and their papers scrutinized. On the evening of the first day, they reached Amman and camped for the night. With them on the highway leading away from the fighting were 20,000 other refugees. The following night they reached Damascus and on the following day they came to the port city of Beirut, their goal.

In Beirut, Mrs. Schut found disappointment. The visitors' permits she had expected for her six orphans were not there. Something had happened to the papers, apparently, when the American consulate pulled out of Jerusalem for the sea coast. Nevertheless, times being hectic and dangerous, American officials at Beirut allowed her to proceed as if she had the permits.

There was a month in which to get a boat from Beirut to the United States. Providence being with them again, they obtained passage on a Greek freighter on the last day of their allotted month.

In the meantime, the eight people huddled in a one-room storehouse in Beirut while the early summer sun baked the city. Alfred suffered a slight sun stroke and a touch of dysentery.

Feeling ran high in Beirut between Jews and Arabs although the Lebanon city was outside the fighting area. Murders were not uncommon. A man was slain just outside the window of the room where the Schuts lived. "We heard it all."

Food was a nearly unsolvable problem. A sack of potatoes cost $37. The black market offered 100 pounds of rice for $120.

Mrs. Schut crossed her fingers when they boarded the Greek freighter. The children had been bitten and eaten by sand fleas so badly that she was afraid authorities might think the orphans had smallpox and forbid them to leave.

The freighter plowed through the Mediterranean to stand 3 miles offshore from a Greek port. It took on a cargo of high octane gasoline and set off on a 6 weeks' crossing of the Atlantic.

At New York, there were no visitor permits for the children. The Immigration Service paroled the six refugees to Mrs. Schut for 6 months under $500 bond apiece. A friend put up the $3,000 required.

And so they came to Yakima. They came here because, Mrs. Schut explained, the summer weather, the hills are so much like their home in Palestine and because she knew the valley.

Three of the children are in school. All have grown sturdy and strong. Jackie, a rotund, chubby little boy who will be 5 this month can remember so little about his homeland that the only boat he knows is not the one he crossed the ocean on but the one he rode on at the fair.

Will they stay in Yakima? Mrs. Schut hopes they will until the children are raised. She wants to return someday to Palestine with her "staff" to re-establish the orphanage at Beit Jala.

"I've been kicked and spit upon in the streets," she says of Palestine, "but still I love them. They are people. They need help."

"HE WILL CARE FOR ME"

She realizes that she cannot help them now, not while fear and war ride about the Holy City. But it is not for herself that she entreats Uncle Sam to stay his hand. She is thinking of the children who would go back to a land where a Jew is killed because he is a Jew, where an Arab is slain because he is an Arab, where food is beyond price and where there is no hope until peace finally comes.

Nor would she abandon the children, sending them back alone while she stays here. "They are mine," she says simply. Instead she will leave her daughter, Donna Mae, here and return with the war waifs.

In the last few days, Uncle Sam has given his final word: The children must go. But Mrs. Schut steadfastly hopes that the Immigration Service will delay its ruling and let the children remain until they can go home as examples of American training and education.

Perhaps the children think of this when they sing the "theme song" of the Schut home—"If the Father's eye is on the sparrow, surely He will care for me.

HARUE SATO

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill for the relief of Harue Sato, and I ask unanimous consent that an explanatory statement of the bill by me be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 840) for the relief of Harue Sato, introduced by Mr. CAIN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The statement presented by Mr. CAIN is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CAIN

The bill is for the relief of Sgt. Franklyn Roff, a wounded veteran of the Korean War. Sergeant Roff had requested permission to marry his fiancée in Japan but was transferred to a hospital in the United States before the proper papers could be processed. This bill, if enacted, will make it possible for Sergeant Roff to have his fiancée brought to the United States so that he may marry her.

I believe that this is little enough to do for a man who has fought our war and has been wounded in our cause. I wish Sergeant Roff the best of luck, a speedy recovery, and a very happy married life with the woman of his choice.

AMENDMENT OF CONSTITUTION PROVIDING REPRESENTATION IN ELECTORAL COLLEGE FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AND CERTAIN TERRITORIES OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide representation in the electoral college for the District of Columbia and certain Territories of the United States, and I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution and a statement by me explaining the joint resolution be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the joint resolution and statement presented by the Senator from South Dakota will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 31) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide representation in the electoral college for the District of Columbia and certain Territories of the United States, introduced by Mr. CASE, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purpose as a part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"ARTICLE —

"In choosing the President and the Vice President of the United States, the District of Columbia, and each Territory of the United States entitled by law to select a delegate in the House of Representatives, shall be entitled to appoint, in such manner as the Congress may provide by law, one elector who shall possess the qualifications required by article II of the Constitution and whose ballot shall be cast and counted as provided by the twelfth article of amendment of the Constitution."

The statement presented by Mr. Case is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CASE

Today I am introducing a proposal for an amendment to the Constitution that would give upwards of 2,000,000 disfranchised citizens of the United States a chance to vote in Presidential elections.

The amendment would give to the District of Columbia and to Territories with a Delegate in the House of Representatives a vote in the electoral college.

There were approximately 800,000 people in the District of Columbia by the last census, the number retaining voting rights in their States being unknown. There were 499,794 in the Territory of Hawaii and 128,643 in the Territory of Alaska.

Hawaii and Alaska have the status of Territories and elect a Delegate to the House of Representatives. There are current proposals to provide the District of Columbia with a Delegate in the House of Representatives, but without amendment to the Constitution, they still would not vote on President.

There are pending, of course, proposals to give both Alaska and Hawaii full statehood. I happen to have voted for such a measure in the House of Representatives but I recognize that there is considerable doubt that either Territory will win statehood in the immediate future.

It has occurred to me that granting the Territories and the District of Columbia an opportunity to vote for President with representation in the electoral college might command the support of many Members of the Congress who oppose statehood. I believe these citizens of the United States should have a right to representation in the Congress and in the election of the President and Vice President. We draft their sons and we tax their incomes.

The proposed amendment is simple, and with the permission of the Senate, I place it in my remarks.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Finance:

H. R. 2141. An act to extend for 2 years the existing privilege of free importation of gifts from members of the Armed Forces of the United States on duty abroad;

H. R. 2192. An act to amend section 313 (b) of the Tariff Act of 1930; and

H. R. 2268. An act to authorize the payment of interest on series E savings bonds retained after maturity, and for other purposes.

INCREASE OF COMPENSATION TO VETERANS WITH SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITY—CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, Senate bill 780, to authorize the payment by the Veterans' Administration of increased compensation on account of service-connected total deafness to veterans in receipt of compensation, was inadvertently referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. I have conferred with the author of the bill, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], and with his approval I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be discharged from the further consideration of the bill, and that it be referred to the Committee on Finance.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

DECLARATION OF FRIENDSHIP FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE TO ALL OTHER PEOPLES

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to address myself for 2 minutes to a concurrent resolution which I propose to submit.

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

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, it is a great tragedy that the Communists have stolen the word peace from the free nations of the world. That happens to be a fact, hard as it is for the average American to understand why it should be so.

Despite recent Soviet aggressions, the Communists have been very successful in selling the idea that the United States is a warmongering Nation while the Soviet Union wants peace. A recent Soviet outburst called us atomic barbarians.

The Communists have planted distrust of the United States and its allies over most of Asia and the Far East. A great many Europeans are in doubt about our peaceful intentions because of clever Communist propaganda.

Perhaps most dangerous of all is the fact that the Soviet Government is constantly telling the Russian people that the United States is a Nation of warmongers intent on their destruction. It is within our power to correct the record, and I believe we should.

I am now submitting a concurrent resolution, which I am proud to announce is being sponsored by 20 other Members of the Senate. The sponsors include Republicans and Democrats; this is in no sense a partisan issue. The sponsors joining with me are the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the senior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER].

The title of the concurrent resolution explains its purpose in simple language. It is called "A declaration of friendship from the American people to all other peoples of the world, including the peoples of the Soviet Union." A similar resolution is being submitted in the House of Representatives today, so that we may have an expression of the Congress.

The concurrent resolution sets forth in simple language what I sincerely and deeply believe to be a fact, namely, that the overriding desire of the American people is to bring about permanent peace. It declares that the United States Government stands ready at all times to compose its differences with the Soviet Government by honorable negotiation.

The resolution also calls upon the President of the United States to transmit the resolution to the Soviet Government with the request that its contents be made known to the Russian people.

The prestige of the Congress of the United States is very great throughout the world, because it represents the American people. I believe adoption of this resolution will set forth the true position of the United States in clear and unmistakable terms.

I submit the concurrent resolution and ask that it be referred to the appropriate committee.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 11), submitted by Mr. McMAHON (for himself and other Senators), was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Whereas the goal of the American people is now, and ever has been a just and lasting peace; and

Whereas the deepest wish of our Nation is to join with all other nations in preserving the dignity of man, and in observing those moral principles which alone lend meaning to his existence; and

Whereas in proof of this, the United States has offered to share all that is good in atomic energy, asking in return only safeguards against the evil in the atom; and

Whereas this Nation has likewise given of its substance and resources to help those peoples ravaged by war and poverty; and

Whereas terrible danger to all free peoples compels the United States to undertake a vast program of armaments expenditures; and

Whereas we rearm only with reluctance and would prefer to devote our energies to peaceful pursuits: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Members of this Congress reaffirm the historic and abiding friendship of the American people for all other peoples, including the peoples of the Soviet Union, by declaring—

That the American people deeply regret the artificial barriers which separate them from the peoples of the U. S. S. R., and which keep the Soviet peoples from learning of America's desire to live in friendship with all other peoples, and to work with them in advancing the ideal of human brotherhood; and

That the American people desire neither war with the Soviet Union nor the terrible consequences of such a war; and

That although they are firmly determined to defend their freedom and security, the American people welcome all honorable efforts to compose the differences standing between them and the Soviet Government; be it further

Resolved, That the Congress request the President of the United States to call upon the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to acquaint the peoples of the Soviet Union with the contents of this resolution.

Mr. McMAHON. In this connection, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks, an article entitled, "McMAHON's Plan To Express Amity Toward Russians Hailed," written by David Lawrence and published in the New York Herald Tribune of January 24, 1951; an article entitled, "A Bold Challenge to Joe Stalin," written by Thomas L. Stokes and published in the New York Herald Tribune of January 24, 1951; and an editorial entitled, "Nothing Against the Russian People," published in the Washington Post of January 25, 1951.

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

[From the New York Herald Tribune of January 24, 1951]

McMAHON'S PLAN TO EXPRESS AMITY TOWARD RUSSIANS HAILED

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON, January 23.—Senator BRIEN McMAHON'S proposal of a resolution to be adopted by the Senate expressing friendship for the Russian people is the first sign of common sense that has come in a long while from officialdom here on the subject of moral force as a preventive of war.

The assumption that, because armament has to be increased substantially to meet outbreaks of aggression, all other forms of peaceful effort to prevent war need not be pressed is erroneous. Yet whenever military measures take the limelight these other methods of avoiding war seem to be sidetracked.

With two world wars to remind mankind that military conquest does not really bring peace, there have been equally erroneous assumptions current that military strength has become futile or unnecessary. The truth is that defense armament is indispensable,

and so is an armament of reason and genuine friendship expressed by one set of peoples to the other.

THE CAUSES OF WAR

The Russian people are not bellicose by nature. They do not want war any more than do the people of the allied countries. Inasmuch as all peoples would prefer the ways of peace to armed hostilities, the real question always is why there should be any wars. Generally they result from the acts of a dictator or of a small group of men—oligarchies, they used to call them in ancient days—who exploit whole nations and force the young to go to war by inflaming public opinion against other countries.

There is no reason to believe that, if the minds of the 200,000,000 people of Soviet Russia could be reached with genuine evidences of friendship, the rulers of the Communist regime would have the power to take the steps of aggression which have now brought the world to the brink of war.

Like all other moves of this kind—and they are by no means novel—the question of methods and means arises. The United States has brought forth what is known as the Voice of America program. This project was for a long time in need of funds, but now has the money from Congress. What is lacking is the ideas that must go into such an undertaking to make it successful. Those ideas cannot begin and end on the bureaucratic level. They must come from the very top level of our policy makers. They must be part of national and international policy.

Today the Voice of America is just one of a number of bureaus in the State Department. It ought to be an important agency independent of any department and reporting directly to the President. It should have enough prestige to command the sympathetic support of Members of both Houses of Congress. It should be the public relations instrument of the government itself in international relations. Few men who have been at the head of the State Department have ever been qualified to do this type of planning even if they had the time to devote to it.

But to occupy so important a role, the project must have Cabinet-level ranking and must be composed of advisers who are able to suggest major policies that will appeal to other nations, especially those behind the iron curtain. Strange, indeed, that nobody has put any official momentum behind the idea of a formal expression of friendship by the Congress addressed to the people of Soviet Russia or that other moves which can appeal to peoples behind the iron curtain should not have come before now from authoritative quarters.

MUST CAPTURE IMAGINATION

The Voice of America can relay messages and broadcast interesting scripts and carry a polemic technique to counteract Communist propaganda, but that's not enough. There must be ways to capture the imagination of the Russian people. That's why the suggestion by Senator McMahon is likely to prove more penetrating than all the high-sounding speeches of diplomatic phraseology that come forth so regularly as the only expression of American idealism.

But will such policies of friendship and other proposals get through to the people behind the iron curtain? The answer is that any event of sensational importance percolates through any man-made barrier. The persons who go and come across the border from the satellite states to the free world are constantly discussing these same issues. Word-of-mouth distribution of ideas still remains the most effective single instrument of communication the world has ever known.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of January 24, 1951]

A Bold Challenge to Joe Stalin—Senator McMahon Would Center Attack on the Iron Curtain

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

Washington.—It is good that in the gathering storm one man is willing to stand up boldly and appeal for another attempt to break through the iron curtain so that our people, as people, might speak to the Russian people, as people, for understanding and peace.

For this Senator Brien McMahon, Democrat, Connecticut, would use both our Senate and the United Nations as instrumentalities.

No man is more entitled to speak—and be heard. The Connecticut Senator knows whereof he speaks, and is conscious of his tremendous responsibility. He is a man with a burden on his soul. As chairman of the Joint Congressional Atomic Energy Committee he lives daily, so to speak, with the awful weapon that could wipe out civilization. He realizes also another bitter truth that history teaches—that arms races such as that in which the United States and Russia are engaged can end only in wars.

UN OUTLET IN RUSSIA

To challenge Joe Stalin and the rulers of the Kremlin on the iron curtain he proposes:

1. That the United Nations assert its rights to have its deliberations known behind the iron curtain—as a minimum by operating its own radio station in Russia.

2. That the Senate pass a resolution expressing friendship for the people of Russia by the people of the United States and otherwise declaring the intentions of our own people for peace and for honorable negotiations for peace, and that the Soviet Government be asked to circulate this among its own people. To reinforce its effect he would have the resolution circulated all over this country and signed by our people.

The Senator was impelled to speak out because of developing circumstances. He has become alarmed by the headway Russia has made with her continuous propaganda that the United States wants war and that our people are warmongers. He knows, as we all know, that this is not so—that, as he said, no Member of the United States Senate wants war, nor do any of our people. Nor, he adds, do the people of Russia.

OUR STORY HIDDEN

But we have not got our story across. As regards Russia, we are stopped by the iron curtain so that we cannot reach the people. As for other people, particularly in Asia, we have failed to get our story to them and to let them know of our interest, from our national experience, in their aspirations to shake off colonialism and run their own affairs as independent nations. Yet we know what they want better than any other people.

The Senator simply would challenge Joe Stalin by asking him "that the free peoples' views be circulated among the Russians as the Soviet's views are circulated among us." As the Senator was speaking, our press wires, for example, were carrying the latest diatribe against the United States as "warmongers"—in this instance, by Peter Pospelov at the Lenin anniversary celebration.

STRONGEST WEAPON

The Senator is not sanguine that Stalin would accept either the UN or Senate proposal; but he is convinced, he said, "that if we focus world opinion on the iron curtain and expose it as a fraud and a menace to world peace, we may convert this barrier against truth into a Soviet liability.

The barrier against truth, the Senator explained, "may be the Soviet's strongest weapon.

"Perhaps we cannot convince the Kremlin rulers to open up the curtain, but I am absolutely certain that we can cripple and perhaps silence the Soviet propaganda guns in the western world. People can see through a fraud very easily when it is exposed to them."

Except for the iron curtain, he declared, "I am sure that ordinary Russians would invoke their wrath on rulers who deny them life's barest necessities and who saddle them with crushing armament expenditures."

As an inducement to peace to people everywhere, the Senator reintroduced his resolution of last February calling for a reduction of armaments, including atomic weapons, by an iron-clad international agreement providing for inspection. The money thus saved would be pooled and applied to build up backward nations.

His threefold program is simple, direct, bold, and possible—that is, if we really want to save ourselves and the world.

[From the Washington Post of January 25, 1951]

Nothing Against the Russian People

There ought to be more attention paid to the suggestion of Connecticut's Senator Brien McMahon, that the people of Russia should be assured of the continued friendship of the people of the United States.

No, that is not appeasement. In a way it is just the opposite of appeasement, because it draws a sharp line between the people of Russia and the present Government of Russia.

The people of Russia are continually bombarded with Soviet lies to the effect that the people of the United States hate them and seek to do them ill. If some semblance of the truth can penetrate behind the iron curtain—and there are leaks in that curtain despite all vigilance—it would produce a very different attitude in the mind of the average Russian.

What Senator McMahon is really proposing is that we should approach this international problem with some of the skill that the Russians themselves have shown in using propaganda as a means of bolstering their side. The ordinary American must be thinking somewhat sadly that since the close of World War II Soviet Russia has made enormous advances by just such methods and without the loss—so far as we know—of a single Russian life. Meantime our boys are dying on the battlefields of Korea while in the matter of world public opinion we seem to be losing ground instead of gaining it.

It is time that we made some effort to cause the real truth to penetrate behind the iron curtain and thus to beat Russia at her own game. For what Senator McMahon proposes is the simple truth. Nobody in this country hates the Russians as such, nobody has ill will against them as Russians and all of the furore in this country against communism is based solely on the evil deeds of a Russian Communist dictatorship.

We should not be misled into believing that the crooks and terrorists now in power in Moscow are any more typical of the Russian people as a whole, than the dope peddlers now being rounded up in New York City are typical of the American people.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may address myself to the concurrent resolution for 2 or 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator from Wisconsin is

recognized for 2 or 3 minutes—the Chair will make it 3.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I am happy to join in cosponsorship of the resolution offered today by the able senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] expressing the deep longing of the American people for peace and expressing their friendship with the rank and file people of the Soviet Union.

I congratulate my colleague on the very sound reasoning of his approach. I trust that the text of this eloquent resolution will be relayed effectively to the peoples of the world.

There is an old hymn which reads as follows:

Make channels for the streams of love,
Where they may broadly run;
And love has overflowing streams,
To fill them every one.

But if at any time we cease
Such channels to provide,
The very founts of love for us
Will then seem parched and dried.

For we must share, if we would keep
That blessing from above;
They cease to have who cease to give;
Such is the law of love.

Mr. President, we have tried nearly everything in the world for peace except the thing which is embodied in the concurrent resolution. The United States Senate is expressing the hope of the people of this country when it agrees to this resolution.

There is absolutely no reason why the man on the street or on the farm in America should have the slightest desire in the world to inflict harm on the man on the street or on the farm in Russia or its satellite states. On the contrary, all human beings, whether they live unfortunately behind the iron curtain or whether they enjoy the blessings of western freedom, have the same wants and desires, the same fundamental longing to live in peace with their neighbors and to enjoy freedom and security for themselves and their loved ones.

It is only the power-hungry leaders of the Soviet Union who have brought about the recent tragic chain of circumstances which finds United Nation boys killing Chinese and Northern Korean boys on the frozen battlefields of that distant peninsula. Moreover, the responsibility for any future aggravating the present situation rests solely on the leaders of the Soviet Union.

We of the west desire peace; we will strive for peace, and move heaven and earth to try to maintain peace. We despise war. We know that war would settle nothing. It would not end communism; it would only bring on more hunger, more disease, more chaos, more confusion, and more suffering to the humble people of the world.

There is no good reason for war. War is not inevitable. On the contrary, peace is very definitely attainable if the leaders of the Soviet will simply recognize the facts that—

First. We of the west will be prepared for every possible contingency, but

Second. We of the west will join in seeking any reasonable and lasting settlement founded on deeds of justice, rather than mere words.

We will not appease, but neither will we provoke. We will not place our faith in armament alone, but neither will we strip ourselves of the arms necessary for defense. We will not change our attitude of love and friendship toward the humble people of the earth, even though they live in aggressor countries. But neither will we change our attitude toward defense of the heritage of which we are the trustee.

I hope, therefore, that the Senate will promptly adopt this splendid resolution submitted by the senior Senator from Connecticut and his associates.

STUDY OF ADMINISTRATION OF TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT

Mr. LANGER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 72), which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is directed to make a full and complete study of the administration of the Trading With the Enemy Act with respect to the assets of foreign countries and nationals thereof and to report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of such study together with such recommendations as it may deem advisable.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to employ on a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $100,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

EXTENSION OF TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT—AMENDMENTS

Mr. BREWSTER submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 1612) 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, which were referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed.

PRINTING OF STUDIES OF ISSUANCE OF INJUNCTION IN LABOR DISPUTES BY STATE COURTS (S. DOC. NO. 7)

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, pursuant to Senate Resolution 140, Eighty-first Congress, and the approval of the Senate Rules Committee, the Senate Subcommittee on Labor-Management Relations, in 1950, commissioned four universities to make studies of the issuance of injunctions in labor disputes by State courts. Our agreements with the universities provided that the subcommittee would not in any way attempt to influence the findings of the universities. The studies have now been completed, have been received and approved by the Senate Subcommittee on Labor-Management Relations, and by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. By direction of the committee, I ask unanimous consent that these studies on State injunctions be printed as a Senate document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEE ON FINANCE TO SUBMIT REPORTS DURING RECESS

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance may, during the recess of the Senate, be permitted to file reports on two bills, one being H. R. 1, 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, and the other (H. R. 1724) to provide for the renegotiation of contracts, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Georgia? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committee.

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

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

William Jennings Bryan, Jr., of Los Angeles, Calif., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 27, with headquarters at Los Angeles, Calif. (Reappointment.)

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, as in executive session from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I report favorably the nominations of 59 postmasters, which were unanimously ordered reported by the committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. As in executive session, the nominations will be received and placed on the Executive Calendar.

WELCOME OF ISRAELI AMBASSADOR ABBA EBAN—ADDRESS BY GOVERNOR OF MARYLAND

[Mr. BUTLER of Maryland asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. Theodore R. McKeldin, Governor of Maryland, in welcoming the Ambassador of Israeli, Mr. Abba Eban, on his visit to Maryland, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE PRESENT DANGER—ADDRESS BY JAMES B. CONANT

[Mr. SALTONSTALL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Present Danger," delivered by James B. Conant, for the Committee on the Present Danger, on February 7, 1951, over a national radio network, which appears in the Appendix.]

PROBLEMS CONFRONTING THE UNITED STATES—LETTER FROM DR. SWAN ERICSON

[Mr. THYE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to him by Dr. Swan Ericson, of Le Sueur, Minn., under date of January 13, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

LIVES AT STAKE IN THE RAILROAD STRIKE—ARTICLE BY CONSTANTINE BROWN

[Mr. THYE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Lives, Not Profits, at Stake," written by Constantine Brown, and published in the Washington Evening Star of February 6, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE POINT 4 PROGRAM—BROADCAST BY RAYMOND SWING

[Mr. KILGORE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from a broadcast by Raymond Swing on January 15, 1951, in regard to the point 4 program, which appears in the Appendix.]

OUR TRAGEDY IN CHINA—EDITORIAL FROM THE KANSAS CITY TIMES

[Mr. SCHOEPPEL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Our Tragedy in China," published in the Kansas City Times of January 31, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE RISE IN COFFEE PRICES—ARTICLE FROM COSMOPOLITAN

[Mr. GILLETTE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Who Made the Money on Coffee?" published in Cosmopolitan magazine, which appears in the Appendix.]

PROPOSED ASSISTANCE TO INDIA—EDITORIAL COMMENT

[Mr. LEHMAN (for Senator BENTON) asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "India's Need," published in the Washington Post of February 6, 1951, an article entitled "Famine and Diplomacy," by Walter Lippmann, and an article written by Robert Trumbull and published in the New York Times, which appear in the Appendix.]

TELEVISION CHANNELS FOR EDUCATIONAL PURPOSES—TELEGRAM FROM THE MEDICAL SOCIETY OF QUEENS COUNTY, N. Y.

[Mr. LEHMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a telegram addressed by the Medical Society of the County of Queens to Commissioner Wayne Coy, Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, dated January 17, 1951, regarding the assignment of television channels for educational purposes, which appears in the Appendix.]

PREAMBLE OF THE FREEDOM OF INFORMATION CONVENTION—STATEMENT BY CARROLL BINDER

[Mr. HUMPHREY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by Carroll Binder, United States representative in the Committee on Freedom of Information, regarding the preamble of the Freedom of Information Convention submitted by the U. S. S. R., which appears in the Appendix.]

CONVENTION ON FREEDOM OF INFORMATION—STATEMENT BY CARROLL BINDER

[Mr. HUMPHREY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by Carroll Binder regarding the drafting of the Convention on Freedom of Information in the United Nations, which appears in the Appendix.]

REMIT, PLEASE—EDITORIAL FROM THE OIL CITY DERRICK

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Remit, Please," published in the Oil City (Pa.) Derrick, which appears in the Appendix.]

LIGHT IN DARKNESS—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON (PA.) OBSERVER

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Light in Darkness," published recently in the Washington (Pa.) Observer, which appears in the Appendix.]

INDIVIDUALIZED WAR AGAINST RED LEADERS—ARTICLE BY ARNOLD PERRETON

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Eventful Present: Individualized War Against Red Leaders," written by Arnold Perreton, and published in the Manchester Union-Leader of January 27, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

THIS WAY TO SUICIDE—EDITORIAL FROM LIFE MAGAZINE

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "This Way to Suicide," published in Life magazine of January 22, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

NORWAY IS READY TO FIGHT—ARTICLE FROM THE UNITED STATES NEWS AND WORLD REPORT

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Norway Is Ready To Fight," published in the United States News and World Report, which appears in the Appendix.]

THREAT OF RUSSIAN AGGRESSION—ARTICLE FROM THE MANCHESTER UNION-LEADER

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "You Can't Play Games With Gangsters," published in the Manchester (N. H.) Union-Leader of January 30, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

CIVILIAN DEFENSE ACTIVITY IN MANCHESTER, N. H.

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an account of a recent civilian defense activity in New Hampshire, which appears in the Appendix.]

A 44-HOUR WORKWEEK—ARTICLE FROM THE CONCORD (N. H.) DAILY MONITOR

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Wrong Medicine," published in the Concord (N. H.) Daily Monitor of January 27, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

AMERICAN HEART WEEK AND NEGRO HISTORY WEEK—VOICE OF AMERICA PROGRAM—PROCLAMATIONS OF GOVERNOR OF NEW YORK

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two proclamations by the Governor of New York State, the first proclaiming the week of February 11 to 18 as American Heart Week and Negro History Week, and the second proclamation is to be included in the Voice of America program to the oppressed peoples of the world.

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

PROCLAMATION

The toll of death in our State and our country from diseases of the heart and blood vessels continues to rise in tragic fashion. This constitutes a major menace to the public health at any time and in any year. Right now, when we are in the throes of drastic mobilization for self-defense, the problem becomes more serious than ever.

We have to realize that more people die of heart diseases than of the next five leading causes of death combined. We are faced with the ominous fact that cardiovascular diseases threaten to impair our national manpower reserve.

The State of New York and its people have embarked upon an intensive program for coping with heart disease both by dint of the research being carried on in nine medical schools and by the research projects of the State Health Department for applying new knowledge to the treatment of heart disease. Last year New York State took the leadership by providing State funds for the establishment of a Chronic Disease Research Institute at Buffalo, in cooperation with the Medical School of the University of Buffalo. Heart disease is one of the principal elements being studied at this Institute.

We are also carrying on demonstrations in attempts to control rheumatic fever in children by the use of some of the new drugs and antibiotics. Rheumatic fever in children leads to serious heart disease among adults. We are making serious efforts to curb this ailment by controlling it at an early age.

The efforts of the State in this direction have the invaluable help of private organizations, outstanding among which are the American Heart Association and its affiliates. In order to call the attention of the public as dramatically as possible to the urgent needs of the 1951 Heart Fund, the Heart Associations will celebrate February 11 to 18 as American Heart Week. This campaign deserves the utmost possible support.

Now, therefore, I, Thomas E. Dewey, Governor of the State of New York, do hereby proclaim the week of February 11 to 18, 1951, as American Heart Week in the State of New York and I call upon the schools, churches, scientific bodies, civic associations and other organizations, as well as the generous people of New York, to cooperate to the limit of their abilities.

Given under my hand and the privy seal of the State at the capitol in the city of Albany this 31st day of January in the year of our Lord 1951.

By the Governor:

THOMAS E. DEWEY.

Attest:

JAMES C. HAGGERTY,
Secretary to the Governor.

PROCLAMATION

I am happy to be able to say that today there is so much concrete evidence of outstanding progress in the position of American Negroes in our State and our economy. I am particularly proud that much of this progress can be directly traced to the passage of our law against discrimination in employment, in which the State of New York took the lead.

We are now in the sixth year of the administration of that law which has ceased to be an experiment in social legislation and has become a real instrument for social progress as well as a model for seven other States. During the past 12 months we passed the second anniversary of the effective date of the New York State Fair Educational Practices Act, also a pioneer law in the United States. We passed another milestone last year when the Austin-Wicks bill, prohibiting segregation and discrimination in both public and publicly subsidized private housing, went into effect.

On June 5, 1950, the Supreme Court of the United States outlawed the segregation of passengers on the basis of color in railroad cars. This legal decision on a national level followed the success of the New York State Commission Against Discrimination in persuading the Pennsylvania Railroad to abandon the practice of segregating Negro

passengers on trains from New York City to points south. Furthermore, the principal railroads of the State of New York have announced that their employment policy no longer confines Negroes to menial occupations. The New York State Commission Against Discrimination also announces that opportunities for Negroes have been considerably expanded in the white collar and clerical fields.

We obtained another notable victory for freedom, equality and decency when the American Bowling Congress voted to rescind that section of its constitution which restricted membership to members of the Caucasian race. This followed the action of Attorney General Goldstein when he filed legal proceedings against the American Bowling Congress in the State of New York. Many private agencies—Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish—added their voices to this effort. Legal and educational steps were also taken in Ohio, Illinois, and Wisconsin.

All this does not mean that prejudice and injustice towards Negro fellow citizens have come to an end. We still face the need of vast improvement. But the facts I have recited clearly indicate that we are on our way in this vital domain of human relations and the progress we have attained is worth recording.

Now, therefore, I, Thomas E. Dewey, Governor of the State of New York, do hereby proclaim February 11 through February 18 as Negro History Week in New York State and I call upon the people of the entire State, regardless of their color, to cooperate with Negro organizations and individuals in the observance of the spirit of this proclamation.

Given under my hand and the privy seal of the State at the capitol in the city of Albany this 1st day of February in the year of our Lord 1951.

By the Governor:

THOMAS E. DEWEY.

Attest:

JAMES C. HAGERTY,
Secretary to the Governor.

SIXTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE YALTA AGREEMENT—STATEMENT BY SENATOR IVES

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, yesterday marked the sixth anniversary of the Yalta agreement. In this connection I have prepared a statement, the text of which I ask to have incorporated in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR IVES

Yesterday, February 7, marked the sixth anniversary of a black and disgraceful page in the history of American foreign policy. On that day in 1945 was concluded at the Yalta Conference an agreement, to which our Nation was a party, and by which our national honor was betrayed and our Government sold out our friends and allies over many years for a mess of Soviet pottage.

This agreement did not represent the will of the American people or the will of their representatives in Congress. It was never submitted to the Congress for approval. The Congress was not even consulted about it. It serves as an appalling example of what can occur when the Chief Executive usurps too much authority.

As victims of this betrayal, the people of Poland have suffered untold hardship and anguish. And yet, their freedom gone, persecuted and tormented by the merciless hordes of Soviet Russia, they still carry on undaunted, determined to be free. Their heroic attitude provides a mighty inspiration to the remaining free nations of the world in this dark hour when freedom everywhere is in peril.

The terrible plight of the Polish people also provides a constant tragic reminder of our Government's duplicity and irresponsibility. If our Nation ever had an obligation, it is our obligation to right the wrongs committed by our representatives at Yalta. We meet this obligation at the earliest possible moment.

In the meantime, with the knowledge that they have the deep sympathy of the American people and that the American people strongly desire to rectify the wrongs thus perpetrated, the people of Poland should take renewed courage and acquire renewed faith that the day will come again when they will be independent and free.

ROSH HASHANA, THE JEWISH NEW YEAR—EXCERPT FROM ADDRESS BY RABBI MAXWELL H. DUBIN

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, because of its importance, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a condensed version of a talk delivered by Rabbi Maxwell H. Dubin, Wilshire Boulevard Temple, before the congregation on Rosh Hashana—the Jewish New Year. This discussion, forwarded to me by Mr. Harry M. Warner, president of Warner Bros. pictures of New York, was given on September 12, 1950, and is a frank portrayal of the dangers of communism here and abroad. It should serve as a warning in our future relations with Soviet Russia.

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

CONDENSED VERSION OF TALK DELIVERED BY RABBI MAXWELL H. DUBIN, WILSHIRE BOULEVARD TEMPLE, BEFORE THE CONGREGATION ON ROSH HASHANA—THE JEWISH NEW YEAR

Last night we ushered in the New Year. In Jewish life this period is called the Yomin Neroim, the awesome days; the days when the fate of the individual, so Jewish tradition tells us, is determined by God for the entire year.

It seems to me that there is a Yomin Neroim atmosphere, an awesome days' atmosphere for the entire civilized world today, but the fate of all civilization lies in the balance trembling, and mankind is awaiting the decision.

Now, this is not the place and there is not time to detail all the mistakes that the democratic nations and peoples made during the past 5 years since the war ended. But I do want to consider with you one of them, because it is the crux of the problem.

The first and the most fatal error that the democratic world made, was our absolute failure to understand the true meaning of communism and the real aims and ambitions of Soviet Russia. We were led to believe in America that communism was a forward-looking social movement, led by great idealists who had a high code of social and international morality. We were sold the idea that Soviet Russia was a civilized country, determined to direct its international life in paths of peace and of progress. We were told that Soviet Russia had a government that would have respect for law and order, that would have respect for its international promises and commitments and would devote its best interests to the welfare of its own people and to the peoples of other lands.

We Jews knew from the outset that all those statements and claims made by Soviet Russia were not true. We Jews knew the truth about the Communists and about Soviet Russia and we knew it through years of bitter experience and pain and blood and suffering and terrible horrors. We paid a bitter price for that knowledge. We know that the Jews of Russia, the millions of Jews who lived there when the revolution took place were the first ones to be liquidated by the Communists. They were sent to labor camps, they dug the canals, they were sent out to Siberia, and they died—by the hundreds of thousands—because the thing for which the Jew stood and stands—respect for human individuality—was not and is not wanted by Soviet Russia.

We knew the truth, but no one listened to us. When the Jews, during the rise of the Nazis, told the world that the burning of those synagogues in Germany was only a prelude to that which eventually led to the bombing of Westminster Abbey and the other English churches, nobody listened to us. So no one listened to the Jew when he warned the world against the aims and the ambitions of Soviet Russia. We warned the world even during the honeymoon period when Russia was working with us, not an ally—she never was an ally—we just happened to have had the same common enemy, that's all; we warned the world to be careful and to be wary, but no. We were just a voice crying in the wilderness. So Russia was treated by the nations of the world like a spoiled child that threatens to hold its breath if it does not get what it wants. We accepted her word, we had faith in her signature, faith in the agreements that were made. And what was the result? We are facing it now. Russia violated every promise to the western world. She abused our trust, spread her power, seized lands, destroyed governments, developed fifth columns throughout the world and poisoned the minds of millions of peoples against their native governments.

Well, 5 years too late, we of America realize and the world realizes the bitter mistake that was made. We have to rid ourselves, to rid every aspect of our lives, social and political and industrial and economic, of the Communist infiltration.

So we are at the brink of momentous days, you and I. The destiny of a world is in the scales and no one can tell of a certainty what is going to happen.

Officially, we are not at war because Congress has not said there is a war. But, factually, there is a war at this moment. There is a war, Russian-inspired, Russian-led, Russian-equipped, in Korea. Right now on Rosh Hashana morning when I am talking to you, boys of this congregation—I know of two who are at this moment in battle with the marines in Korea—American boys are dying, newspapers are carrying casualty lists, homes are being broken, hearts of parents are being torn. Reserves are being called.

We are at war; and that war is being waged on two fronts. I am not concerned so much about the war in Korea if it does not spread, and, please God, it may not spread. That does not worry me very much because I know that that front is going to be cleaned up before long. But there is another front, the home front, and that front worries me. Because on this home front war has been declared on us by Soviet Russia. And that has to concern us. And it has to concern every man, woman, and child in America. Because you see, my friends, the whole character of war has changed. Wars are no longer fought only on the battlefield; and wars are fought not only by men, and yes, even women in uniform. You and I who are not in uniform, you and I today are just as much in the service as though we actually wore a uniform. Wars today are fought at home. Wars are fought in the laboratories, wars are fought in the factories. That is where Russia has declared war upon us. Her aim is to paralyze, her aim is to sabotage, her aim is to slow down the work that we in America are trying to do in order to prepare ourselves for the ordeal.

In the days ahead you and I have to be on guard, very much on guard, because attempts have been made and attempts will be made to befog the issue. You are going

to be asked to sign all kinds of protests and all kinds of proclamations. Be careful. Know what you are doing; and if you do not know, ask. There are Government agencies to enlighten you.

Remember that this terrible scourge that we call communism must be stopped wherever we are going to meet it. And in that connection we have a twofold duty, you and I. We have a duty to our country, to America, and we have a duty to our faith, to Judaism, and to our coreligionists as Jews, and to all faiths, whatever they may be.

I returned recently from 3 months abroad. You have heard Americans returning from abroad recite the trite, the very trite words, but nonetheless true words, that America is the best, the most fortunate land in the world. And it is. Both materially and spiritually, there is not another land in the world as fortunate as America. The best proof of that is that people everywhere abroad, no matter where one goes, want to come to America.

Everyone wants to come here, and few people want to leave America. Your best proof of that is that whenever a Communist agent is ordered to be deported from America to Europe listen to the fuss that he makes about going back to his paradise of a homeland. He doesn't want to leave; he wants to remain here.

Now, here in America labor is better protected and better treated than anywhere else in the world, even in Socialist England. Labor enjoys more governmental benefits in America than it enjoys in Socialist England. That irks Russia, because Russia is supposed to be the fatherland of the proletariat. Russia is supposed to be the land where the working people have everything—Russia, and not America. Therefore, Russia does not like us. For that reason every person who loves America, every person who makes a living here, every person who enjoys the way of life that is America, must protect it in the danger that now faces it.

As for the Jews, let us not forget this, my friends: That wherever Communist Russia has come to power, Jewish life has been destroyed. There is not a vestige of Jewish religious, economic, social, or cultural life left in Russia today, not a vestige. And even in Moscow the Yiddish daily, Heint, which was nothing but a Yiddish translation of Pravda, has been eliminated. Yiddish writers have been sent out to Siberia. There is not a vestige of Jewish life in Russia today. And those few Jews who have been able to steal out from behind the iron curtain in Europe—from Rumania and Hungary and Czechoslovakia, and all the rest of the Balkan countries—they tell us that the last traces of Jewish life are being eliminated behind the iron curtain by the Communists.

Now, remember this, should—God forbid—the horrible thing happen and communism spread its influence over this country, then I say to you that the American Jewish community, which is today the largest, the most influential, the most powerful Jewish community in the world, will go down and will be destroyed even as have been the Jewish communities of Europe.

Therefore, for these reasons, we must be on guard. We must pledge ourselves to wipe out communism wherever and whenever we find it, even if it means cutting deep into our own family and social circles. My friends, there was in Jewish life, particularly amongst the orthodox Jews in days gone by, a weapon that was used to control the community. It is a weapon which, of course, we of the liberal Jewish group do not have and never have had, but it was a weapon in Jewish life. It was a weapon that was so horrible that even those who watched its being inflicted in the synagogue, were terror-stricken, not to speak of the one who was subjected to that weapon. It was called the charem, excommunication. So we today must take a page out of the book of those old Jews and apply that same weapon, that same punishment today, the punishment of excommunication, of ostracism, of complete isolation from the community of any Jew who has become infected with the Communist virus.

The fate of humanity is lying in the balance and the slightest hair may tip those scales in one direction or another. It is a fact, a fact that faces you, and you, and you, and me every moment of our existence today.

So we pray for life this morning. We pray that God may inscribe us, and inscribe our dear ones, and inscribe the world in the Book of Life. But there can be no certainty of life, there can be no certainty of a future for any of us if this dread thing continues to go on. It will affect you, and you, and you, and every single member of your family and mine. So we pray to God this morning for life. We pray that this catastrophe may be averted, that untold millions of people may not be condemned to death through the horrors of another war. Grant us, then, O God, Thy protection. Grant that this year that we have ushered in, may be for us and for all humanity, a year of life and not of death, a year of peace and not of war, a year of happiness and not of misery. Amen.

TAXATION AND REDUCTION OF EXPENDITURES—EDITORIAL FROM THE RICHMOND NEWS-LEADER AND STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD

Mr. BYRD. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an editorial from the Richmond News-Leader of February 6, 1951, the title of which is "$10,000,000,000 cart, $71,000,000,000 horse."

I believe this editorial very graphically presents the situation with respect to increasing taxes before reducing nondefense expenditures.

To follow this editorial, I ask that a statement made by me on February 4 likewise be printed in the body of the RECORD.

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

[From the Richmond News-Leader of February 6, 1951]

TEN BILLION DOLLAR CART, $71,000,000,000 HORSE

Mr. Truman's $10,000,000,000 tax program, as it was outlined yesterday to the House Ways and Means Committee, leaves a great deal to be desired. Clearly, the President has in mind a plan to tax first and spend later; Congress would do better, in our view, to wait awhile before putting so monstrous a cart before so intangible a horse. Not until the recommended budget has been stripped of at least $7,000,000,000 in nonessential spending should the Congress give its approval to new tax legislation. The world will not come to an end if we wait to look at the menu before paying our check.

Once the budget has been boiled down by committee action to a more realistic figure, the question of a tax increase can be considered. When that time comes, the first aim should be to close loopholes in existing tax law—in short, to abolish the outrageous privileges of oil and mining interests, to bring tax-exempt cooperatives into the fold, to tighten up rigorously on others who are getting a relatively free ride. Secondly, the necessary tax increases should be designed to obtain some direct revenue from millions of persons in low and moderate income brackets who now escape direct Federal taxation almost altogether. A $100 reduction in the individual exemptions under income tax law would enroll 5,000,000 new taxpayers who would contribute an estimated $240,000,000 without overwhelming personal hardship. Finally, other necessary tax increases should be spread as equitably as possible over the entire economy. A Federal sales tax seems to us the best answer to the problem.

This newspaper has insisted steadfastly, since the Korean War began, that the Nation's taxes must be increased so that we can pay as we go, to the very limit of our endurance, for the preparedness effort. The sacrifices demanded by high taxes are infinitely preferable to the prospect of currency collapse and national bankruptcy. But personal taxes already have been hiked by 17 percent; corporation taxes have been increased sharply, and an excess profits tax law has been reestablished. There are some indications that these amendments in tax law will produce substantially higher revenue than the Treasury had predicted. At any rate, the Government's need for immediate cash is not as urgent as it was 4 months ago.

It follows that this is a time for taking stock. One mistake was made in December in the enactment of an excess profits tax which will cause endless difficulty in administration; if further mistakes can be avoided, let us avoid them now. For our own part, we raise no special objections to the proposed across-the-board increase of four percentage points in individual income taxation, but the recommended boosts in excise taxes seem excessive. A tax of 20 percent on automobiles and 25 percent on household appliances should be considered carefully. The requested increases in whiskey, beer and cigarette taxes may prove more than these golden geese can survive, but the point is one for tax experts to decide; as luxury commodities, these items assuredly should be taxed right to the point of diminishing returns. Again, it seems to us that a sweeping Federal sales tax would prove fairer and more desirable than heavy increases in selected fields.

But we do not wish to leave any impression of opposition to higher taxes in general. With the best will in the world, Congress cannot cut the swollen Federal budget to a point where present revenue laws will cover the inflated costs of national defense. Mr. Truman has requested Congress to levy taxes "'til it hurts." Added taxes will hurt, and we can only pray that the confiscation of more than a quarter of national income for the expenses of government will not cause irreparable damage to the economy. Sooner or later, as a new tax bill is drawn up, the time will come for separating the men from the boys. And if that day brings an additional tax of 15 cents on every 10 gallons of gasoline, or 30 cents more on a carton of cigarettes, or 60 cents more on a fifth of whisky, let us grouch and grumble and howl to our heart's content—but let us pay it in the grim realization that far worse sacrifices could be demanded of us all.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HARRY F. BYRD RELEASED ON FEBRUARY 4, 1951

To pass a quickie tax bill of $10,000,000,000 to be followed by another, as requested by the President, would be a most unwise procedure.

Two so-called quickie tax bills have already been enacted in the past several months. The Treasury estimates that the tax take will be increased from $37,000,000,000 in fiscal year 1950 to $55,000,000,000 in fiscal year 1952, even if no further tax increases are enacted.

We have taken off the fat. Further huge tax increases will dig deeply into the lean meat and possibly into the very bone structure of our economy unless they are eased by elimination of nonessential expenditures.

General Eisenhower has warned that our war-alert status may last 20 or 30 years. We

must husband our financial strength and tighten our belts for the long struggle ahead.

The country is entitled to a firm financial program from the administration instead of piece-meal quickies. Our financial preparedness cannot be attained by piece-meal implementation such as the President proposes.

It is essential to pay as we go, but the people of the United States will not accept huge tax increases in good spirit unless they are accompanied by:

1. The closing of all loop holes in existing tax laws;

2. Improved tax assessment and collection system to prevent tax evasion; and

3. Elimination of every dollar of nonessential spending.

ECONOMIES UNDER THE HOOVER RECOMMENDATIONS—CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN SENATOR LODGE AND HON. HERBERT HOOVER

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, as Senate author of the Lodge-Brown Act which created the Hoover Commission, I recently wrote to former President Hoover asking him to state the economies which could be effected by carrying out the remaining recommendations of the Hoover Report. Mr. Hoover estimates that total savings of over $5,000,000,000 could be achieved. I believe this estimate is, if anything, conservative, and I hope that the members of the Appropriations Committee in particular will read this correspondence and put into effect all of the true economies which it recommends. I ask unanimous consent that my letter and Mr. Hoover's response be printed in the body of the RECORD.

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

JANUARY 8, 1951.

Hon. HERBERT HOOVER,
The Waldorf Towers, Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: This inquiry is addressed to you as the former Chairman of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government.

We shall soon be asked to raise additional taxes to finance the expanse of our defense efforts. This will focus, more than ever before, public attention on the need for economic and effective Government. I therefore ask you:

1. How much of your Commission's recommended changes, innovations, and reorganizations remain yet to be accomplished?

2. What is your estimate of the dollar savings to be expected if these remaining recommendations are carried out?

As Senate author of the act establishing the Commission, I have a continuing interest in this whole subject and wish to do all I can to promote its reports. May I have your permission to use your reply in connection with my efforts on behalf of this objective?

With kind personal regards,

Very sincerely yours,

HENRY CABOT LODGE, Jr.,
United States Senator.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *January 26, 1951.*

The Honorable HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR LODGE: I have your letter of January 8. Your continued interest in the Commission, created under the Lodge-Brown Act, is most gratifying.

The opening sessions of the Eighty-second Congress offer an opportune time to consider again the proposals of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government. International circumstances now require that this program to achieve efficiency and economies in the Federal Government be brought to fulfillment.

Much has already been achieved in the field of Government reform. The Eighty-first Congress approved 20 public laws and 26 reorganization plans, embodying recommendations of the Commission. These, together with administrative actions taken within the executive branch, mean that nearly 50 percent of the Commission's recommendations have been authorized. The attached Report to the American People, prepared by the Citizens Committee for Reorganization of the Executive Branch of the Government, details these reforms.

Savings from those reforms already authorized should eventually approach $2,000,000,000 annually, according to estimates of the Commission's task forces. Those recommendations not yet adopted should provide additional savings of similar proportions. These savings estimates were based upon a $40,000,000,000 budget. A budget of $70,000,000,000 could well increase certain items in these estimated savings pro rata. Although it is difficult to estimate such increases without complete research, it would not be unreasonable to hope that full enactment and faithful execution of the recommendations could bring total savings of over $5,000,000,000 to the Nation's taxpayers. It must be realized, however, that such vast changes take time.

The full savings and efficiencies from the work of the Commission can be accomplished. However, there must be acceptance of three fundamental responsibilities:

First, the responsibility of Congress: The report of the Commission on Organization was a complete plan for the orderly organization of Government. Even those portions of the plan now in effect will not yield the maximum benefits as long as some other integral parts are missing. Remaining recommendations, applying to both specific and general aspects of the Government, require enactment by the Congress.

Second. The responsibility of the executive branch. Savings do not automatically follow passage of a law. Savings follow only upon skillful and vigorous application of reforms. Federal officials and employees must (a) demonstrate a desire to install the reforms and save the money, and (b) demonstrate skill and talent in applying those reforms. In the final instance, of course, the degree of Federal efficiency and economy is dependent upon the officials and employees of the executive branch.

Third. The responsibility of the citizens. Active citizen interest and demand for better Government must continue. Public momentum behind Federal reform is the key to action. Constant citizen attention must be focused on the problems of Federal management. It must be expressed through an ever-vigilant Congress. Otherwise, the value of the reforms will atrophy.

Administrative economies may seem small by contrast with necessary huge increases in Federal expenditures for defense. Actually, the potential economies suggested by the Commission reside only partly in the realm of measurable dollars and cents. Over the long run, better administrators, working with up-to-date methods within a sound organizational structure, are found to do a more efficient, and hence a more economical, job.

This points up the necessity for prompt action on the Commission's remaining recommendations. Among these first priority must be given to proposals for better personnel management. The need for attracting and holding capable administrative, scientific, and specialized personnel has been greatly accentuated by the emergency. As the Commission said: "High caliber executives can eliminate cumbersome and wasteful forms of management." No matter how good a watch is, someone must wind it.

Among the other vital reforms ahead are these: (1) Consolidation of present overlapping, duplicative, and wasteful Federal activities in water resources development and other public works, and the provision of adequate review and supervision for all projects; (2) reorganization of the Veterans' Administration in order to provide more effective and economical service to our increasing numbers of veterans, particularly with respect to life insurance; (3) centralization of policy determinations and of supervision for the expanding Federal medical programs in order to permit full utilization of our limited facilities, both private and public, and, at the same time, to conserve our precious and limited supply of medical manpower; (4) a top-to-bottom overhauling of the United States Department of Agriculture and the transfer to it of control over the public domain; (5) completion of the streamlining of the Post Office Department and ripping out all vestiges of politics; (6) a complete review and reform of the abuses and malorganization which the Commission found in many Federal business enterprises.

Item 6 above offers a particularly fruitful field for congressional activity, as the Reconstruction Finance Corporation review of the Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency so clearly demonstrates.

Adoption of these remaining Commision recommendations will alleviate, to considerable extent, the increasing burden falling on the taxpayers. Your appreciation of this fact and your foresight in establishing the Commission is commendable.

You are at liberty to make such use of this letter as you choose.

Yours faithfully,

HERBERT HOOVER.

THE MANAGEMENT OF THE PUBLIC DEBT

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes to make a statement concerning the critical situation which has arisen over the management of the public debt.

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

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, during my 6 years of service in the Virginia State Senate I was a member of the finance committee which handled both taxes and appropriations. Having through that service become familiar with the financing of the State government, I was happy to be privileged to serve for 10 years on the Ways and Means Committee of the National House of Representatives and to participate in the framing of 12 tax bills, including the financing of World War II. For the past 3 years I have served on the Senate Banking and Currency Committee as chairman of the Subcommittee on the Federal Reserve System with jurisdiction over the problems of banking and credit. My 24 years' study of fiscal matters have at least given me a keen appreciation of what is involved in our present unprecedented inflation, although I confess that a lifetime of study of either taxes or banking and currency would be insufficient to give any man expert knowledge of all the intricate details of either.

Knowing how deeply concerned I was over the present disagreement between the Treasury Department and the Federal Reserve Board over the plan announced in New York on January 18 by

the distinguished Secretary of the Treasury for the management of the public debt, the chairman of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], requested me last Monday to make an investigation of the matter and report to him whether or not I thought a public hearing on the issue involved by my subcommittee or by the full committee would serve a useful purpose.

On the following day, after conferring with officials of both agencies, I announced to the press that, while the problems confronting both the Treasury in the management of the public debt and of the Federal Reserve Board in the management of currency and credit as a brake upon inflation were bigger and more difficult than ever in our history, I felt that full and frank conferences between the officials of the two agencies, with the public welfare as the north star of any agreement being discussed, could result in an area of agreement and, if so, such a means of settlement was much to be preferred to a public hearing. I have never stated, as reported in at least one newspaper, that the issue is a dead one and that I had washed my hands of it.

On yesterday the Senator from South Carolina and I interviewed at length the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board and the chairman of the Executive Committee of the Open Market Committee of the Board and found them willing to enter into negotiations with the Secretary of the Treasury along the lines we suggested. The Senator from South Carolina and I urged immediate action since the issue was so vital to the Nation, and since all members of the Open Market Committee were in the city. The result of that conference was communicated to the Secretary of the Treasury, who this morning invited the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board to confer with him as a preliminary, I assume, to the type of conference suggested by the Senator from South Carolina and myself. Since the confidence of the public in the value of Government securities, without which there can be no successful management of the public debt, is involved, I hope that partisans of a high-interest rate and partisans of a low-interest rate, concerning which at the moment there is no categorical answer, will be restrained in their comments until we know whether or not a policy geared to the general welfare can be agreed upon by the two agencies in question.

During my service in the Congress I have found Mr. Richard L. Strout, of the Christian Science Monitor, to be one of the clearest and most accurate reporters on fiscal affairs. His article, published in the Christian Science Monitor of February 6, entitled "Reserve Board-Treasury Row Breaks Out Into Open," is a clear and accurate description of the issue involved, expressed in terms that a layman can understand, and I ask unanimous consent that the article be published in the RECORD at this point.

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

RESERVE BOARD-TREASURY ROW BREAKS OUT INTO OPEN

(By Richard L. Strout)

WASHINGTON.—A first-rate row has broken out between the Treasury and the Federal Reserve Board.

It involves the conflicting personalities of stubborn Missourian Harry S. Truman and crusty multimillionaire Marriner S. Eccles, Mormon banker.

It involves the pocketbook of nearly every American.

The majority faction on the Reserve Board charges, in effect, that the administration is doing a job of controlling inflation at the grocery store but at the same time is pumping out inflation for all it is worth at the corner bank.

To which quiet-voiced ex-small-town banker John Snyder, Secretary of the Treasury, retorts in effect: "t aint so!"

Mr. Truman is listening to his old friend and close intimate, Mr. Snyder.

MAJORITY SEE SNYDER WRONG

As contrasted to Mr. Snyder, most Federal Reserve officials, the great majority of the bankers, and pretty nearly all economists say the Treasury Department and Mr. Truman are wrong.

This is no mere academic squabble.

It is true that it is extremely complicated. There is not a man in a thousand who can understand the ramifications of the credit-finance system and how bank loans and interest rates are turned into credit.

But there are two things to say: first, complex or not, the issue could hardly be more important because in the final analysis it involves the success or failure of Government efforts to lick inflation.

Second, although the windings of the banking credit system are intricate as a city's gas mains, the important thing to the average citizen is not the winding but whether when he strikes a match he gets gas.

In the same way it is the pragmatic effect of the complex system that is important rather than expert understanding of details.

Inflation is caused by a scarcity of goods in comparison to a plentiful supply of money and credit which bid up prices.

The Eccles school in the Reserve System charge that under presidential and Treasury Department pressure they are forced to support an "easy money" credit policy with low interest rates.

THE SNYDER ARGUMENT

Secretary Snyder likes low interest rates. The reason is natural. The United States is enormously in debt. If interest rates are low he does not have to pay so much on the debt. Interest payments are now $5,800,000,000 every year. Long term interest rates are about 2½ percent. Raise that interest rate as much as one-half of 1 percent, says Mr. Snyder, and presto, the Government's interest payment jumps $1,500,000,000.

This has to be added to the taxpayers' tax bill, Mr. Snyder points out.

On the face of it, it is an open and shut case. Low interest rates seem good for the taxpayer.

But now comes the other side of the argument.

Low interest rates for Government borrowing mean low interest rates for everybody else. Stripped of details the argument goes that low interest rates encourage speculation, business activity, inflation, just when the accent should be on belt-tightening and austerity.

Says the Eccles school the taxpayer stands to lose infinitely more by an easy-money policy that sees the basic value of the dollar depreciated by inflation, than by the hard-credit policy (higher interest rates) even though the latter boosts the cost of carrying the Federal debt.

PERSONAL FEUD INVOLVED

A bitter personal feud has got entangled in one of the great financial controversies of the day.

Until a few years ago Mr. Eccles was Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board. His caustic independent comment and differences with Mr. Snyder got under President Truman's skin. When Mr. Eccles' term expired Mr. Truman politely reappointed him as a member of the Board but replaced him with good-natured friendly Thomas B. McCabe as the new Chairman. Mr. Eccles was demoted. Many thought the wealthy Mormon bachelor would resign from the Board. He stayed on, quietly seething. He is a tough fighter.

The interesting thing is that Philadelphia Banker McCabe seems to have come over to the Eccles viewpoint on the basic opposition to the Treasury's easy-money policy.

The big row burst into the open this week when the showdown came.

Mr. Truman called to the White House for a peace meeting the entire Board membership and heads of the five Federal Reserve big city banks.

Following the meeting, quick statements by Mr. Truman and the Treasury announced the Board had pledged itself to the Treasury program.

This looked like a complete capitulation.

Then came the bombshell.

TRUMAN VIEW CHALLENGED

On his own authority, and specifically stating that he was acting without consultation with other Board members, Mr. Eccles released the official minutes of the meeting prepared by Gov. R. M. Evans and approved by the Board.

These showed that the Truman-Snyder interpretation was incorrect or at any rate overstated the case. On the basic dispute the Reserve Board members had hardly expressed any opinion at all to Mr. Truman. The critical issue of interest rates had hardly been raised.

Internal evidence indicates that Mr. Truman took silence for consent at the meeting. His statement appears to have been issued in good faith. A bitter schism has appeared in the Reserve Board. Members ask why Chairman McCabe didn't act as their spokesman and present the issue. When Mr. Truman left the conference he apparently thought he had full agreement.

The seven board members and five bankers took a vote afterward on a motion to suspend independent action and go along with Mr. Snyder and the Treasury on interest rates. It was defeated 8 to 4. Here was the vote.

For the motion: Board Governors Vardaman, Powell, Norton & Evans. Against: Board Chairman McCabe, governors Eccles, Szymczak, bankers Sproul, Young, Peyton, Gilbert & Erickson.

In such bitter division the crucial inflation issue now stands.

THE MEAT SITUATION—STATEMENT BY SENATOR BUTLER OF NEBRASKA

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, it has been my intention to obtain the floor today, if possible, to make a statement in regard to the meat situation. However, in view of the fact that I understand that the program for today is to be a very busy one, and in view of the fact that I have to attend a committee meeting at 2 o'clock, I ask unanimous consent to have the statement

which I intended to make printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

DON'T HAMPER THE MEAT PRODUCER

(Statement by Senator H. BUTLER)

During the last few weeks, the livestock producer and the meat industry generally seem to have been selected and singled out as the principal object of the efforts of the Office of Price Stabilization in its program of controlling the cost of living. Almost every edition of any daily newspaper carries stories about new orders or rumors of orders to control the production of meat. Meat prices were, supposedly at least, frozen along with the general freeze of all prices issued a few days ago. In addition, we are told that slaughterers are to be placed under a special licensing system, and are to be required to make special reports. There is talk of meat rationing, and there are rumors of subsidies as an instrument of price control. In fact, there are rumors of almost every conceivable price-control technique on meat and livestock.

Evidently, there is a sort of crusade underway against the farmer and the livestock producer. Apparently, he is to be the object of all the experiments that may come to the minds of those administering price control. Furthermore, it is apparent that he has been selected as the goat of the whole inflation problem. The story has been presented to the public that meat prices must be controlled first and most thoroughly, if other items in the cost of living are to be controlled.

This general campaign against the farmer has gone to such lengths that I believe it is time for some of us from farming areas to speak out. If there has been any inflation to date, the farmer is not the cause of it. Industrial prices and wages have reached new record heights. Farm prices have not yet even recovered from the price collapse of the last few years. Farm prices are still well below the level of 3 years ago. In fact, prices of many farm products are still well below parity.

I realize, of course, that there are those in the administration who would like to place ceilings on farm products at levels below parity. Parity prices for farmers are a favorite target for some big-city newspapers. During the last few months, the volume of criticism of some of the daily newspapers has increased steadily in volume against Congress—for refusing to permit ceilings below parity.

It is certainly true that Congress insisted that no ceilings be placed on farm products below parity. Congress put that provision in the law, and I hope and believe that Congress will keep it in. I, for one, would never vote to take it out. If we are to have a system of price controls, the farmer is certainly entitled to a fair price under such controls—and that's what parity is.

Returning now to these various proposals to control livestock and meat, just why are any controls necessary on livestock or livestock products?

I can understand the absolute necessity for placing price controls on those products of which there is an actual physical shortage because they are being used directly for rearmament. The shortage of these items would create such a scramble among consumers that their prices would certainly go sky high if there were no controls. There is no shortage of meat, however, and the men of the armed services do not eat any more meat than they did at home, or at least not enough to make any difference.

I can also understand why it may be necessary to control the prices of many manufactured items during an extreme sellers' market, such as we have now. Industrial prices are generally set by the industrial firms selling the goods. The purchaser has no choice except to pay whatever price is asked or do without. That is not the situation that the farmer faces in the sale of his products. He has no way of setting his own price on the products he sells. The price for his produce is set by the buyer, or at an auction, or perhaps by the fluctations of an open market. It is, so to speak, always a buyers' market for farm products.

There is no way that the farmer can exploit his customers, even if he wanted to. He has virtually no control over the price of what he sells.

In short, we are now speaking of putting a ceiling on an item which is in plentiful supply and which is sold in an open, uncontrolled market where buyers freely purchase whatever quantities they want at prices they agree upon. If prices have gone up, it is because buyers have bid them up.

I suggest that if meat and cattle prices have gone up too much, it is not the fault of the livestock producer. It is because of inflationary governmental policies, and particularly because of wrong Federal financial policies. Prices are being pushed up because the Federal Government is spending more than it takes in, and that is the only reason. We can correct it and prevent it if we choose by balancing the budget.

Mr. President, I do not believe that it is in the interests of either producer or consumer to attempt to control the price of either meat or cattle at this time, and under present conditions. I believe that the attempt at control will defeat its own purpose. Furthermore, I believe our experience should teach us that it is virtually impossible to exercise effective control over meat.

As I mentioned before, there is no shortage of meat in this country—yet. There may be if the livestock industry must submit to price controls, but today our supplies of meat are practically at an all-time high. That supply can be increased still further if the meat industry is not hampered and discouraged by unrealistic control. Let me cite a few of the basic facts about the meat supply.

Last year, after making allowances for the quantity of meat required by the armed services, there was still available 145 pounds of meat per capita for our entire population. That is not quite a record supply per capita, but it is very close to it. This year, there will be even more—146 pounds per capita.

That is more meat per person than was consumed in any year since 1947. It is substantially more than in any prewar year. This supply of meat can be even further increased by a considerable amount. Production of meat has been rising for the last 3 years. During that same period, feed supplies have been increasing ever faster. Production of feed over the past 3 years (including an allowance for normal quantities of wheat and rye for feed) has averaged nearly 155,000,000 tons. That is more feed than we have ever used in any year—even in our peak production year of 1944.

We are starting into this defense production effort with an all-time record carryover of feeds. The corn carry-over this year is 860,000,000 bushels (25 percent of the normal crop). In addition, we are fortunate in that we are now on a rising trend of cattle numbers. During and following the OPA days, there was extensive slaughter of herds. Cattle numbers on farms dropped from a peak of 85,573,000 head down to a low point of 78,126,000. During the past few years, that figure has climbed up rapidly again. On the first of January 1950, there were 80,277,000 head, and it is expected that the figure for January 1, 1951, will be at least 82,000,000. If there is no interference with this process, we may hope that cattle numbers will continue to rise rapidly, at least to 85,000,000, and perhaps even to 90,000,000 head. That will mean more breeding stock, and also more meat on the hoof within a comparatively short time. As I have already pointed out, we will undoubtedly have the feed to carry this increased number of cattle, and produce the additional meat we want.

Under these circumstances, it is highly probable that meat production can be pushed well past the production level of 1944, which allowed 153 pounds of meat per person, aside from those in the armed services. I can understand that consumers would like to have their meat at a low price, but I believe they also want to secure the maximum quantity of meat. Unwise controls will cut down this production and cut into the meat supply that consumers want.

There is another problem which is peculiar to the meat industry. That is the virtual impossibility of really effective controls. Meat is produced on thousands of farms all over this country. Much of it is processed in a few packing plants, but it does not have to be. It does not take very elaborate equipment to slaughter livestock and prepare the meat for consumption. Furthermore, livestock can be and is sold not only at the large stockyards, but also at country markets, by private sales, and virtually at every crossroads. The marketing channels are extremely fluid and can be readily changed.

There are no precise grades or quality classifications that can be placed on live cattle. Each shipment of beef cattle commands its own price on its own merits. Therefore, it is not possible to establish effective ceilings by grade.

Altogether the livestock industry is the one industry that is just impossible to control effectively. There are too many different possible markets, too many individual differences in cattle, too many ways to get around the control machinery.

We have learned from our experience during World War II that a simple price ceiling is not enough to do the job. Price ceilings create shortages and the apparent need for rationing. If any real attempt is made to enforce price ceilings, I predict that we will have meat rationing within 3 months. If we do, that is when the black marketeers will really come into their own. I have heard rumors that there are packing houses now closed down, which are getting ready to reopen as soon as rationing is restored and black market opportunities arise. During World War II, the black marketeers were amateurs at the game, but now they have learned all the tricks. I am afraid they will do a professional job of diverting the meat from the legitimate channels and into the black market.

Altogether the job of administering such a complex system of controls would tax the ingenuity of the most competent, honest, and nonpartisan administrative organization. Unfortunately, it does not seem likely that we shall have such an organization to administer this system. The administration has already given clear evidence that price-control machinery is to be handled on a strictly political basis. The Office of Price Stabilization is being loaded up with political appointees and "lame ducks" of every description. In State after State, the better positions are being parceled out to those acceptable to the Democratic organization. Thus these high-salaried positions are being reserved to a select clique, but more important, those holding the top enforcement jobs will be in position to use their authority for the benefit of the party. It is safe to assume that if any black marketeers who are not on friendly terms with this administration are caught, they will be prosecuted. Whether party stalwarts who break the regulations will receive the same treatment, remains to be seen.

Mr. President, altogether the difficulties in a program of this sort are tremendous, while the advantages are questionable. To

my mind, the whole attempt is virtually a confession that we have failed to develop sound policies to finance this rearmament effort. Why should price controls and rationing be necessary if there is no shortage? Why, at the very time when we want and need more meat, should we take an action which will necessarily hinder the production of meat? The livestock men of this country can produce all the meat we can possibly require, and at a fair price. If given a chance, they will do so in response to the normal play of the forces of supply and demand. They can and will expand livestock numbers and increase meat production very sharply within a year or two, now that they know there is a market for it. We are foolish if we do not let them do so.

Instead, the Office of Price Stabilization appears intent on holding down meat production, thereby creating an artificial shortage, and then rationing the shortage.

In this emergency, Mr. President, I suggest that much of our thinking is in the wrong direction. Instead of restriction, we need expansion. Instead of cutting down on necessities, we need more production to produce those necessities and to meet the demands of rearmament.

To take the other course is to take the path that Socialist England has taken. England put price controls and rationing on early in World War II and has never reached the point where she can take them off. The price of meat is controlled, but there is no meat. The individual ration for meat has been cut—again and again. It is now less than one-half what was allowed during World War II. Today in England, the individual ration for meat is so small that it provides each consumer about one square meal per week. That is the course, I am afraid, down which we are being led. I do not worry so much about temporary hardships and temporary controls. I am more afraid that these temporary emergencies will be used to fasten a control system on us permanently. That is my real fear, and that is why I am protesting today.

Mr. President, price ceilings and rationing will never solve the problem of supplying meat to our people, but production will. I urge most strongly that the Office of Price Stabilization, in its consideration of any proposed regulations and controls, will adhere to that fundamental principle.

PRICES RECEIVED BY FARMERS FOR EGGS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I send to the desk and ask to have printed in the RECORD a list which appeared in the Renville County Farmer, a very fine newspaper published in Renville County, N. Dak., showing that the price of eggs on February 1 to the farmer was 25 cents a dozen.

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

Tuesday's market

Butterfat No. 1 (sour)	$0.69
Butterfat No. 1 (sweet)	.71
Wholesale butter	.71
Wheat	2.16
Flax	4.35
Oats	.75
Rye	1.46
Choice A durum	2.00
Red durum	1.91
Eggs, dozen	.25

COMPLAINT BY DEFIANCE SPARK PLUG CORP. CHARGING MONOPOLY

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be allowed to address the Senate for 2 minutes in connection with a letter which I wish to read.

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

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, the letter is dated January 25, 1951. It relates to Federal Trade Commission Docket No. 3977.

Mr. President, I desire to call the attention of the distinguished junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], the Democratic leader, to this letter. I do not know the writer of the letter, although I have had some correspondence with him since I received the letter, but what he states in his letter is in direct contrast to everything the Democratic Party promised the people at the last election.

I now read the letter:

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: May 4, 1937, we filed complaint with the Federal Trade Commission against Champion Spark Plug Co. charging monopoly.

Final hearing was held December 4, 1950, in Washington.

Thirteen years is a long waiting period. The Big Three—Champion Spark Plug Co., AC Spark Plug Co., and Electric Auto-Lite Co.—have 90 percent of the spark-plug business in the country, while some 40 small manufacturers are bleeding to death; more than 20 have "passed on."

Can anything be done to hasten action by the Commission?

Thank you.

Very truly yours,

DEFIANCE SPARK PLUG CORP.,
RAYMOND P. LIPE, *President*.

I may say that three of the present members of the Federal Trade Commission, Mr. Mead, Mr. Carson, and Mr. Spingarn, are not to blame for the condition complained of in the letter; but if any member of the Commission has served on it for as long as 10 years, I suggest that he should resign his office and should let a competent person take his place.

Mr. President, in that connection I hold in my hand a list of the licensed attorneys in North Dakota. This list gives the name of every licensed lawyer in that State. I ask unanimous consent that the list be printed along with the letter. I suggest that any lawyer practicing in North Dakota, no matter how young or how old he may be, can do a better job than has been done in this case, in which 13 years have passed without the taking of action.

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

1948 LIST OF LICENSED ATTORNEYS

ADAMS COUNTY

James A. Clement, Charles M. Dunn, E. C. Thomas, Hettinger.

BARNES COUNTY

Romen H. Fitzner, Fred J. Fredrickson, A. F. Greffenius, Valley City; A. P. Hanson, Litchville; Tilford Owen Kroshus, E. G. Larson, Bernard C. Lyons, Marian Maloney, William L. Paulson, C. E. Peterson, Roy A. Ployhar, D. S. Ritchie, John Sad, L. T. Sproul, L. A. W. Stephan, Valley City.

BENSON COUNTY

L. L. Butterwick, Minnewaukan; Adrian E. Buttz, Leeds; M. C. Hiasen, Charles A. Lent, Albert Louis Lindstrom, W. G. McDonald, Steve Ward, Minnewaukan.

BILLINGS COUNTY

William W. Eichhorst, W. J. Ray, Medora.

BOTTINEAU COUNTY

W. H. Adams, Asmunder Benson, O. B. Benson, Bottineau; E. O. Haraldson, Lansford; Maurice Weeks, Bottineau.

BOWMAN COUNTY

Mark H. Amundson, M. S. Byrne, Theodore B. Torkelson, Bowman.

BURKE COUNTY

Earl Walter, B. L. Wilson, Bowbells.

BURLEIGH COUNTY

W. J. Austin, Robert A. Birdzell, Scott Cameron, Joseph Coghlan, Ed. B. Cox, Gordon V. Cox, I. C. Davies, E. Forsyth Engerbretson, P. J. Engeseth, C. L. Foster, P. B. Garberg, Arnold O. Goplen, Bismarck; A. H. Helgeson, Wilton; Harold Hopton, E. A. Houck, J. A. Hyland, Clifford Jansonius, William Langer, Charles Liessman, Thomas Daniel McCarty, F. E. McCurdy, Archie H. McGray, Walter Mohn, Catherine E. Morris, R. C. Morton, J. K. Murray, William S. Murray, Gunnar Olgeirson, I. M. Oseth, Owen Tudor Owen, William R. Pearce, George M. Register, George S. Register, P. O. Sathre, Geo. F. Shafer, Charles Simon, Alvin C. Strutz, C. L. Young, Alfred Zuger, John A. Zuger, Bismarck.

CASS COUNTY

Gordon S. Aamoth, Alvin Aas, Oscar H. Ahlberg, Aaron Aronson, Harold W. Bangert, Albert R. Bergesen, Pershing Boe, Clair F. Brickner, Myron H. Bright, Lee F. Brooks, Gordon F. Burnett, W. F. Burnett, Neil Cameron, Fred W. Colby, E. T. Conmy, E. T. Conmy, Jr., J. F. X. Conmy, Ralph F. Croal, A. W. Cupler, Alfred S. Dale, Vernon W. Edenstrom, H. S. Finch, Morgan D. Ford, Martin C. Fredricks, Jr., A. S. Grady, Wayne A. Grimm, Otto Haakenstad, S. W. Hagan, William E. Heller, J. E. Hendrickson, Lyle Eugene Huseby, John S. Johanneson, A. I. Johnson, Francis X. Kirsch, Fargo; G. W. LaBree, Casselton; P. W. Lanier, P. W. Lanier, Jr., Harry Lashkowitz, B. H. Lee, Marion Jane Leslie, G. Eldon Longstreth, Fargo; Arthur Whitten McCauley, West Fargo; D. E. McCullagh, William P. McGrath, Adrian McLellan, Dale R. McMichael, Harry O. Mowery, John J. Mudready, Francis Murphy, Herbert G. Nilles, John Joseph Nilles, L. H. Oehlert, Fargo; Manfred R. Ohnstad, West Fargo; Bessie Spangler Olson, John Gordon Ottis, John G. Pfeffer, Roger Pitsenbarger, Charles M. Pollock, Joseph M. Powers, Roy K. Redetzke, Scott T. Rex, Robert W. Rovelstad, C. J. Rund, Chester J. Serkland, Emanuel Sgutt, Albert W. Shupienis, Charles H. Shure, W. H. Shure, Chauncey B. Simons, Leland J. Smith, George A. Soule, Lynn U. Stambaugh, Emanuel M. Stern, Marie K. E. Stiening, Odlin J. Strandness, Norman G. Tenneson, Paul G. Thonn, Franklin J. Van Osdel, Mart R. Vogel, Phil B. Vogel, Fargo; Alfred O. Wallen, Erie; C. C. Wattam, Goodwin T. Westlund, Neal E. Williams, Fargo; Frank J. Woell, Joseph H. Woell, Casselton.

CAVALIER COUNTY

Thomas Devaney, E. L. Donovan, Robert Q. Price, Ellis G. Snowfield, J. M. Snowfield, Langdon.

DICKEY COUNTY

T. L. Brouillard, Donald R. Crabtree, F. J. Graham, Ellendale; A. P. Guy, George Margulies, Oakes.

DIVIDE COUNTY

Olaf Braatelien, George P. Homnes, R. H. Points, T. S. Stuart, E. A. Tannas, Crosby.

DUNN COUNTY

J. Kenneth Eckes, Karl Gruenwald, Killdeer; H. L. Malloy, A. J. Palmer, Halliday.

EDDY COUNTY

Dorwin Z. Aas, R. G. Manly, Edgar P. Mattson, Lynn W. Schwoebel, New Rockford.

EMMONS COUNTY

Robert Chesrown, Charles Coventry, H. C. Lynn, Linton.

FOSTER COUNTY

C. W. Burnham, William A. Kunkel, Thomas A. Roney, Carrington.

GOLDEN VALLEY COUNTY

W. L. Eckes, John Keohane, Beach; Guy Lee, Sentinel Butte; Howard A. Moum, Beach.

GRAND FORKS COUNTY

Grace Alphson, John A. Alphson, Robert A. Alphson, Philip R. Bangs, O. B. Burtness, Ronald N. Davies, Carroll E. Day, Thomas L. Degnan, Theodore B. Elton, Robert A. Feidler, Edward C. Gillig, Harold M. Hager, Helen N. Hamilton, Fred E. Harris, Donald C. Holand, Carther Jackson, E. Clifton Lebacken, Grand Forks; J. A. Lemery, Inkster; James Edward Leo, Daniel S. Letnes, W. H. Linwell, Martin U. Lohn, George Longmire, Charles A. Lyche, Cyrus N. Lyche, H. H. Matt, Milton E. Moskau, Kenneth J. Mullen, C. J. Murphy, Carlton G. Nelson, Lowell A. O'Grady, Henry O'Keefe, Jr., Grand Forks; Ralph S. Oliver, Larimore; Henry Grattan Owen, Samuel E. Paletz, C. F. Peterson, Samuel Rubin, Henry G. Ruemmele, Harry L. Schwam, Harold D. Shaft, Sam S. Silverman, George D. Smith, Arthur W. Stokes, T. H. Thoresen, Olaf M. Thorsen, T. A. Toner, Grand Forks; Horace G. Webster, Northwood.

GRANT COUNTY

R. G. Beede, Elgin; Edmund Dubbs, New Leipzig; Emil A. Griese, Carson.

GRIGGS COUNTY

Maurice William Duffy, Oscar J. Thompson, Cooperstown.

HETTINGER COUNTY

Reuben J. Bloedau, Charles E. Crane, V. H. Crane, H. P. Jacobson, Mott.

KIDDER COUNTY

Jasper N. McCarter, Ralph N. Molbert, Rees L. Phelps, Linn Sherman, Anne Vinje, Steele.

LA MOURE COUNTY

Mark A. Buechler, Roy A. Holand, Theodore F. Kessel, T. W. Lynch, LaMoure.

LOGAN COUNTY

D. L. Anderson, Burnstad; August Doerr, C. Francis Swanke, Napoleon.

M'HENRY COUNTY

Thomas D. Morrow, Walter R. Spaulding, Victor V. Stiehm, D. G. Topp, Towner.

M'INTOSH COUNTY

B. E. Kretschmar, I. A. Mackoff, Edwin J. F. Myers, Jr., Max A. Wishek, Ashley.

M'KENZIE COUNTY

P. C. Arildson, A. O. Haugerud, J. S. Taylor, Watford City.

M'LEAN COUNTY

R. A. H. Brandt, Big Bend; Robert L. Fraser, Milton K. Higgins, Washburn; D. W. B. Kurtz, Jr., Garrison; Lewis J. Mann, Washburn; Alex W. Skoropat, Wilton; Robert L. Vogel, Garrison; John E. Williams, Washburn.

MERCER COUNTY

Wesley Henry Esterly, Beulah; F. Leslie Forsgren, Hazen; W. R. Mills, Stanton; Raymond R. Rund, Golden Valley; Theodore A. Sailer, Hazen; Floyd B. Sperry, Golden Valley.

MORTON COUNTY

C. D. Cooley, Mandan; August E. Draeb, Hebron; J. P. Fleck, R. F. Gallagher, Richard P. Gallagher, Mandan; S. E. Halpern, Glen Ullin; Thorstein Hyland, Mandan; P. S. Jungers, Hebron; C. F. Kelsch, Mandan; Kurth H. Krauth, Hebron; John F. Lord, Mandan; J. V. McCormick, New Salem; William H. McCormick, Walton S. Russell, Clarence James Schauss, W. H. Stutsman, John F. Sullivan, Mandan.

MOUNTRAIL COUNTY

K. E. Edwardson, White Earth; Quentin R. Schulte, R. E. Swendseid, F. F. Wyckoff, Stanley.

NELSON COUNTY

E. C. Boostrom, Lysle C. Boostrom, Einar Johnson, Ingman Swinland, Lakota; Peter C. Tangen, Aneta.

OLIVER COUNTY

Burton S. Wilcox, Clara W. Wilcox, Center.

PEMBINA COUNTY

Eugene E. Coyne, Leonard J. Eid, Walhalla; Ross H. McEnroe, Drayton; Ross McIntosh, F. S. Snowfield, H. B. Spiller, Cavalier; I. Steenson, Drayton.

PIERCE COUNTY

Roland A. Heringer, A. R. Jongewaard, Harold B. Nelson, L. R. Nostdal, H. B. Senn, Lawrence E. Watson, Rugby.

RAMSEY COUNTY

F. T. Cuthbert, Clyde Duffy, Douglas B. Heen, Henry E. Lemke, D. B. McDonald, Howard Maher, Devils Lake; T. W. Morrissey, Edmore; Myer R. Shark, Torger Sinness, H. W. Swenson, Obert C. Teigen, S. W. Thompson, Fred J. Traynor, Mack V. Traynor, Devils Lake.

RANSOM COUNTY

S. D. Adams, Lisbon; Charles G. Bangert, Enderlin; Charles S. Ego, Lisbon; Tim A. Francis, Enderlin; Clarence G. Mead, H. P. Remington, Lisbon; Frank E. Shaw, Sheldon.

RENVILLE COUNTY

P. M. Clark, Theo. P. Clifford, S. A. Sorenson, Mohall.

RICHLAND COUNTY

M. S. Aker, Hankinson; Wayne T. Childs, Wahpeton; Everett R. Dawson, Lidgerwood; Jos. G. Forbes, Vernon D. Forbes, Harry M. Griffith, Wahpeton; O. S. Gunderson, Christine; Mildred Burns Johnson, Vernon M. Johnson, Patrick T. Milloy, Clifford Schneller, Wahpeton.

ROLETTE COUNTY

John B. Hart, Rolla; Ralph B. Maxwell, Belcourt; J. Howard Stormon, John A. Stormon, J. Arthur Vandal, Rolla.

SARGENT COUNTY

Walter C. King, A. Leslie, Forman; O. S. Sem, Milnor.

SHERIDAN COUNTY

Victor L. Thom, Goodrich; John Oliver Thorson, Warren A. Tripp, McClusky.

SIOUX COUNTY

Nelson Mason, Fort Yates.

SLOPE COUNTY

R. L. Striebel, Marmarth; Theodore Swendseid, Amidon.

STARK COUNTY

L. R. Baird, Richard V. Boulger, W. C. Crawford, Theodore Kellogg, M. L. McBride, H. A. Mackoff, Norbert J. Muggli, T. F. Murtha, W. F. Reichert, Gilbert Saxowsky, C. H. Starke, J. W. Sturgeon, Otto Thress, Dickinson.

STEELE COUNTY

A. E. Dolezal, Hope; E. T. Meldahl, Finley.

STUTSMAN COUNTY

A. W. Aylmer, Quentin N. Burdick, Leslie R. Burgum, Russell D. Chase, J. A. Coffey, Robert D. Dames, M. C. Fredricks, Robert Emmett Fredricks, T. E. George, Arnold O. Ginnow, John Hjellum, Arthur I. Knauf, John Knauf, Cytella Dahn Rittgers, Harry E. Rittgers, Arnold M. Snortland, Samuel A. Wilder, Jamestown.

TOWNER COUNTY

Paul L. Agneberg, C. E. Joseph, J. J. Kehoe, J. S. Moothart, Lloyd B. Stevens, Cando.

TRAILL COUNTY

G. J. Clauson, Hatton; Thomas G. Johnson, Chauncey T. Kaldor, Hillsboro; Harvey N. Kaldor, Harvey B. Knudson, Carl J. Larson, Mayville; John I. Lerom, Buxton; Charles H. Shafer, Hillsboro; George F. Sorlie, Buxton.

WALSH COUNTY

Mark J. Clayburgh, Jr., Grafton; George V. Coffey, Minto; T. I. Dahl, H. C. DePuy, W. T. DePuy, Ben Greenberg, Lynn G. Grimson, Albert Lundberg, Joel Myers, Grafton; Roy A. Neste, Park River; Robert Vaaler, Wallace E. Warner, Grafton; F. Lorene Whitesides, Park River.

WARD COUNTY

C. D. Aaker, Robert H. Bosard, B. H. Bradford, G. O. Brekke, Robert A. Buttz, Paul Campbell, Thomas F. Clifford, Carlton B. Davis, B. A. Dickinson, Joseph J. Funke, Halvor L. Halvorson, H. L. Halvorson, Jr., O. B. Herigstad, Clara J. Johnson, H. E. Johnson, Robert M. Johnson, Leo C. Lindemann, Grant J. Lindlauf, John C. Lowe, E. B. McCutcheon, E. Hugh McCutcheon, George A. McGee, Richard H. McGee, E. J. McIlraith, Jim Miller, Thomas B. Murphy, Magner J. Muus, Mrs. F. Margaret Pfeffer Muus, P. D. Norton, Alice E. Olander, Robert W. Palda, Minot; A. J. Pederson, Kenmare; Joseph P. Stevens, C. A. Thompson, Ella J. Van Berkom, Bruce M. Van Sickle, Corbin A. Waldron, G. S. Wooledge, Minot.

WELLS COUNTY

Samuel H. Dolve, John A. Layne, F. W. McGuiness, Arthur L. Netcher, Fessenden; J. W. Schmidt, John J. Tebelius, Aloys Wartner, Aloys Wartner, Jr., Harvey; Adam V. Zuber, Fessenden.

WILLIAMS COUNTY

Arley R. Bjella, Williston; H. Morris Borstad, Tioga; Eugene A. Burdick, U. L. Burdick, Walter O. Burk, F. W. Medberry, Joseph N. Mendro, Robert Norheim, Everett E. Palmer, Telmar E. Rolfstad, Williston; E. C. Rudolph, Ray; Dean Winkjer, Williston.

TAX LAWS MUST BE BASED ON EQUALITY OF SACRIFICE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be allowed approximately 4 minutes in which to make a statement on the President's tax message.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the American people last week read with great interest the tax message submitted by the President. I heartily endorse the President's determination to pay as we go for our expanding defense effort. It is wise to tailor the tax program to the unfolding defense program, pushing through about $10,000,000,000 of higher taxes now, and holding the rest of the tax increase until the military picture unfolds.

A pay-as-we-go tax policy is the least we can do in the face of the sacrifices being made by the men and women in our Armed Forces. Besides, it is just common sense to match expenditures on guns, planes, ships, and tanks with tax receipts. Otherwise, the Government will incur large deficits, and the inevitable result will be more inflation.

I am sure that the American people see the need for additional taxes. I am also sure that they are willing to make their contribution, even if it hurts. But we cannot in good faith ask the rank and file to pay their share when a chosen few can take advantage of glaring loopholes in the tax laws. It would violate every test of equal sacrifice to ask the man in the street to pay higher excise and income taxes when the rich become richer through our failure to close loopholes.

I, for one, will insist that the $10,000,000,000 tax bill be accompanied by a firm commitment that loopholes will be closed. The American people demanded an excess-profits tax last year, long before the Congress acted. This year the American people will insist on a tough loophole-closing program to catch the tax dodgers. They want to have a right to equality of sacrifices; they oppose special tax privileges for anybody. I intend to make it my business, and I hope that other Senators and Representatives will join me in the effort to tell the people the unvarnished truth about these loopholes.

Those who want to keep on protecting the privileged few will argue that loophole closing will not raise much revenue. It is a familiar line: "Why worry about the few dollars that slip through the net? The real money lies in raising rates." This is false counsel. Let there be no mistake about the fact that billions of dollars can be raised by plugging loopholes. Here are a few samples:

First. The excess-profits tax which was enacted by the last Congress is full of holes. Railroads, utilities, natural-gas companies, and other regulated companies are virtually exempt from tax. Congress has also guaranteed other corporations fabulous levels of profits free of excess-profits tax by a number of technical provisions, such as the growth formula and the special allowances for borrowed capital. By tightening up the excess-profits tax we could raise at least $1,000,000,000.

Second. Our unbelievably generous depletion provisions hand the oil and mining interests half a billion dollars each year. Last year, the President called this loophole the most glaring in the tax laws. Congress did nothing about it. This year, with tax rates going still higher, this loophole is even more unconscionable and more expensive.

Third. The estate and gift taxes are in a pitiable state. It is unbelievable that, in a country so wealthy as ours, these taxes raise little more than three-quarters of a billion dollars. The Secretary of the Treasury presented a plan to the Congress last year for tightening up these taxes. Again nothing was done. Yet there are at least another three-quarters of a billion dollars to be had for the asking from the estate and gift taxes, by plugging loopholes, raising rates, and reducing the big exemptions. Let us make these taxes do the job they ought to in the richest country in the world.

Fourth. At the same time that wage earners are paying every last cent of their taxes because the money is withheld from their pay envelopes, billions of dollars of interest and dividends are evading taxes. This criminal evasion must be stopped. One of the best ways to do this is to withhold the tax from interest and dividends, just as we do on wages and salaries. By this elementary improvement in enforcement, we can add at least $300,000,000 a year to our revenues.

Fifth. The income-splitting provisions enacted by the Eightieth Congress confer unwarranted tax benefits on the well-to-do. People in the lowest tax bracket gained nothing from this provision. At the $25,000 level, it reduced the taxes of a married person by more than a quarter. We cannot afford to give such hand-outs in times like these. If the benefits of income splitting were eliminated, we could increase tax collections by no less than $2,500,000,000.

These five items alone add up to an even $5,000,000,000. I have not mentioned others, such as the loopholes in the capital-gains provisions, the tax exemption for interest on State and local bonds, and the weak tax provisions for life-insurance companies. I have no doubt that a determined effort to close all the loopholes could be made to yield practically all of the $6,500,000,000 needed over and above the $10,000,000,000 program itemized by the President.

Last year, when the Senate was considering the Revenue Act of 1950, I joined with my able colleagues, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] in bringing to the attention of the Senate defects in the bill. We presented at that time 12 amendments designed to close various loopholes in tax legislation. I am pleased to say that we will again, with the assistance of other distinguished and able Members of this body, make an effort to improve the tax laws by eliminating loopholes. It is our hope that, with the assistance of the American people, this will be done. Already, as a result of the energetic activities of radio commentators such as Mr. Frank Edwards and Mr. Drew Pearson, many thousands of Americans have written to me expressing interest in our activities, and requesting information.

I therefore ask unanimous consent at this point that there be included, following my remarks, a summary of our tax presentation on the floor of the Senate of last year outlining certain of the tax loopholes which were at issue in the 81st Congress.

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

SUMMARY BY SENATOR HUMPHREY OF TAX BILL AMENDMENTS TO CLOSE LOOPHOLES

It is essential for the American people and all their representatives in Congress to know more about Federal taxation. It is not enough merely to know that a graduated individual income tax is desirable, because it is based on ability to pay, and that a sales tax is bad because it hits hardest those with lowest incomes and largest families. In order to insure that everyone pays his fair share of income taxes we have several considerations that must be taken into account:

1. We have to weed out those who misrepresent the amount of their income when they fill out their tax return. This is primarily the job of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, but the rest of us can help out by frowning upon sharp tax practices and assuming our responsibilities as citizens.

2. We have to keep a sharp lookout that our graduated income tax system is not defeated by efforts of individuals or corporations to divide or "split" income with other persons in such a way as to avoid payment of taxes, while at the same time retaining effective economic control of the income.

3. Another source of trouble has been the availability of a much lower rate of tax on so-called "long-term" capital gains, with the resultant temptation to taxpayers to try to claim that ordinary, recurrent income is really a capital gain.

4. There is constant pressure upon taxpayers (and those who do not want to pay taxes) to reduce their taxable income by charging off greater deductions than would normally be allowable under proper rules of accounting.

Finally, there are the pleas, usually upon some claim of injustice, discrimination or unconstitutionality, that all or part of the income of an individual or corporation should not be subject to any tax at all.

This summation of the principal current problems of Federal income taxation may wreak havoc with the erudite concepts of the tax lawyers, accountants and economists. But I have taken this approach in an earnest effort to understand how the income tax part of the Federal tax system really operates. Perhaps a little unorthodoxy can help us dispel some of the fog which enshrouds the twists and turns of Federal taxation as tightly as do all the security regulations in the field of atomic energy.

If we analyze the provisions of the pending bill, and the decisions of the Committee on Finance, there are a number which seem to fall within the broad confines of the five areas I have outlined.

An analysis of the 12 amendments introduced by me is as follows:

1. Dividend withholding: Out of about eight million paid out in corporation dividends annually, one billion is not reported on stockholder tax returns. Wage earners must pay taxes as earned, why continue to tolerate evasion by coupon clippers? The provision in the House bill for withholding taxes on dividends should be restored. The Government is now losing between one hundred and sixty and one hundred and seventy million dollars a year under present law.

2. Percentage depletion: Neither the Senate nor House bill does anything to limit the excessive depletion allowances for oil and gas and other minerals which the President described as the worst loophole in our tax laws. This windfall costs the Government $400,000,000 a year. If an ordinary businessman invests $100,000 in plant and equipment, he gets a tax deduction of this amount prorated over the useful life of the property. Another man who invests in an oil well can, through "percentage depletion" allowances obtain a tax deduction not only for the $100,000 initial investment, but several times this amount.

3. Oil royalties: Instead of receiving royalties from oil wells, which are subject to ordinary income and surtax rates, oilmen would be able to "sell" their right to such income for a 1-year period or longer, and be subject only to capital-gain rates. Many oilmen are now taxed at normal and surtax rates totaling 50 percent or more. Yet these operators would pay, under the committee bill, at only the capital-gain rate of 25 percent on such "in-oil" payments.

4. Family partnerships: This is a retroactive reversal of Supreme Court decisions which refused to allow businessmen to make fictitious "partners" of their wives, children, and other relatives, solely to split up their income for tax purposes. For example, the tax on an unmarried man with an income of $40,000 a year amounts to almost $17,000, or nearly double the total taxes of $8,500 payable on four incomes of $10,000 each.

5. Stock options: Corporate executives would be allowed to pay at capital-gains rates in lieu of normal and surtax rates, on that part of their salary received in the form of options to buy company stock at less than market price. An unmarried executive earning $30,000 a year would pay $12,000 more in taxes if given a $20,000 a year cash bonus. If the bonus is paid in stock options, under the Finance Committee bill he would pay only $5,000 more in taxes.

6. Tax-free redemption of stocks to pay estate taxes: Estates of owners of corporations would be allowed to draw down accumulated earnings and profits free of income tax to the extent used to pay estate and inheritance taxes. This amendment has practical application under present gift and estate tax exemptions only to single persons with estates of $250,000 and over, or to married persons with estates of $500,000 or more.

7. Corporate spin-offs: This provision would exempt from taxation the value of new stocks distributed to stockholders by a corporation which decided to "spin off" part of its business into a separate firm. These stocks are now considered as "dividends" for tax purposes and, thus, are subject to individual income taxes. Under the committee bill, therefore, accumulated corporate profits could be distributed to stockholders at capital gains tax rates instead of the usual normal and surtax rates applicable to dividends. This amendment is of real benefit only to single persons with income of $18,000 a year and married couples of $36,000 a year.

8. Amortization of emergency facilities: While omitting an excess-profits tax on corporations, the committee bill would permit accelerated amortization of plants and equipment certified to be necessary for the current emergency. Instead of the usual 15- to 40-year period of depreciation for tax purposes, the entire cost could be recovered tax-free within a period of 5 years. The report of the Senate Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program states that many persons responsible for the renegotiation of war contracts in World War II considered accelerated depreciation as the greatest source of excessive profits during the last war.

9. Section 117 (j): Since 1942 the tax law has contained a "heads I win, tails you lose" provision in favor of a taxpayer who sells property used in his trade or business. If the sale results in a profit, it is taxed as a capital gain. If it results in a loss, the loss is treated as a fully deductible ordinary loss. The Treasury has estimated this loophole as costing about $70,000,000. Accelerated amortization greatly expands the importance of this loophole.

10. Life-insurance companies: At a time when other individual and corporate taxpayers are overburdened, life-insurance companies paid no taxes on income for 1947, 1948, and 1949. This results from a technical error in the Revenue Act of 1942. The committee bill would in effect grant a $50,000,000-tax melon to the life-insurance industry by striking out the provisions in the House bill for collection of the 1947 and 1948 tax liabilities.

11. Foreign subsidiaries of domestic corporations: The House bill would have closed a loophole in the existing law under which domestic corporations can liquidate subsidiaries operating abroad (such as oil companies), and bring back tax-free profits that have never passed through the Federal income tax stream. The committee bill would retain this glaring loophole.

12. Reduction in holding period for long-term capital gains: Under existing law a capital gain is taxable at a maximum rate of 25 percent if the asset was held for over 6 months. Under the Senate bill this period is reduced to 3 months. This amendment, which was included in the House bill and approved by the Finance Committee, fits best the tax needs of the stock market and commodity speculators, who are thus permitted to convert ordinary profits into capital gains. This loophole will benefit principally single persons above $18,000 and married couples above $36,000.

DEEDS PROVE THEIR VALOR—EDITORIAL FROM THE INDIANAPOLIS STAR

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the body of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Deeds Prove Their Valor," published in the Indianapolis Star of February 2, 1951.

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

DEEDS PROVE THEIR VALOR

When Drew Pearson gave credence to an alleged Red Chinese "combat bulletin" in yesterday's column, in which the American Army in Korea was pictured as a gang of cowards, we expected a storm of protest, which the Star has received, and in which we wish to join.

According to the bulletin from which the Washington columnist quoted American troops are not aggressive, tend to panic and "quail and flinch at the sound of heavy firing." Mr. Pearson then added on his own part that this "Chinese intelligence estimate" was true, although we are not aware that he has visited the Korean front or that he has access to official military information which is not available to other reporters.

The record of America's fighting forces in Korea speaks for itself. Against tremendous odds our troops have held on in that miserable land and have inflicted terrible punishment on the enemy.

Dispatches of front-line reporters in Korea have drawn a far more reliable picture of the performance of American troops than any "intelligence estimate" which the enemy is likely to distribute or any of Drew Pearson's "pipeline" information. These dispatches, uncensored until recently, have consistently disclosed a high quality of aggressiveness and a wealth of individual and unit gallantry on the part of United States forces of which every American can be fiercely proud.

The very best we can say for Mr. Pearson in this instance is that he is innocently or overzealously promoting a dangerous generality which gives aid and comfort to the enemy. Throughout history a favorite propaganda trick has been to impugn the foe's courage. Hitler called Americans decadent cowards and, to his misfortune, came to believe his own lie. Stalin and his Chinese stooges know better but they are busily advancing the same lie. But the deeds of our men in Korea shout down both this lie and the unfortunate opinion which Mr. Pearson chose to express.

FARM POLICY COUNCIL

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to address the Senate for less than 2 minutes regarding the Farm Policy Council.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GEORGE in the chair). Without objection, the Senator may proceed.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, as a result of the hearings conducted by the Select Committee on Small Business of the Senate, it becomes quite apparent that drastic shortages of material and manpower are appearing. Thousands upon thousands of small businesses are confronted with the possibility of having to give up unless raw materials and supplies upon which they must depend for their very existence are available even in restricted quantities.

No one objects to the shortages of such materials as steel, lead, zinc, nickel, aluminum, electrical supplies which are actually needed in furtherance of the war effort. Thousands of small businesses are interested in the manufacturing, processing, and distribution of much-needed farm supplies and those used in connection with specialized farming activities in dairying, poultry raising, and many other types of small industries in supplying farm trade. The farm groups who are interested in seeing that they receive just consideration for supplies have done a very good job in organizing to make their demands and requests known and to see that businesses directly connected with farm-producing activities are not overlooked.

There appears in the February 1951 issue of the Country Gentleman an editorial entitled "Let's Strengthen Agriculture's Position." This editorial stresses the need of the farming interests for better safeguards as to their position both in the producing program and the farm-labor situation, which, from reports, can become critical before next summer. This editorial further points out that this is not a matter that affects the farming interests alone. Everyone has a stake in what is likely to happen. Everyone wants plenty of food. The defense program needs the necessary supplies. This editorial stresses the need and the necessity for a Farm Policy Council to be set up by the leading farm organizations with the responsibiilty of watching over the needs of farming, including farm labor, and to present these matters before the proper groups charged with the administration of the various defense production boards and groups.

Mr. President, I think this editorial is so timely and is so important to the agricultural interests of this Nation that I ask unanimous consent that it be incorporated in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

LET'S STRENGTHEN AGRICULTURE'S POSITION

Farming needs to be better safeguarded under the defense production program. The farm labor situation, which could become critical by next summer, is an example of what can happen unless the interests of agriculture are properly looked after.

It isn't a matter that affects farmers alone. The public, which will have to do without some other things, will want plenty of food and the defense program requires ample supplies of food and fiber. But neither fact assures prompt attention to farm needs for all-out production. Somebody will have to take the responsibility for getting that kind of attention.

The Defense Production Act, passed by Congress, did fairly well in protecting farm prices. But it left the Department of Agriculture with little authority over the workings of the defense program. The Department can advise and can present claims for materials necessary for farm production. But this does not mean they will be granted. It will be only one of a number of interests pressing claims for materials, some of them with a stronger backing than agriculture now has in Washington.

Not only vigor in pressing farm requirements but an alertness in anticipating them is needed. The farm labor situation, reported in the Roundup columns on pages 4

and 10 of this issue, shows how important this can be. Such a loss of experienced farm workers, as now seems certain, may seriously handicap the heavy production program that has been called for. Farming is in a much different position than at the outbreak of World War II. At that time a surplus of farm workers had been backed up on the farms by the depression. Even then a farm manpower shortage soon developed. There is scant surplus of farm manpower now and farming is mechanized to twice the extent it was in 1941. Just any kind of worker won't do now.

This makes it imperative also that a shortage of spare parts be averted in the future. Many farmers keenly recall the time they spent and the distances they traveled trying to find needed parts during the last war. A far more highly mechanized agriculture couldn't stand that sort of experience again. Somebody will have to see to it that it doesn't happen.

Agriculture isn't in a position to do much about such things now. Outside the Department's services it has been represented only by a consulting committee on the National Resources Security Board, now superseded by the Office of Defense Mobilization. This committee was not fully representative of farming and has been of little effect.

Something is needed to strengthen the position of agriculture. For that purpose Country Gentleman suggests a farm policy council, set up by the leading farm organizations. Its job would be to keep watch over the needs of farming and to press them vigorously when they arise. Labor has such a council and there has been no lack of vigor in presenting labor's case in Washington. A council, fully representative of agriculture, could be an effective voice in its behalf. It could cooperate with the Secretary if he were willing, as he should be, and reinforce his claims for needed farm help and materials. And it could work along the same lines with the two agricultural committees of Congress.

But, before any such council can be set up, two things will be necessary. The various farm organizations will have to submerge their differences and work together for the common good of the farmers they represent. And there will have to be less thinking in terms of commodity groups and more in terms of agriculture as a whole.

This lack of unity and the struggle for special commodity gains together make up one of the reasons why agriculture isn't in as strong a position as it should be. The effects are felt both in Washington and in the attitude of the public, which isn't any too friendly toward farming and is inclined to take its food supply for granted.

These disadvantages should be removed. In this emergency farming requires a single effective medium through which its needs can get attention. It ought to have a responsible channel through which it can reach the public with the facts about agriculture. A farm policy council could render both these services. The farm organizations should see the opportunity and act upon it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further routine matters, the Senator from Ohio is recognized.

THE EUROPEAN ARMY PROJECT

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the most serious and fundamental question before Congress today is whether we shall establish, and furnish troops for, an integrated European army under centralized command. Even today people hardly realize the tremendous implications of this proposal. On the decision we make may hang the issue of peace or war. On that decision depends the size of the Armed Forces, perhaps for the next 10 years. On the size of those forces hangs the tax burden which must be paid by the American people during that period. It will determine also the question whether we must draft boys of 18 or 18½ or 19 with all of its effect on education and industry. Finally, the extent of credit and price and wage controls so difficult to enforce and so burdensome on freedom and progress, will also be measured by the size of our Armed Forces and the economic effort in arming other countries.

General Eisenhower has made a report to us regarding the interest of the European nations in protecting themselves against Russian aggression. He has done a fine job of raising their morale and tells us of his hope that they will do their share. He has expressed his general approval of the project before us. But in my mind, at least, his report only makes this whole plan more hazy and indefinite and uncertain in outline than it was before his return.

At this time, therefore, I wish to discuss certain questions relating to this project:

First. What is the project, and to what share in it do we obligate ourselves?

Second. Is the President to have unlimited power to act without approval of Congress, or are the people themselves to have a voice in deciding the extent and nature of this revolutionary program?

Third. To what extent do we all agree on certain fundamental principles relating to the resistance to Communist aggression in the world, and in particular in Europe?

Fourth. Is the program a wise program and, if so, should its limitations be clearly stated?

1. WHAT IS THE PROJECT, AND TO WHAT SHARE IN IT DO WE OBLIGATE OURSELVES?

Before General Eisenhower's return, I had supposed there was a definite plan agreed upon at Brussels. Article 9 of the North Atlantic Treaty reads as follows:

> The parties hereby establish a council, on which each of them shall be represented, to consider matters concerning the implementation of this treaty. * * * The council * * * shall establish immediately a defense committee which shall recommend measures for the implementation of articles 3 and 5.

The report of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee says that the powers of the council "are purely advisory with respect to governmental action. Its purpose is to make recommendations to the governments and to assist them in reaching coordinated decisions. It should be emphasized, however, that the responsibility for making decisions lies in the respective governments rather than in the councils. * * * The defense committee will concern itself primarily with making plans and recommendations for the implementation of articles 3 and 5, i. e., preparation for the exercise of the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense. Being subordinate to the council, it too shall have only advisory powers."

In December 1950, the council established under article 9 met in Brussels and issued the following communiqué on December 19th:

> The North Atlantic Council, acting on the recommendations of its defense committee, today completed arrangements initiated in September last for the establishment in Europe of an integrated force under a centralized control and command. This force is to be composed of contingents contributed by the participating governments.

The North Atlantic Council speaks as if it had authority to do so, although its recommendations are simply advisory, under the treaty.

On December 22 Secretary Acheson made the following statement about the Brussels agreement:

> At Brussels we did several things. We took recommendations which had come from the meetings immediately preceding in London and acted on those recommendations. They had to do with the creation of the united, unified, integrated army which is to provide for the defense of Europe.
>
> The papers which came to us laid out the structure of that army, how it should be composed, of what troops, where should the troops come from, how should it be organized, what was its command structure which would give that army its direction, and how should the supreme commander be selected and appointed. All of these matters were dealt with in the papers that came to us and all of those matters were acted upon. The structure was agreed upon and the force was created.

Mr. President, I cannot understand what authority Secretary Acheson had in that connection, because I do not think there was anything but advisory power in the Council; but that is the statement which he issued.

Today no one knows whether an agreement was entered into or not. General Eisenhower tells the committees that he does not know whether or not there is any commitment on our part. Congress is unable to obtain any reliable information as to the size of the "united, unified, integrated army which is to provide for the defense of Europe." We are unable to find out how many American divisions are to be contributed to it. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] seems to feel that the army is to be one of 55 divisions of which we should contribute 10. I have heard from high sources that it is to be approximately 60 divisions of which we ultimately will contribute 15. The newspapers report some talk in the committees of a total army of 40 divisions by the end of 1952 after 2 years of preparation. There has also been some suggestion that there will be five or six American divisions in Europe by the end of 1951. General Eisenhower has said that we would only contribute a minor fraction, but not a major fraction, but this might mean 30 percent or 40 percent and might amount to a million men before our obligations are finally completed.

The number of foreign divisions at that time or any time is clouded in doubt. General Eisenhower stated that there would be 25 French divisions at the end of 1952, but this was immediately contradicted by Mr. Pleven, and the figure perhaps is 15 divisions on that date, and 20 divisions by the end of 1953. I get the general impression from General Eisenhower's broadcast and testimony

that we will contribute five or six divisions in 1951, including the two already in Germany, and then wait to see what the others do. At Brussels it seems to have been contemplated that there would be German divisions, but General Eisenhower says that the Germans are out for the present.

Mr. President, there is just as much uncertainty regarding the nature of the proposed army as there is concerning the status of General Eisenhower himself. He did not tell the committee whether he was only the President's representative in Europe, or whether he was a commander of the new army deriving his power from the action of nine governments. It seems clear to me from the communiqué issued in Brussels that he is the appointee of the Atlantic Pact nations if they had any authority to set up an army, which I doubt. Perhaps the Council's action is only a recommendation. Is this in fact an international army, or is it only a loose grouping of various national armies? To whom are the American divisions responsible after they are asisgned to this army? Do they take orders only from General Eisenhower, or do they take orders from General Marshall or General Collins? Can General Eisenhower overrule the Joint Chiefs of Staff on questions of military strategy, or are they to be superior to him?

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

Mr. TAFT. I shall be glad to yield for a question. I do not wish to break up my remarks unduly.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Before the Senator leaves the question of the number of divisions, let me inquire if he heard the testimony of General Eisenhower, or read his testimony, before the Armed Services Committee in which he said, in answer to a question by the Senator from Nebraska, that he believed the Europeans would furnish the bulk of the land forces in Europe.

Mr. TAFT. The only quotation I saw, and that was in the newspapers, was that the United States would provide a minor fraction and not a major fraction. Perhaps he used those words before the House committee. But he says "the bulk," whatever that may mean. Possibly it means 60 or 70 or 75 percent. I do not know what "bulk" means. But there is no question that General Eisenhower stated that we are at least not to put up a majority, but how much less than a majority I think remains in doubt.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I think it is a very substantial part of the Army.

Mr. TAFT. However, the Senator is not able to tell me what branches are involved.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. No; that was not specifically stated.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, in all my experience in Washington I have never seen an important program so confused and uncertain. Yet we are to be asked to pass upon it within the next few weeks.

In that connection, Mr. President, I should like to read a quotation from The Economist of January 13, 1951, as follows:

> The machinery of the Atlantic Pact, now nearly 2 years old, remains for the layman as mysterious, incoherent, and confusing as ever. "There was a time when no one outside the organization could understand what went on inside," so a distinguished adviser at the Brussels meeting of the Atlantic Council was heard to mutter. "But," he continued sadly, "now no one inside can understand either."

Mr. President, this is secret diplomacy with a vengeance. It seems to me that there was a definite plan, but that the administration is deliberately concealing its nature, or delaying its completion, because it is afraid Congress will not consider the detailed proposal as practical, fair, or desirable.

So far as I can see at the moment, Congress is going to be asked to set up a great Armed Force of 3,500,000 American boys and give the President carte blanche to do anything with them which he wishes to do. If he claims that he had the power to send troops to Korea, he must be claiming the right without approval of Congress to send them to any other country in the world if that country is attacked by another country. He apparently claims authority to assign them to any foreign commander, or to any international force which he approves. This is a straight demand for simple dictatorship and a claim of power which no President has ever had in time of peace.

Let the administration submit this project in definite form. We cannot intelligently pass on it otherwise. Without this we cannot intelligently pass on the size of our Armed Forces, our draft laws, or our tax laws. I can hear cries now that a definite plan would reveal top secrets to the enemy. I can only say that within 1 week from the time the size of the Army, and the proportion and size of the American contribution is fixed, every columnist in the United States will know what it is and discuss it in his columns.

2. IS THE PRESIDENT TO HAVE UNLIMITED POWER TO ACT WITHOUT APPROVAL OF CONGRESS, OR ARE THE PEOPLE THEMSELVES TO HAVE A VOICE IN DECIDING THE EXTENT AND NATURE OF THIS REVOLUTIONARY PROGRAM?

I do not think that the American people have ever faced a more serious constitutional issue, or one which in the end may present a greater threat to its freedom. The framers of the Constitution provided expressly that only Congress can do certain things, and we find these powers in section 8 of article 1:

> To declare war, grant letters of marque and reprisal, and to make rules concerning captures on land and water;
>
> To raise and support armies, but no appropriation of money to that use shall be for a longer term than 2 years.

That reflects a certain and definite suspicion of setting up a great permanent military force.

> To provide and maintain a navy;
>
> To make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces.

There are other powers relating to calling out, organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia.

The Constitution also provides that the President shall have power to make treaties, but only "by and with the advice and consent of the Senate provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur."

The President's relation to the Army is stated only in section 2 of article II:

> The President shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States.

What possible basis is there for the claim that the President can enter into an agreement with foreign nations to set up an integrated international army under a centralized command, and to commit a certain number of American troops to that army without the approval of Congress?

It may be said he has acquired more power from the Atlantic Pact. But I think it is fully agreed now that the Atlantic Treaty did not commit us to the providing of any troops whatsoever and that under article 11 of the Pact the carrying out of the provisions of the Treaty must be in accordance with the respective constitutional processes of the country concerned. The Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate stated expressly that the Treaty did not increase, decrease, or change the power of the President as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces, or impair the full authority of Congress to declare war. It is clear, therefore, that the President must look to his constitutional powers for the agreements that he has made or is proposing to make and there are no such constitutional powers.

Certainly an obligation to furnish armed forces to an integrated force for the defense of other countries has all the dignity of a treaty, and certainly it is not within the President's power as Commander in Chief.

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

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. The distinguished Senator from Ohio certainly could help my thinking, if he would. On January 8, 1951, the President of the United States addressed a joint session of Congress. On that occasion the President was very positive in what he said. I would deeply appreciate the reaction of the Senator from Ohio to the observation made in very positive form by the President of the United States, in which he indicated to us and the American people that he had reason to believe that NATO military plans were in existence. He said:

> Together we have worked out defense plans. The military leaders of our own country took part in working out these plans, and are agreed that they are sound and within our capabilities.
>
> To put these plans into action, we sent to Europe last week one of our greatest military commanders, Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower.
>
> General Eisenhower went to Europe to assume command of the united forces of the North Atlantic Treaty countries, including our own forces in Germany.

Against what the President said so clearly and in such concrete fashion on January 8, I hope the Senator from Ohio will give us his reaction as to where and

in what form he thinks such plans actually are.

Mr. TAFT. Frankly, I do not know. General Eisenhower testified before committees of both Houses of Congress, and either he did not know or he did not say. I understand he was asked what his own status was. He said he did not know. I think the Senator is correct. At least an official statement was issued in Brussels announcing that General Eisenhower had been appointed by the council. Whether the council had the right to make the appointment may be open to question. At least, that is the position he occupies. In any event, he did not seem to be certain of it himself.

Mr. CAIN. If I may, I should like to make one observation. I think the great contradiction in the minds of Members of Congress and the American people today is simply that the President of the United States on the 8th of January said that American military minds, in concert with their friends across the sea, had actually drafted a concerted plan of action for the future, and that General Eisenhower had gone to Europe to activate it. When General Eisenhower returned he said, as a very honest and frank individual, that he would not be able for some time to discuss in any detail any comprehensive, integrated plan for action in Europe, because at the moment one does not exist. He went so far as to say, "Please encourage me in what I want to do. I want to come back in about 6 months, and perhaps then I can begin to answer your very legitimate questions." If there is an integrated, comprehensive military plan for NATO and Western Europe, as the President has said exists and General Eisenhower has said is only in vague and preliminary form, no one has yet produced it for study by the Congress or the Nation.

Mr. TAFT. I have no objection to following such a course, provided the Senate is not asked next week to give the President unlimited power to send troops or to make any agreement regarding an international army. That seems to me to be the problem which we shall have to face in another week, without a single idea of what the plan is. I thought that perhaps the President was referring to a detailed military plan. Of course, we in Congress cannot determine where we are going to defend Europe, or anything of that kind.

However, it seems to me that we have before us the constitutional question of what it is that we are going to be asked to do. In other words, what is the nature of it? Are we going to commit troops to an international army, to serve under an international command? It so happens that the present commander in chief is an American. He could very well be a foreign general. The council would have the right to appoint someone else in General Eisenhower's place, if it wished to do so. My own feeling is that the whole subject is shrouded in uncertainty. If we are to pass on the subject it should be reduced to certain general and definite principles so that we can consider it on its merits.

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

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. Bearing on the status of General Eisenhower, he was quoted in London—and I presume he was quoted accurately—as portraying himself, I trust somewhat facetiously, as only one-twelfth an American. I took it to apply to his status under the Council, to the effect that he recognized a responsibility, by implication, to 11 other countries. Is the Senator from Ohio familiar with that statement?

Mr. TAFT. No; I am not certain of it. However, the Brussels Council issued a communiqué saying that it had appointed General Eisenhower to head the army. That was what the communiqué said. I assume that is the authority under which the general is acting.

Certainly it seems also clear that as Commander in Chief he cannot delegate his command to a foreign government, or to 10 foreign governments, without the approval of Congress which has full power to make rules for the Government and regulation of the land and naval forces.

With regard to the sending of troops to Europe without any commitment no doubt the President has power to send divisions to occupy Germany, which it is our obligation to police and defend. But it can hardly be claimed that this power would justify sending more than two or three additional divisions. I have heretofore stated my opinion that the President cannot send an army to defend one country against another country which is attacked in the absence of any treaty, because it clearly involves us in war. Many cases have been cited against that view, because the President has actually landed troops in many countries in the past. In every case, however, the action was taken to protect American citizens or American property, and in no case has it been maintained that the President can even involve this country in war unless it is attacked.

There may be an argument that under the Atlantic Treaty if one of the Atlantic Pact nations is attacked, the President could send troops to defend it, but under article 11 of the treaty, it seems clear to me that the President's power to carry out the treaty is dependent upon a declaration of war by the Congress because clearly such action of the President would involve us in war. That roughly speaking, is the test as to the sending of troops abroad.

I do not say that the Congress by resolution or the Senate by the adoption of a treaty may not authorize the President to involve us in war without a congressional declaration of war. That certainly is a debatable question, but I do say without qualification that neither the Congress nor the Senate has given any such authority to the President. A somewhat similar authority was contemplated under the United Nations Charter, which was approved as a treaty, but the actual authority to send soldiers to an international army was limited by article 43 to the terms of a special agreement, and Congress provided that that agreement must be subject to approval by Congress.

Any other view means that the President today would have power to involve the United States in war in any section of the world in his unlimited and arbitrary discretion, and that Congress in creating a great American Armed Force of 3,500,000 men and drafting every boy of 18 for that purpose is completely without power to limit the President's arbitrary discretion. Merely to state this proposition should arouse the undying opposition of every man who believes in the maintenance in this country of government by the people.

It is rather interesting to note in Winston Churchill's second volume, Their Finest Hour, the reference to the opinion of Franklin D. Roosevelt on his own powers in this field. Mr. Roosevelt had written a letter to Monsieur Reynaud, the Premier of France, which Mr. Churchill thought could be construed as an agreement for America to join the French and British Governments in their defense against German aggression. Mr. Roosevelt hastened to disavow this conclusion, and Mr. Churchill in his book says that Roosevelt "then said he had told Ambassador Kennedy to inform me that his message of the fourteenth was in no sense intended to commit, and it did not commit the Government of the United States to military participation. There was no authority under the American Constitution except Congress which could make any commitment of that nature."

On February 15, 1848, Abraham Lincoln wrote his law partner, William H. Herndon, with reference to Polk's use of the Army against Mexico.

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

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. McMAHON. The Senator from Ohio realizes, of course, that there was a different situation at that time. The President was assuring the Prime Minister and Mr. Reynaud that he could not commit troops to the war which was actually going on. The Senator realizes that the situation to which we are now referring is the business of putting troops there for the purpose of keeping the peace, and not to engage in conflict.

Mr. TAFT. Let me read what Abraham Lincoln said:

> Allow the President to invade a neighboring nation whenever he shall deem it necessary to repel an invasion, and you allow him to do so whenever he may choose to say he deems it necessary for such purpose, and you allow him to make war at pleasure. Study to see if you can fix any limit to his power in this respect. If today he should choose to say he thinks it necessary to invade Canada to prevent the British from invading us, how could you stop him? You may say to him, "I see no probability of the British invading us"; but he will say to you, "Be silent: I see it, if you don't." * * *
>
> The provision of the Constitution giving the war-making power to Congress was dictated, as I understand it, by the following reasons: Kings had always been involving and impoverishing their people in wars, pretending generally, if not always, that the good of the people was the object. This our convention understood to be the most oppressive of all kingly oppressions, and they resolved to so frame the Constitution that

no one man should hold the power of bringing this oppression upon us. But your view destroys the whole matter, and places our President where kings have always stood.

It is argued that no one can stop the Commander in Chief from sending the Army anywhere he wants to send it. This argument only goes to his power, not to his right. If he has not the right, Congress can properly restrain him by law or resolution.

It is suggested the Congress should grant general authority to act in Europe because any such authority will be wisely used. Our experience in Korea does not support any such conclusion.

The confusion which surrounds the Brussels agreement raises the question whether the administration is trying to avoid congressional action by denying the existence of any agreement. I have pointed out that I do not think the President can send troops to Europe for the defense of Europe without congressional approval, even in the absence of a binding agreement. Apart from his right to contribute troops to an international army, however, it would certainly be most unwise to do so without a binding agreement. Surely, if we are going to participate in an international army for the defense of Western Europe, we want to be sure that the other nations will provide most of the soldiers. Before we send any troops, we should certainly have a binding contract to that effect from these other nations. General Eisenhower's speeches were both directed to the proposition that these nations are willing to undertake the principal burden of their own defense. In his broadcast, he said: "The European nations must, of course, produce and maintain the great bulk of the land forces necessary to their defense." He said: "By no means do I believe that we Americans can support the world militarily or economically. In our own interest we must insist upon a working partnership with every nation making the common security its task of first priority." In other words, if there is not an agreement, there ought to be an agreement. Whether there is or not, the project and any such agreement, are only lawful if approved by congressional action—not by any mere Senate resolution expressing the sense of the Senate, but by legislation in the form of a bill or joint resolution.

There is one final reason why this should be done. It is stated clearly in the report of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on the Atlantic Treaty where provision is made for the ratification or the carrying out of the treaty by the constitutional processes of the country involved:

It has been questioned whether a treaty subordinating action to the constitutional principles of 12 democratic nations offers sufficient certainty and immediacy of action effectively to deter aggression. The committee is convinced that it does. The expression of the will of a whole people offers far more certainty than any commitment by a dictator.

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

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. McMAHON. Am I correct in my recollection that the Senator from Ohio was quoted in the press as saying that he would be in favor of a limited number of American divisions?

Mr. TAFT. Yes; I am coming to that. I believe very strongly in the necessity of this Government carrying out its promises lawfully made. Whatever project may be approved by Congress, whether I agree with it or not, will have my support in future years. But if the President undertakes to make promises which he has no right to make, I feel no obligation to support those promises. There will never be unity behind the proposal unless it is constitutionally approved. The only path to unity is to obtain the approval of Congress to a definite program or agreement relating to the use of American armies in Europe in time of peace.

I therefore intend, if any general resolution is brought in, to support the Wherry resolution, and also to offer a further amendment providing that no agreement relating to the furnishing of American troops to an integrated European army formed under the Atlantic Pact shall be valid until it is approved by Congress. I do not mean to propose that every military detail be contained in such an agreement, but certainly the size of the army and the basis of national contributions should be clearly specified. These facts will under no circumstances remain military secrets, and they form the very basis of the character of the entire project, and of every other major proposal before Congress.

3. TO WHAT EXTENT DO WE ALL AGREE ON CERTAIN FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES RELATING TO COMMUNIST AGGRESSION IN THE WORLD, AND IN PARTICULAR TO EUROPE?

There have been a good many misunderstandings with regard to the issues which we here face, and as the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] has pointed out, there are many areas of agreement.

A. No one is proposing that we abandon Europe or run out on Europe or invite the Communists to take over Europe. We have assisted Western Europe continuously for many years. We helped many of the countries by lend-lease during the war. Many loans and grants were made after the war. Under ECA, billions have been freely given in unprecedented generosity to build up the economic life and the industrial potentiality of Western Europe so that today production is approximately 40 percent over prewar. We have appropriated billions to provide armament with which these nations may defend themselves, and no one has questioned that principle since it was adopted by Congress in the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949.

B. We have entered into the Atlantic Treaty under which we have agreed to go to war if any nation attacks a member of the pact. No one is even considering a withdrawal from that obligation. I certainly believe in carrying out the promises we have made; I did so even when I voted against making them. This means also that, if Russia or any of its satellites in Eastern Germany, Poland, or Czechoslovakia attacks Germany we will go to war with the aggressor. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee in its report on the North Atlantic Treaty says:

It should be noted that Germany receives some protection since the treaty covers armed attack upon occupation forces.

One question does arise which perhaps should be determined by the members of the Atlantic Pact. If East Germany or Poland attacks the occupied zones in Germany or any of the pact nations, do we go to war with the satellite which makes the attack, or do we regard such an attack as an attack by Russia itself involving a war with Russia? Should we give a definite notification to Russia that an attack by certain countries will be regarded as an attack by Russia itself? Such a notification might be a deterrent to the beginning of a limited war in Germany which in the end would almost certainly lead to general war anyway. The Atlantic Pact nations should adopt some policy also regarding an attack on Yugoslavia so that snap judgment is not taken at some midnight conference.

C. There is no doubt that the freedom of Europe is of vital interest to the United States. There would be a much greater threat to our own liberty if Western Europe were conquered by Soviet Russia. No one questions that conclusion and, of course, it is the only justification for spending billions on ECA, and on armament for Europe, and for the agreement to go to war if Europe is attacked. It does not follow, however, that because we desire the freedom of every country in the world we must send an American land army to that country to defend it. Western Europe, after all, has more people in it than we have in the United States and is completely able to defend itself if we furnish the armament and if it desires to do so.

There is a good deal of confusion as to exactly what would happen to Europe in case Russia should attack, and arguments have been made on behalf of this program on the theory that in some way Europe would be entirely taken over by the Communists, and that that would involve the rest of the world. If Russia should attack, obviously there would at once be a general war. We would be engaged in bombing the Russian bases. Any army, whether we contributed troops to it or not, would probably have to retreat to the Rhine and make a stand there against Russian aggression. England and France and Germany west of the Rhine presumably would be bombed by the Russians, and Russia and Eastern Germany by the Allies. If France were overrun as they were by the Germans, this time presumably a Free French Government would retreat to Africa and continue to perform its obligations under the Atlantic Pact. It is inconceivable to me that the Russians could conquer Great Britain. I see no reason to suppose that the industrial potentiality or the skilled labor of all Western Europe—which have been stressed so much—would be at any time available to Soviet Russia. In case of war, much of the industrial power might be destroyed in Russia, Germany, and France. We know that after the last war only the tremendous assistance of the United States

and the ECA brought about the restoration of industrial power.

Nor does it follow because of a Russian success on the Continent that we would be cut off from any raw materials, either in the Belgian Congo or in Indonesia. In short, General Eisenhower and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and John Gunther somewhat exaggerate the danger of an unsuccessful war in Europe. But I fully agree that we are vitally concerned with the continued freedom of England, France, Italy, and the other Atlantic Pact countries, as well as Germany.

It is certainly vitally important that we do not exhaust our resources on a vast land army in Europe and neglect to any extent the sea and air power and the supporting armed troops necessary to protect these sources of raw material upon which General Eisenhower lays so much stress. But it can be said that the serious difference regarding the importance of the defense of Western Europe is the extent to which the establishment of a great international army with many American divisions is effective for that purpose during the intermediate period, and whether it commits the American people to something beyond their power of fulfillment.

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

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I should like to ask the Senator from Ohio if the opinions he has expressed in regard to the military situation are based upon advice given to him by military men; or are they his own personal opinions?

Mr. TAFT. What particular opinion does the general—I mean the Senator from Arizona—wish to ask me about?

Mr. McFARLAND. I disclaim being a general. I know we have many "generals" on the floor, "experts" in regard to military matters, but I disclaim anything like that. I give the Senator from Ohio credit for being one.

Mr. TAFT. I have talked to a good many generals, some of very high rank. We have received advice from military critics. I certainly have not ventured to go into anything but the most general principles in asserting any military opinion in this connection. I do not know what the Senator from Arizona has in mind.

Mr. McFARLAND. The Senator just stated that if Europe was involved in a war with Russia we would also be involved in it.

Mr. TAFT. We would be at war with them. We would be fighting.

Mr. McFARLAND. That would be true regardless of whether we had troops there or whether we did not have troops there. The Senator concedes that; does he not?

Mr. TAFT. Yes.

Mr. McFARLAND. Then, the Senator from Ohio proceeds to outline what the military situation would be, and what would be the result of such a war if it should break out. I was wondering if the Senator was giving his own personal opinion as to those matters or whether it was based upon the advice of military experts.

Mr. TAFT. The only opinion I remember off hand expressing was that if there were such a war, it would involve bombing on both sides, and to a large extent the destruction of the industrial potential of Europe, the use of which by Russia was one of the things held up to us as being completely fatal in a war between Russia and the United States. I simply suggest that if war should start that industrial potential would probably never be available to the Russians.

Mr. McFARLAND. Is that the opinion of the military men, or is that the Senator's personal opinion?

Mr. TAFT. No; I do not think that is particularly a military question. We saw what happened in the last war. We know that when the war ended the industries of France and of England were unable to go ahead without many billions of dollars from the United States—amounts which Russia probably could never furnish. That is a mere conclusion. That particular conclusion I formed for myself. As to where and when fighting might take place, I have talked to some generals.

Mr. McFARLAND. I merely wanted to know what the source of the Senator's opinion was.

Mr. TAFT. Does the Senator from Arizona question my conclusion?

Mr. McFARLAND. I am not questioning it, nor am I conceding it. I am not setting myself up as a general—a term the Senator has just applied to me. Yes; I might question the Senator's conclusion. I might question some of the things the Senator has to say. But I would not want to set myself up as a military expert or a "general," by which term the Senator has just addressed me. I believe it takes a military expert to pass upon many of the questions the Senator is speaking about in his address today.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, so far as I know, I have not tried to establish any great military principles which are not accepted generally by everybody writing on military or cognate subjects. I do not know that I have laid down any general principles that will not command respect, so far as the military aspects of the situation are concerned. Like the Senator from Arizona, I do not venture into detailed prediction of what military operations are to be undertaken.

D. Of course, there is now general agreement that control of the sea and air is our primary field in war with Russia; and that we cannot also assume the major burden of any great land army. That is clearly stated by General Eisenhower. Control of air, sea, and the Eurasian Continent is probably beyond our power. If we commit ourselves to more than we can carry out, we weaken the whole Nation and we weaken the effectiveness of every branch of the armed services including our sea and air forces.

If we provide sea and air support plus all of the equipment required for land forces, plus five divisions of land troops, we will certainly be doing 50 percent of the entire job. Unless these nations together are willing to defend themselves by providing the other 50 percent, I do not believe that any integrated army could be successful. If we provided half of that land army, our total share in the entire operation would probably run up to 80 percent. We do not want to find ourselves again as in Korea, doing substantially the entire job, because we cannot possibly do it.

E. There is general agreement that the whole project is dependent upon substantial action by European nations and by high morale. May I say that I have never questioned that morale. The distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] based most of his criticism of my speech on the theory that I said that the European nations would not fight. Others have indicated their doubt on this subject, and even General Eisenhower does not seem to be certain; but I said nothing to indicate any belief on my part that England and France were not vitally interested in their own defense. I am glad to have General Eisenhower's assurance that their morale is steadily increasing. I notice, however, that he is not completely certain. He said, "We must make sure that the heart and soul of Europe is ripe. That is one of the obligations certainly that is imposed upon me and my staff." In other words, there is still something to be done in the future in this field. His whole report is an expression of hope, and a hope that I feel confident will be justified; but he spends part of his time explaining why France is completely occupied in Indochina, and why any further sacrifices impose a reduction in their standard of living, already low. In any event, I am quite willing to accept the principle that Europe is ready to go ahead; but I do insist upon definite promises from them as to the part which they will play in the project.

F. There is general agreement that this country can overcommit itself and thereby weaken its whole economic structure and interfere not only with our morale, but with the important function of providing equipment for Europe. General Eisenhower repeatedly says that we cannot carry the world on our shoulders like Atlas. The General Staff, I think, clearly recognizes that there is a practical limit to our Armed Forces. They have rejected the idea of 6,000,000 men, as proposed by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], and have fixed a goal of 3,500,000 men. I have said myself that I believe 3,000,000 is about the limit that we can wisely provide for a permanent standing army, navy, and air force over a long period of years. The present estimate is that this force of 3,500,000 men will cost us $40,000,000,000 in cash in fiscal 1952, but that the cost will increase. I think we can assume that it will increase to at least $55,000,000,000 a year for several years, which means a total expenditure on the President's budget, including nondefense expenditures, of $85,000,000,000. Even with great economy in nondefense expenditures, the budget would be $80,000,000,000 and would require $25,000,000,000 more in taxes. Even now the President does not dare to recommend taxes to meet the $71,000,000,000 expenditure which he proposes. I do not see how we can today raise taxes beyond,

say, about $65,000,000,000 a year without hardship and injustice and danger to the economy of the country. Whatever the amount, there is a general agreement that some limit on our commitments must be imposed either by the President or Congress. I believe it should be by Congress, that it is our constitutional duty to decide that question.

4. IS THE PROGRAM A WISE PROGRAM AND, IF SO, SHOULD ITS LIMITATIONS BE CLEARLY STATED?

For these reasons and for other reasons stated in my speech of January 5, I am opposed in principle to undertaking a land force on the continent of Europe. As I stated then, however, we do have two divisions already in Europe; and I would not object to a few more divisions, simply to show the Europeans that we are interested and will participate in the more difficult job of land warfare while we carry out also our larger obligations. This is particularly true because the President has gone so far in his unauthorized promises that a withdrawal now will affect badly the morale of the European's interest in his own defense.

I can restate briefly my objections to any large American participation in an integrated European army.

A. I believe that the formation of such an army and its location in Germany along the iron curtain line, particularly one headed by an American general and dependent primarily on American strength, is bound to have an aggressive aspect to the Russians. We would be going a long way from home, and very close to the Russian border. If we merely help France arm in France and England arm in England, it is hard to see how Russia could object; but a great army in Germany is undoubtedly a threat to their present dominion. Of course our purposes are purely defensive, but a first-class defensive army must also be an offensive army. Today, armies do not stand still—either one advances or the other advances. Russia cannot reasonably fear from this proposed army an attack on Moscow; but if the army can hold the Russian Army at all, it could make advances into the eastern zones of Germany or Austria, or Czechoslovakia or Poland. It has therefore seemed to me that the formation of this army is more an incitement to Russia to go to war, rather than a deterrent. They have not been deterred by land soldiers up to this time because there have been no land soldiers; and if they have been deterred at all it has been through our Air Force and the power to drop atom bombs on Russia. If Russia is contemplating a military attack in Western Europe, why does not the present plan give them an incentive to attack at once, or in 1952? Apparently it will take at least 2 years to provide 40 divisions, and no one thinks that is enough. On the other hand, if Russia is not contemplating a military attack, this proposal might incite it to do so, when otherwise a gradual increase in strength could be achieved among Western European nations without danger of war. I have repeatedly asked the question with reference to this temporary period of 2 or 3 years during which we are building up an army on the borders of Russia, before it is sufficient in the opinion of military experts to withstand a Russian attack: If Russia is planning a military attack at any time in the future, why will they wait during this period?

B. The whole defense program seems a very hazy one to a layman, and I know it is considered by many military experts to be impracticable as far as the defense of Germany east of the Rhine is concerned. It is useless to talk about defending the line of the Elbe, because the Russian zone, with strong military positions, extends halfway from the Elbe to the Rhine already. Today it is within approximately 80 miles, I think, of Dusseldorf. A defense of Europe to the Rhine means that Russia will control the Ruhr and much of Germany's industry. To defend completely the British and American zones and Denmark would apparently require at least 75 divisions, and no one is proposing to develop that number. Therefore, it seems useless to talk about the defense of large sections of Western Germany for a good many years to come, or to expect the Germans to participate until a much larger number of divisions are available than now seem to be in sight. That appears to be the position of the Adenauer government. The defense of Germany at the Rhine would endanger Holland and place France, Belgium, and England themselves in easy reach of Russian short-distance bombs, and perhaps of the atom bomb itself. I am not at all a defeatist as to the ultimate ability of Europe to defend itself, but I would prefer to wait until each of these countries has built up a very considerable force of its own, and until Germany is independent and arming itself, before we attempt to establish a military position with an integrated army.

C. When it is possible to do that, however, there is still a question in my mind whether we should even then commit any considerable number of American forces to that European army. The effect of it is to commit us to a major war on the continent of Europe against Russia, and that will inevitably be the major project to which most of our limited resources will have to be devoted. The larger the force we station there, the more we are committed to fighting such a war to the bitter end in Europe and putting more of our energy into that part of the contest, postponing or neglecting the job that ought to be done elsewhere to assure our raw materials and lines of communication. We would be fighting Russia on a battlefield most favorable to them, and one where we would always be outnumbered in manpower. It is said repeatedly that wars can only be won by land soldiers. That may be true, but it is no longer absolutely certain. It was complete control of sea and air which enabled us to take over the smaller islands of the Pacific, and it was the same control which enabled us to take over Japan without landing a soldier. Possibly a third world war could be won from the air. It is also doubtful whether a victorious nation gains much from physical occupation after destroying the industries of the vanquished. Possibly in the end, Mr. President, we might decide that the only way to win a war is to build again an army of 10,000,000 men and march to Moscow; but certainly we cannot have any such army in being at the beginning of the war, and it may never be necessary. Our military authorities are too apt to think that a third world war will be just like the Second World War; but a new war is never like the one that preceded it.

D. Finally, I believe that the undertaking of a project in Europe which is not strictly limited would lead to a constant demand for a larger and larger land army. Senator Douglas evidently realizes that to carry out the project would require 6,000,000 men under arms, as he proposes, instead of the 3,500,000, which the administration is now asking for. The Army plan is for 1,400,000 men, or 27 divisions, in the United States—the total land army of the United States. It seems to me it would be unsafe to station a large proportion of that army in Europe. We require troops in this country to protect us against attack from the air, and we require troops in Alaska and in the Far East. There should certainly be mobile forces to protect air bases in Africa and elsewhere in the world and to go to the assistance of other nations which request assistance if the project is important and practical. If we are going to have to station 15 divisions in Europe, we probably need closer to 45 divisions overall in our Army, instead of 27. That would add another 1,000,000 men and perhaps $13,000,000,000 for maintenance and equipment.

At present the administration is trying to play down the requirements of this program and, of course, is not even telling us what the program is, at least beyond the year 1951. We have seen this process constantly repeated. We were told that Bretton Woods would solve the financial problems of Europe. Within a few months it became apparent that the British loan was necessary. That was followed by other aid, and then by the Marshall plan. In every case the next step was said to be essential in order to maintain the morale of Europe against communism. Then came the Atlantic Pact, our obligation to go to war, and the commitment of small sums to the arming of European countries. Then the appropriations for arms had to be quadrupled. Now we are told that the morale of Europe will collapse unless we send at least three or four more divisions in 1951. So long as we encourage the idea of constantly increasing aid to Europe, and do not pin down the size of the European army and the extent of the contributions of the European nations, there will be every year a new demand again urged as essential to save the value of all that has been done before. It seems to me that we should definitely notify the European nations the limit of what we can do so that they may make their plans on that basis. There is this tremendous difference today over the past. What we are proposing to do stretches the capacity

of the people of the United States to the very limit in 1951 and many years thereafter. The program, even on its present scale, proposes to take all 18-year-old boys for 27 months service in the Army, while General Eisenhower is praising France highly for instituting universal service for 18 months. We have the lion's share of the job of producing munitions, and we are short of manpower for that purpose. We cannot upset our system by taxes so heavy as to interfere with that job. We hear much of the need of bolstering up the morale of Europe. The tremendous taxes and long universal service may have a substantial effect on the morale of the people of the United States. Even now the President is soft-pedalling his tax request, because he is afraid the people will not take an increase sufficient to balance the budget which he has submitted.

If, therefore, Congress decides to proceed with this project of contributing American troops to an integrated army in Europe under a centralized command, then I believe certain limitations should clearly be imposed. I would suggest that the American contribution be not more than 1 American division to 9 foreign divisions—that is 5 American divisions to an army of 50, or 6 American divisions to an army of 60, and that it be undertaken only as and when foreign nations bind themselves to provide the divisions determined to be necessary for an adequate defense. I also suggest tentatively a provision that not more than 20 percent of the land army of the United States and not more than 10 percent of the Air Force be stationed on the continent of Europe in time of peace. These limitations, I believe, should be attached to any authority given the President to set up an integrated army in Europe and commit American troops to that army.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, let me say that no one is more determined to resist Communist aggression in the world than I am. I think the Russians present a menace to the liberty of the entire world and to our way of life, a menace greater than we have faced before in our history. That menace is not entirely military. It is a battle of liberty against communism in the minds of men. We cannot afford to destroy at home the very liberty which we must sell to the rest of the world as the basis for progress and happiness.

There is no reason whatever for panic or defeatism. I feel less concern about the ultimate success of Russian military power than do many others. But if they choose to start a war, it will be a long and bitter conflict, and this country must remain strong in every aspect of production and morale. Our limited resources must be directed to the field where they can be most effective. I do not believe that Western Europe can be defended unless the Western Europeans are determined to defend themselves and take the intiative in rearming which is essential for that purpose. To encourage that action, we are furnishing them with economic assistance and military equipment in practically any amount which they request. We will support them by sea and by air, and I would agree to send some troops to prove to them that we do intend to fight at their side if Russia attacks. But even the program which I outline will require tremendous sacrifices from the American people, from every taxpayer, from every family, from every boy. We should not further endanger the position of America as the arsenal of democracy and the bastion of liberty.

AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, before I commence my address, I desire to express my appreciation of the splendid presentation we have just heard by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] on this very important and difficult subject. The Senator's remarks indicate to me that it is vitally important that any decisions arrived at with regard to this important question of foreign policy be considered fully and completely by the Congress of the United States.

I have contended from the beginning that, irrespective of the constitutional aspects of the question as to whether the President had the power to send troops without consulting the Congress, he would be making a critical mistake if the Congress were not fully consulted and if appropriate action were not taken to support such a policy. What we need today is the confidence and support of public opinion in America. We need the support of the American people. The only way we can have that support is for the representatives of the people in the Congress to have an opportunity to participate in the development of such an important piece of foreign policy as is involved in this debate.

Mr. President, as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I have felt it incumbent upon me to try to follow in detail and to study carefully the contributions which have been made to this subject. I have studied the original speech made by Mr. Herbert Hoover last December, and the speeches which followed, by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], by Mr. John Foster Dulles, by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], and the contributions made by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], and other Senators, including the Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], my colleague. It was my purpose originally to cover in my remarks today not only the European question, but also to cover some of the problems presented by the situation in Asia, and especially in Korea. But I realize that that is a very large field, and therefore I have decided to limit myself today to the so-called Eisenhower report, and to what I believe to be his purposes, from my talks with him and from my reading of his address and his broadcast, and also to discuss certain aspects of the so-called cold war.

I hope that next week, or probably sometime later, I can discuss certain aspects of the Asian problem, especially the crisis in Korea. I think it is too large an order to cover both those problems in one address. So, Mr. President, I shall turn, first, to the situation in Europe, primarily to the matter which the distinguished Senator from Ohio has been discussing.

I think, generally speaking, I could agree with the approach of the Senator from Ohio if it had been put in a positive form as a warning to us in considering the issues involved in the whole question of our European participation. As I heard him, I rather felt, I am frank to say, that his remarks were on the negative side. He emphasized the difficulties rather than, in the first instance, realizing that the problem facing us from the standpoint of world security is one of finding positive ways of meeting those difficulties.

I want to stress first certain conclusions which, it seems to me, we have to accept after hearing General Eisenhower, and after studying the critical problems facing us. I am convinced that the North Atlantic Treaty countries—and this is the reason why the treaty was established—must stand together and mobilize together. I cannot see any possible alternative to that. I believe the Senator from Ohio would probably agree with that statement, although I would probably go further in the development of that mobilization than he would.

My next thought, Mr. President, is that probably the spirit and determination of the European countries are dependent to a large degree upon our leadership. I am sorry for that, but I feel that it is true. We emerged from World War II unscathed, in a way, because we did not feel the brunt of the destruction caused by the war. We are looked to, because of the stronger position we are in, at least to give the sense of leadership which the other free nations need.

General Eisenhower brought out the fact that the spirit and determination of European nations were dependent to a large degree on our willingness to provide—what? In the first place, arms and ammunition. Those nations do not have arms and ammunition, nor do they yet have adequate facilities to produce them. Whatever emphasis General Eisenhower may have placed on manpower, his first and strongest emphasis was on arms and ammunition. Then he referred to a reasonable ratio of troops in order to give assurance to those nations that we would participate and not merely contribute material aid.

In studying his statement, and in talking with him, I received a further impression. I thoroughly believe he was right in the way in which he presented the case to us. His investigation indicated that it is too soon now to define the numbers of troops, either the overall number or the ratios that can be furnished by the contributing countries, including the United States. He was in Europe for about 3 weeks, and he said to us, frankly, that he could not in that short period of time get all the information on which he could form a considered judgment. He was still engaged in the planning stage and had not yet reached the point where he could present an intelligent and concrete program.

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. THYE. As I heard the remarks of General Eisenhower, and I am sure the Senator from New Jersey will concur with me, he stated that the European Continent had the men, but that what we want to do is to place rifles in their hands.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. That is true, but he did not preclude our participation with men to a reasonable extent. He did, however, emphasize the fact that to a large extent they have the men and we have the rifles and ammunition.

Mr. President, let me state another thing that impressed me. I have not seen it reported by any commentator or given any publicity, but it was very clear to me from what he said and from what I gathered from my conversation with him before he went abroad—and this is not violating any confidence—that General Eisenhower felt we could deal with the subject using the same approach which we used with the Marshall plan. We would probably have to have a larger participation at the beginning, until the European nations were built up. As by degrees their defenses were perfected, we could ease off in our participation. He said it would probably be possible to have a flexible and decreasing program so that we would not be facing a permanent program of 15 or 20 years in which we would have substantial numbers of troops continuously stationed in Europe and dedicated to European service.

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. It is not pleasant to be seemingly the devil's advocate, but in the words which were quoted by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] and agreed to by the Senator from New Jersey, the American people have indelibly impressed upon their recollection the words of Winston Churchill, which were:

> Give us the tools and we will do the job.

We have also the recollection of Korea in connection with which the United Nations overwhelmingly voted for our embarking upon the enterprise, in which their participation has been almost negligible. Does the Senator from New Jersey feel that in the minds of the American people there must be very tangible evidence that neither of those episodes is going to be repeated?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I think the point raised by the Senator from Maine is entirely correct. We have to make as clear as we can what our commitments will be. I agreed with what the Senator from Ohio said, to the extent that when the program is developed it should be brought up for consideration and approval before it is arbitrarily put into effect by the President of the United States. I do not know what the Senator from Maine means with reference to convincing the people. Of course, we must have public opinion behind us, and we are trying to prevent either arbitrary or unwise action.

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I appreciate what the Senator from New Jersey said as to the necessity of satisfying the people of America that we are going to go forward in a cooperative mood. The formula which I would follow in connection with it, in the light of the two episodes to which I have referred, which have caused very serious concern, is as follows:

> What you do speaks so loudly, I cannot hear what you say.

Those are the words of Ralph Waldo Emerson.

Moreover, I would remind the Senator of the old adage that actions speak louder than words.

The American people, if I may add a metaphor, like a "singed cat"——

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I think the Senator's comment is relevant, but I was wondering whether the Senator implies that we should do nothing until we have complete agreement on what should be undertaken.

Mr. BREWSTER. Not at all. We have had two recent experiences in which words have far outrun deeds. We have great confidence in General Eisenhower and in his capacity to survey the situation, but I think it would be a grave disservice to the cause of world peace if our European friends should understand that in America there are not serious misgivings with reference to embarking upon this enterprise. General Eisenhower was unable to give us specific information relative to the contribution of the other countries and of our country. He said it was impossible to do so either from the standpoint of their economy or their military laws. That adds to the difficulty of understanding. So that the more the nations of Europe can do to show us that they mean business, the easier it will be for us who recognize the great importance of Europe and the very great desire to defend freedom everywhere in the world.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the Senator. In answer to his statement, I have here a quotation from General Eisenhower's speech, which I read:

> What we are trying to do is * * * to start a sort of reciprocal action across the Atlantic. * * * We establish an upward-going spiral between this problem of strength and morale. * * * The only thing that can defeat us is to establish a descending spiral, born of suspicion, unreadiness on the part of each of us to do his job, the job that he knows in his heart he must do. * * *
>
> We must make sure that the heart and the soul of Europe is ripe. That is one of the obligations certainly that is imposed upon me and my staff. * * * But we must not watch that so closely that we fail to get out in front to provide the leadership that will make this thing a complete success.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, if I may be pardoned, the general also said that it is developing into a situation in which we must not look over our shoulders to see whether the others are doing their part.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I do not recall that statement, but I do recall that he very distinctly hoped to come back within a period of a few months and report to us whether or not in his judgment the Europeans were doing the things which they had undertaken to do. I think that was very important.

Mr. BREWSTER. There can be no question about that. Apropos of the question of looking over our shoulders, I am sure that the boys in Korea are looking over their shoulders to see whether or not they are getting the assistance which they were apparently pledged they would get by the action of the United Nations, which assistance has been conspicuously lacking in the past 7 months. I think we would be doing a very serious disservice to the entire cause if we did not realize that such considerations are being weighed in the minds and hearts of the American people. We cannot say that we should not be suspicious or doubtful, when boys are dying in Korea because we will not let the Chinese Nationalists go to their aid.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I agree entirely with what the Senator from Maine has said in that respect, and I shall go into the subject further a little later on in my address.

Mr. President, continuing my analysis of what I understand to be General Eisenhower's position, as I said, I interpret what he said to me and what he said in his speech to mean that what is needed now is to get under way the mobilization of the North Atlantic countries that is needed for the collective defense of Europe. As European nations develop military strength and as such strength grows from the inside, there will be less and less call on us for help, as in the case of the Marshall plan. Under the Marshall plan we established a 4-year program. It will be wound up in 1952. In other words, our program now is to join with these European countries and start the ball rolling, to get the program under way. It is not expected of us to keep a permanent army in Europe. I am sure that is the feeling General Eisenhower had.

Mr. President, as I announced a few moments ago, and as has been brought out by questioning by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], General Eisenhower said the greatest need today is for arms and equipment. He also said—and I think this is very important—that our contribution must be within the limit of our resources, and our system must remain solvent. That is what the general said:

> Our system must remain solvent.

The general will be governed by that fundamental principle, which was also referred to by the Senator from Ohio in his address this morning.

Mr. President, I said before that the American people must be behind the program. Without congressional approval I do not believe any program can succeed. So I continue to restate my position, that irrespective of the constitutional question of whether or not the President has the power to send troops, in my judgment it would be fatal if he

did not consult Congress and get congressional approval before any troops were sent. That is the spirit of the Wherry resolution. I believe it is the spirit of the American people today. If the letters and telegrams which have come to me are any indication of what the American people are thinking, that is their spirit today. The spirit of the American people is that we should work together in developing a policy for setting up a European army to help defend the bastion of liberty throughout the world.

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I should like to say to the very able Senator from New Jersey that my mail indicates the same thing. It shall be my determination to make certain that Congress will know what our Nation is committed to do, and that there shall not be the secret agreements entered into which we have witnessed in the past. I am determined to see to it that it will not happen in the future, if I can do something about it.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I agree entirely with the Senator. I think his position is perfectly sound. I may say that in my judgment, while under article 9 of the North Atlantic Pact the United States and the Western European countries have been considering what kind of set-up we should have, I am satisfied that General Eisenhower does not feel bound by any commitments. He told me that, so far as he knew, there were no commitments which in any way bound him, and that he would have a free hand to determine what the whole picture should be, what planning should be undertaken, and what the participation of each nation should be. When that has been determined, and when we know what General Eisenhower thinks each nation should and can do in the common effort—and all that must be done before we are called upon to contribute anything—it will be time for us to consider how many troops we should provide, in what ratio, and similar questions.

I am frank to say that I was very much impressed by General Eisenhower's approach. It seemed to me to be the correct one. He indicated that he would come back for approval of any program that should be carried out. In the meantime, of course, there is no reason why our production should not be stepped up. We will need war materials whether we send them abroad or keep them here. Our whole military program must be accelerated. It is perfectly proper for an expanded selective service draft to go into effect, so that we can be ready, when the time comes, to make the best disposition of our strength.

Mr. President, I should like to point out one danger which I see. General Eisenhower emphasized it, among others. It is that we must be careful not to try to dominate the whole program. We must look to the other people who are working with us to take part in the program and to accept their share of the responsibility of setting it up. It must not be looked upon as though we were dominating the entire program. The Senator from Ohio pointed that out. I have no doubt that General Eisenhower is the ablest man to head the program. That does not mean that we must run the whole show. That does not mean that it must all be done under our dictation and with complete disregard of other countries. We must not do so, or they may very well take the position, "the United States is going to do it all. We can just sit back." That is the danger, as I see it. I shall speak further on this subject of domination, as distinguished from leadership, before I conclude my remarks today.

Mr. President, I wish to say a word about Germany. On my trip to Europe last fall, to attend the Interparliamentary Conference in Dublin, and then during my visits to London and Paris, my discussions with the leaders of the various countries which I visited indicated there was a strong feeling, which I shared, that Western Germany was an important part of this whole European army set-up. Understandable difficulties confronted some countries, especially France, which had been invaded so frequently, in approving any sort of German Army. There has been widespread discussion of divisions being organized in Germany which might be made a part of a larger army.

General Eisenhower has convinced me that any discussion of Germany's contribution to a European army is probably a mistake until a political solution is worked out. There is no use precipitating differences of opinion. For the moment, at least, we do not need to move into that particular problem. It can wait until the political questions are solved and until such time as the German people definitely feel they want to be a part of a western European set-up, until they wish to come in voluntarily, and not under any pressures or any feeling of compulsion because they were the conquered nation in the last war.

As General Eisenhower pointed out, they should be looked upon as equals when they do come in. He specifically spoke of "equality." He said that they should have some divisions of their own, with their own leadership, but, of course, with adequate safeguards provided against their ever developing again a militant spirit for aggressive nationalistic purposes.

Therefore, Mr. President, after reviewing, as I have, what I take to be General Eisenhower's approach, I am glad to state that I find myself in accord with the point of view he presents. He is not suggesting a program in the sense that it is worked out in detail. He is investigating what may be needed and developing a program that he is going to bring back to us for approval. We have not yet reached the final stage of making military commitments, nor are we going to give blank checks. I would not do that.

I think the Senator from Ohio was right in calling attention to that. I have found nothing in his words of caution with which I would not agree. But I think the time will come when General Eisenhower will come back to us with a program for a certain-sized European army, if there is to be one—and I think there should be one. He will tell us the contributions to be made by the various contributing countries. He will tell us how much they can aid, based upon his own studies; and he will have suggestions as to what part we can play in that particular program when the plan comes to us for approval.

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I should like, at the appropriate point in the Senator's discussion, to refer to the situation in the Mediterranean. I do not know whether it would come more appropriately now or later.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I think I would prefer to finish my discussion of Europe, because my points are arranged in sequence, and I am afraid that if I interrupt my presentation, what I am trying to develop will not be clear in the RECORD.

I wish now to move from my interpretation of General Eisenhower's over-all approach to a discussion of strategy. I do this with great humility, because I am only a layman. However, because of my interest in the subject, I have been discussing the matter with various persons. I have been discussing the question of the possible strategy so far as all of Europe is concerned, and, in fact, so far as the world is concerned.

The Senator from Ohio referred to the difficulties involved in trying to meet force with force, and the danger, if we arm now, of our stimulating an attack by Russia. I should like to explore that subject for a moment.

I suggest that the basis of our strategy is to deter the Russians from aggression by building our own strength to the point where aggression would be too costly for the Russians. As I see it, this is the key of our policy position. I am not talking about establishing a ground army that can, by itself, resist an attack by the Russians. I want an over-all strength sufficiently great to deter them from risking the attack. So I am going to call our policy the building up of deterrent power. I underline the words "deterrent power."

This deterrent power should have three elements. As a layman I am not competent to judge military strategy, but I have discussed the subject very fully with military authorities and others who have studied it. What I am submitting is, to a considerable extent, the result of the conversations which I have had. I believe that it is well worthy of careful exploration. I think it is the spirit of the Atlantic Pact idea of collective defense against aggression.

This deterrent power, as I have said, must have three elements:

First, the power of strategic retaliation. This includes not only our atomic-bombing force, but all other weapons and techniques whereby, if Russia should start a global war, we could carry that war—where? To her own homeland. The power of strategic retaliation is very important, so that Russia will

know perfectly well that if she starts world war III, a global war, we can carry our defense, through retaliation, to her own homeland. That, to my mind, is the most potent deterrent to war today. I remember Mr. Churchill saying to me when I was in London, "The one thing that has prevented world war III has been the control of the atomic bomb by the United States." The point I am making relates to the power of strategic retaliation in case Russia should start a war.

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. One question occurs to me. In the event Russia should attack the United States, and should choose to attack us by air, she would be attempting to lay waste our strength by destroying our industrial plants and communications. Let us assume that such an approach were from the north, across Canada, from Alaska, or in the Pacific area. If such an approach were made, and a sufficient number of planes, loaded with atomic bombs, were sent to our shores Russia would naturally hope that she could get a few planes through—one to New York City, one to Chicago, one to the Twin Cities area, one to San Francisco, and one to Los Angeles, for example. If only a few planes, with atomic bombs, got through, they could lay waste our strength immediately.

If such an attack occurred upon this continent, in the United States, would it not then be to our advantage to have bases on the European continent so that we could immediately make an attack upon Russia, without the necessity of a long flight from the United States across the Atlantic to the mainland or the real heart of Russia? That is the picture as I see it.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. The Senator is correct. It is a part of the strategy of retaliation, to be in a position where we can do that from available bases. We require such bases if our plans are to be carried out.

Mr. THYE. That is why western Europe is so important in the entire world defense against communistic aggression. The peace of civilization and the freedom of religion are involved in whether we stop the Russian communistic aggression or whether that aggression is permitted to overpower one nation after another. It seems to me that our strength will lie in how strong the countries of western Europe are made.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Doubtless the Senator would agree with my suggestion that one of the elements in deterrent power is the power of strategic retaliation from properly located bases, so that we could attack at once with our atomic strength.

Mr. THYE. I have followed very closely the comments of the able Senator from New Jersey. I am very much in agreement with his views and ideas. That is why I was prompted to make the comments which I made about what it seems to me we must accomplish. We must strengthen the countries of western Europe militarily to such an extent that they can stand as bases from which we start, if the intent of Russia is ultimately to strike at this great, strong nation in order that the Russians may have a better opportunity of spreading communism to all corners of the world.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the Senator.

Mr. THYE. The United States stands today as one nation which in the past has demonstrated its ability to produce the implements of war. Russia recognizes that. She also recognizes our ability to encourage men to fight when the time calls for a fight. For that reason, if Russia attacks at all, she will attack our industrial heart, and not attack in any other manner. She will dissipate our strength, as she is doing in Korea and elsewhere, but when the final hour comes, if Russia wants to attack, she will not attack anywhere but at the very heart of the United States.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I think the Senator is correct.

Mr. THYE. We must be able to retaliate decisively or Russia will succeed in her endeavors.

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Will the Senator wait until I finish the discussion of deterrent power? I have two or three more points to bring together. Then I shall be glad to yield.

As I have stated, the first element is the power of strategic retaliation. The second is the power of mobility. This, to my mind, is vitally important. I am sorry the Senator from Ohio is not present in the Chamber, because I think this would help to answer one of the difficulties which he had in mind concerning the great Russian force.

The free world cannot hope to build a static defense line all around the iron curtain, but it can and must deploy powerful mobile forces at strategic bases so that, in the event of attack, they can go into action at the weakest points in the attacker's armor, wherever those points may be.

So we have the power of strategic retaliation and we have the power of mobility. We cannot possibly put a circle around the land mass of Russia plus the land mass of China, which are now together. I cannot conceive of a static army strong enough to meet an attack from any of those areas. We must have mobility. We must have the strategic points which the Senator from Minnesota has so well emphasized, in order to be able to retaliate promptly with our air and atomic weapons.

Finally—and this, I think, is very important—there is the power of ground defense in Europe. Western Europe is now the most vital area endangered by Communist aggression. By building the Western European army under General Eisenhower, we make it clear to the Russians that they cannot swallow this immense strategic prize without paying an ever-increasing price, not only in retaliation against their own homeland, but also in heavy losses on the ground. It has been suggested that there is no use in having any army in Europe, because we cannot possibly meet an over-all attack by Russia. Mr. President, I submit that we must have forces organized to defend those homelands that are so vital to the free world and to make the Russians pay a maximum price if they are going to take that risk.

I have been exploring the possibility of thinking in terms of a measuring stick for the European army, and I submit only this one tentative suggestion, namely, that the measuring stick might conceivably be a strong enough force to meet any possible attack by one satellite or a group of satellites; a force that could meet anything except the actual impact of the whole Russian strength. This would force the Russians themselves to join in the attack, in effect, to start world war III, and we would be prepared to retaliate immediately by striking at Russia's weakest points with all the force of our atomic bombs, our air and naval strength, and our mobile units.

The suggestion has been made that we could set up an army adequate to take care of a satellite or a group of satellites, which would not require the enormous army the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] has referred to in his remarks.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am prepared to yield to the Senator from Indiana if he wishes to ask me a question.

Mr. CAPEHART. I wish to ask the Senator from New Jersey, as well as the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], a question at this point. During the colloquy which took place between the two Senators mention was made of the fact that if Russia were to attack the United States we would want bases from which to attack Russia. My question is: Is the Senator confident that the European nations will fight Russia if Russia attacks the United States?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Of course, that is the whole spirit and purpose of the Atlantic Pact. The Atlantic Pact contemplates that an attack on one is an attack on all, and the third world war would then be on.

Mr. CAPEHART. Of course, the spirit of the United Nations is that they will likewise declare an aggressor to be an aggressor, and that they will join with the United States or any other members of the United Nations to fight an aggressor. England particularly has failed to do that with respect to Korea. They say they want no part of a war.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I said earlier that I agreed with the implication of the Senator's remarks, because the danger he speaks of is a real one in the light of the most unfortunate shilly-shallying in the United Nations. The intent of the UN Charter is to follow aggression with sanctions. In the case of the North Atlantic Pact, in my opinion, it is the duty of General Eisenhower to satisfy himself that in case of such an attack on the United States the other countries would stand fast and join us in defense against Russia.

Mr. CAPEHART. At the moment my opinion is that they would not.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am sympathetic with the Senator's feeling, but I do not think that we should choose the alternative of accepting that position and saying that therefore we will do nothing to assure the building up of collective security. I feel that it is necessary for us to stand together in a program of collective defense and see if we cannot work this problem out by the deterrent, united power of the North Atlantic nations, which should cause Russia to fear starting anything and make her realize that we are strong enough to meet attack, in other words, to show Russia that the cost of an attack is more than she can pay.

As I have said, I plan, in an address to be made next week, to deal with the Middle East, the Asian and the Japanese questions, and the present troubles in the UN, but at this moment I desire to pass to another aspect of this subject, because I feel it is vitally important to the whole picture. I shall move from the position of discussing defense, which is the Atlantic Pact problem, to a discussion of the problem of our offense in Europe. What should our offense be? We are not going to be aggressors, but, as I survey the situation, there is something going on in the world to which I am convinced we have not given sufficient attention.

I refer to the battle for the minds and spirits of men and women, otherwise known as the ideological struggle. In my considered judgment, having studied this matter ever since I have been in the Senate, and especially since the postwar period has come, the ideological struggle is the most important aspect of our foreign policy. Military strength and economic strength are important, but they are not enough. We might win in a third world war and still lose because we did not undertake wholeheartedly this important ideological struggle. We must face the issues in that struggle and the question whether or not Russia is defeating us in the battle for the minds and spirits of men.

I submit that if we are to win out in this struggle, it is not sufficient merely to be anti-Communist. Along with political, economic, and military programs the Communists have been smart enough to use the power of ideas in what may be called a four-dimensional offensive against us. The Communist ideology has been the central factor in the Russian attack. They have placed their ideology in the middle of the picture, and then built their military, political, and economic program around it.

Our defense, on the other hand, has tended to rely primarily on a three-dimensional strategy. That is, we have thought in terms of economic, political, and military programs, and have given too little attention to the power of ideas. We have given too little attention to what I call the spiritual and moral offensive to catch the imagination of the people of the world, and enable them to see that the issue is something very fundamental.

So I suggest that the free world must develop the superior force of an idea greater than communism, an idea more revolutionary than communism: The universal idea of human freedom. It seems to me that that is the thing which is being lost sight of in this whole contest.

There is a picture in the world, to which I shall refer again later, of America as a capitalistic, materialist, dollar-sign nation competing against Russian communism, with the Russians claiming that they are the champions of the downtrodden, and that they are trying to release the downtrodden classes from the domination of other powers. In trying to counteract this devastatingly erroneous interpretation, we have failed to put across the conception of freedom which is the foundation stone of all our American traditions. We must emphasize that the keynote of our traditions is not merely freedom as license, but freedom under the high spiritual power of Almighty God, and that we have built this country on a deeply spiritual foundation which has made possible our greatness. If once properly set forth and explained to the world, it can defeat the claims of communism, which are atheistic and materialistic, and which embody the Marxist philosophy of class hatred.

I think it is appropriate to refer to an illustration which I am taking from the Constitutional Convention of 1787——

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, before the Senator proceeds to the Constitutional Convention, may I ask him a question on the subject of freedom?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I shall be happy to yield to the Senator from Vermont, although I am going to continue on the subject of freedom.

Mr. FLANDERS. I have been wondering to what extent freedom, as an abstract question, is of primary interest to people who are living in a substandard manner of life, as we understand it. Are there not, in the case of the people behind the iron curtain, questions of freedom which apply more directly to their own situations? Is it not reasonable to believe that the freedom of their sons or their brothers or their fathers who have been taken away in the darkness of the night, perhaps, and sent to labor camps, they know not where, is of more immediate concern to them? Is there not a very lively personal sense of freedom viewed from that standpoint which perhaps would be stronger with these people than freedom as a more or less abstract subject?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I am glad the Senator from Vermont has raised that point. As I recall, when he was speaking in the Senate a week or so ago, he stated that the "gemier" parts of his speech would come later. I may suggest to him that the points he has raised in the questions he has asked me will be developed later in my speech.

My point here is that we must interpret freedom in a way that the people with whom we deal can understand, for otherwise we shall not be understood. After all, when we discuss freedom when we are dealing with Americans we translate it into terms which apply to the lives of our own people. So we should proceed in similar fashion in attempting to have our interpretation of freedom understood by the people in the Far East, for example, by the people in the other parts of the world, where the people have never enjoyed the freedoms we take for granted, and where they may be suffering from hunger and poverty. I think we must consider and emphasize that.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, although I had agreed to be in attendance at a certain committee hearing to listen to a person of very high rank, I am inclined to remain here now, to wait for the gems of which the Senator from New Jersey speaks.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I sincerely hope the distinguished Senator from Vermont will not be disappointed.

First, Mr. President, I wish to point out that in the early days of the history of the United States, our people floundered around with their conceptions of freedom. They were not entirely clear as to what freedom meant. Those who came to this land knew in a general way that they had come here in order to achieve certain freedoms. However, there was confusion regarding them at the time of the writing of the Constitution, in Philadelphia, in 1787; and our people were prone to be divided by bickering and jealousies which were reflected in the discussions at Philadelphia. Then arose one of our elder statesmen, Benjamin Franklin, who was over 80 years of age at the time, and he called attention to the fact that one trouble was that the people there thought they could rely upon their own wisdom and did not need to rely upon a Higher Wisdom.

I refer now to the spiritual guidance we need in connection with our attempts to deal with these complex world problems and to solve them. I think the words of Benjamin Franklin will be most helpful to us. He said then:

> I have lived, sir, a long time, and the longer I live the more convincing proofs I see of this truth that God governs in the affairs of men. And if a sparrow cannot fall to the ground without His notice, is it probable that an empire can rise without His aid? I * * * believe that without His concurring aid we shall succeed in this political building no better than the builders of Babel. We shall be divided by our little partial local interests; our projects will be confounded; and we ourselves shall become a reproach and byword down to future ages. And, what is worse, mankind may hereafter, from this unfortunate instance, despair of establishing governments by human wisdom and leave it to chance, war, and conquest.

Mr. President, at this time I quote that statement merely because it seems to me that in connection with the present battle for the minds of men, it is most important to have all men realize, as we have learned during the course of our history, that man by himself cannot solve these problems.

Furthermore, Mr. President, if we continue to think of what we mean by human freedom, it seems to me we should redefine to the other nations of the world our moral position in concrete and positive terms, so as to stress the common aims and aspirations of the free world for freedom and peace with justice. Such a redefinition should take the

form of a ringing and positive declaration of peace objectives. I suggest the following as examples of matters which should be included in a redefinition of peace objectives. These have been suggested by many other Members of this body, so they are not new, but all of these suggestions should be refined, clarified, and assembled in one declaration, which would include:

First, the broad outlines of a disarmament program. Let us keep stressing our desire for peace, Mr. President.

Second, consistent adherence to the principle of freedom of communication and freedom of information, not only as applied to ourselves, but also as applied to the peoples of other countries. In that connection, I refer to the resolution submitted today by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMahon] in which I was happy to join, and which the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Wiley] has endorsed. As evidence of our adherence to the principle of freedom of communication and information, we should send a message of friendship to the people of Russia, and we should insist that that friendship message be gotten through the iron curtain, in order to reach the Russian people.

Third—and this is very important, as I found as I traveled through the Far East last year—we must present to these people our unquestioned belief in the self-determination of peoples, through self-expression and self-development; and we must present to them our unquestioned opposition to any future imperialism, colonialism, or any attempt to impose by force a system of government upon a peaceful nation. We must be prepared to do all we can, just as we have done in Korea, and as we ought to be prepared to do in other parts of the world, to help people who aspire to achieve freedom.

Fourth, we should continue to demonstrate our willingness to achieve our objectives through the United Nations. Of course, I have been disappointed in the recent developments in the United Nations, but I believe that the United Nations organization still contains the promise of peace with justice; and while it is going through the ordeal of developing a new means of dealing with international problems, we must continue to demonstrate our willingness to work through the United Nations.

Fifth, we must affirm our rededication to democratic principles in our own countries. There must be a frank recognition that our systems of government are not perfect, but that we are seeking to give people freedom of self-expression and self-development. Certainly we must insist that the people of the free world must practice the democratic principles we profess and in that way give to the other nations examples of freedom in action.

Mr. President, in addition to the declaration of peace objectives I have outlined, we must lose no opportunity to strengthen our information programs, and to relate them to the traditions, the problems, and the attitudes of other peoples, so that they will have an impact upon the everyday life of the peoples concerned. This is a part of our foreign-policy program that has not been adequately emphasized.

We must translate our conception of freedom—and this is the approach to the problem about which the Senator from Vermont has asked—into words which have tangible meaning to peoples all over the world.

Mr. President, I have often suggested that we should not try to dominate this field by necessarily applying to our broadcasts the title "The Voice of America." I have suggested that we call it, the Voice of Freedom or the Voice of the Free World.

In order not to get into a position of appearing to dominate in that connection, we should encourage other countries to join us in stating what freedom means. There might well be a Voice of the Western European Nations, a Voice of the Benelux Countries, a Voice of Free China, or a Voice of Free Asia.

In any event, the important point is that in the dissemination of information from the free nations of the world to those that are groping for freedom, we must use words and terms which have tangible meaning to the peoples of countries all over the world; and we should state very definitely, in terms they will understand, just what freedom means to them.

In this connection, Mr. President, I should state that General Eisenhower, in his recent speech at the Library of Congress, before the joint meeting of the House and the Senate, emphasized the importance of our information program. He said:

> I will close on one note * * * (that) does not lie completely within my province, but it is important. * * * That is our own efforts to let the world understand what we are about, about what we are, and sometimes our own efforts to have our own people understand what we are trying to do. In any event, I believe that the United States needs a very, very much stronger information service. In our case I will not call it propaganda, because the truth is all we need. We don't have to falsify the record, nor our intentions.

Mr. President, I think we have relegated the entire program of information—our Voice of America program and all the aspects of the communication of ideas and information which is a central part of this cold war for the minds of men—to a relatively insignificant place in our entire military and diplomatic scheme of things. I am very sympathetic with the suggestion made recently by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Benton] that we should take the information service, the Voice of America, entirely out of the State Department, and should set it up by itself, because of its importance, so that we can be sure that it constitutes one of the chief means upon which we rely in our continuous contact with the rest of the world and in our struggle against Communist infiltration.

Recently I was engaged in conversations with some of my colleagues, and the question arose, "Have not we lost our prestige in Europe, recently?" There was general agreement that whereas in years past we were respected and admired as one of the leading champions of freedom in the world, since then we have become unpopular for one reason or another. Those who participated in these group discussions attempted to explore the reasons for this situation. I shall not go into detail in that connection, except to say that it is always true that if one member of a group is more prosperous than the others, there is always an element of envy which results in making the prosperous person somewhat unpopular. I am afraid, however, that we have not used our prestige and our strength to the best effect. Rightly or wrongly, we have been looked upon as the "dollar country." We have been rather aggressively dominant in dealing with many of these people. We should face these facts, and should realize that we have to practice an attitude of humility in dealing with other people of the world, who are very proud, and who resent any attempt on our part to be the dominant factor in discussions or in working out these programs.

That is why I said earlier that, even though I feel that General Eisenhower is the most capable military man to deal with the present situation in Europe, he is wise when he says he does not think he should be in the position of dominating the decisions, but should rather share in determining the decisions of those who have the problems to meet.

So we cannot overlook the importance of humility. We have to face the problems of the world as one of many nations, not permitting to operate against us the feeling which apparently has started in some areas of the world. I shall deal with that subject more fully next week, because my experience in the Far East has brought it forcefully to my attention. The people of the Far East understand us less than do our European cousins, and they feel that we are a people far removed from them, with completely different ideologies from their own.

There are obvious examples of our own derelictions, which I feel we must correct. I am calling attention to them to indicate that we cannot merely pride ourselves as having attained a position of eminence in this matter. We cannot solve these problems without recognizing the difficulties in our own country, which indicate that we have fallen down within our own borders. For example, the Kefauver subcommittee has been doing excellent work in bringing out many evidences of crime in America. The situation depicted is very distressing, and it is something to which we should certainly be giving a great deal of attention, in an effort to determine why such things can happen.

I was very much disturbed by the draft rejections which we experienced during World War II, and have been concerned about the rejections in the recent draft, which indicate that a large percentage of young people are suffering from mental illnesses. They are disturbed because they do not know quite where they are going. They are drifting. They need leadership.

I am distressed by the evidences of family distintegrations in this country. I am distressed by the evidences of discrimination, of one kind and another,

among our people. We do not adequately face up to these moral issues which mean so much to the future of any nation, and which meant so much to us when this great country was originally founded.

It is my conviction, as I stated earlier, that we must return to the principles of our basic Christian tradition, on which were laid the moral and spiritual foundations of this great Republic. In times past, when we drifted away from these principles, we felt the evil effects of our derelictions.

I need only refer to the crisis during the war between the States, which arose when Lincoln was suffering his greatest difficulties. One statement he made at that time, which is not quoted so frequently as are some of the other things he said, seems to me to be particularly applicable today in considering the problems we are facing. Lincoln said:

> We have been recipients of the choicest bounties of heaven; we have been preserved these many years in peace and prosperity; we have grown in number, wealth, and power as no other nation has ever grown. But we have forgotten God. We have forgotten the gracious hand which preserved us in peace and multiplied and enriched and strengthened us, and we have vainly imagined, in the deceitfulness of our hearts, that all these blessings were produced by some superior wisdom and virtue of our own. Intoxicated with unbroken success, we have become too self-sufficient to feel the necessity of redeeming and preserving grace, too proud to pray to the God who made us.

I merely quote that and place it in the RECORD because it seems to me that there we have the thinking of one of the greatest leaders of all time, a man who certainly understood his people, who certainly loved them and was not overly critical of them. He was merely saying that we became "intoxicated with success" without recognizing that the force behind what happened was a power outside ourselves.

But, in addition to what I have said about humility, and about the necessity of examining our own record before we try to preach too much to others, I desire to submit a word of caution. The fact that we need humility does not mean that we do not have great responsibility for leadership. I wish to distinguish between leadership in the right sense and an attitude of domination, which I fear, and against which General Eisenhower warned us. The great province of leadership is to inspire others by example. That is what I have been hoping I could bring out in the course of my remarks—that the course America follows will be the means by which we can sell our idea of freedom to other countries.

We have an example today in the food problem of India. I have been very eager to relieve the Indian people who may soon be suffering from famine, and I hope helpful legislation will be enacted. I trust the assistance may be extended without relation to any possible political implications, without reference to the fact that we may not agree with India's position today. The questions of suffering, of famine, of human beings being in danger of losing their lives, are entirely apart from any differences between us as nations. America has always met such a challenge, and I trust and hope and pray that she will meet this challenge.

The great province of leadership is to inspire others by example, to persuade them to do what needs to be done in their own interest. General Eisenhower referred in his speech to a rising spiral of strength and morale, and we must have that rising spiral. This does not mean paternalism. It does not mean a constant goading. We want to get away from any feeling of resentment which may come from any of our activities. We must try to dispel any feeling on the part of other nations that we look upon them as inferiors. As the strongest free nation, we must exert true leadership of the kind to which I have referred, and the leadership which through its actions, speaks louder than words, as the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] has said. We profess to believe in humility, but if our actions do not coincide with our professions, it is of no avail. These problems are matters involving character—our national character and individual character.

In concluding these remarks, Mr. President, I desire to call attention especially to what seems to me to be a very significant aspect of the present world crisis. Russia, by very clever propaganda, has painted a picture of what is going on in the world which to my mind is absolutely misleading. Yet it has pervaded the minds and hearts of many peoples of many nations. Russian propaganda presents the struggle as a fight between the two major powers, the United States and Russia, with the United States representing imperialism, colonialism, and a decadent capitalism that exploits the common man, while Russian communism is the virtuous and benevolent champion of the poor and downtrodden.

There is no doubt that in large areas of the world this erroneous contrast has been dramatized until today there are nations wondering whether for their own best interests they should get into the tent behind the iron curtain with Russia, or whether they should get behind the western countries, and especially the United States. Millions of people are confused as to the real issue, and as to the true aspirations and objectives of the United States and the Western World.

This is evidenced by the strong sentiment for neutrality. I encountered when I was in Europe the question whether some of the countries should remain neutral, the suggestion that the struggle need not affect all nations and all peoples and the idea of waiting to see. It has shocked me beyond measure, because it seems to me that if the free world has not been able to show that what is at stake is something far more than simply a contest for power between two great nations, it has missed its greatest opportunity. The future of the civilized world is definitely at stake. Our most important challenge, then, is to convince the peoples of the world that this is a struggle between human freedom under God and slavery to a totalitarian state.

This means that we must acquaint people everywhere with our belief in the sacredness of the individual man, of his right to self-expression, to self-development, and to protection against exploitation by any stronger power. That is what we mean by freedom. It also means informing people everywhere of the true nature of the Russian Communist system, with its complete denial of the value of the individual, and its complete exploitation of the individual by the state. The contrast is evident, but, as I see it, we have failed to make it clear. The fundamental issue is between real freedom, freedom under God, as we have experienced it in this world, and human slavery.

Lincoln quoting Scripture, it will be recalled, said that a house divided against itself cannot stand, and so a nation half slave and half free cannot endure. I think we are facing the issue of a world divided against itself unless this great problem is solved. Nothing less than our dedication to a new birth of freedom of the world is adequate to meet the crisis. As Lincoln Day approaches I believe we cannot too often restate his great vision of what this eternal struggle is about. I need only to quote the closing words of his Gettysburg address:

> That this Nation, under God—

We can change the words, now, to "This world, under God"—

> may have a new birth of freedom, and that government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from the earth.

The America of our forefathers is the hope of the world today. It is my hope and prayer that America shall not fail the world.

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. I wanted to address myself to the subject the Senator was discussing, as I indicated, but I waited until the conclusion of the Senator's very worthwhile address, which I wish might be esteemed the "Voice of America" to be heard by our friends around the world. If they would listen to it and follow its teachings, our problem would be much less difficult.

Mr. President, I wish to invite the Senator's attention briefly to a portion of geography which it seems to me has been very much ignored. I refer to the Mediterranean. It was not mentioned by General Eisenhower in his discussion, but it is my understanding that in his statement before the committees he did recognize its strategic importance, as well as that of the nations which border the Mediterranean. It has been the center of civilization in the past, and is a place in which wars in the very recent past have been waged.

Turkey, in proportion to its resources, has been the greatest contributor to the battling in Korea. I think that would be a fair statement, would it not?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. The Senator from Maine is absolutely correct. I

am glad to join with him in paying tribute to the wonderful aid which the Turkish forces have been contributing in the war in Korea. They realized their own danger in connection with the Dardanelles and the Bosporus, and they knew that they might be the next victim. They realized what Korea meant in the whole picture of the world struggle.

Mr. BREWSTER. That is profoundly correct. Would the Senator from New Jersey, as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, to which we must look for guidance, think that European countries would be recognized in connection with any appeasement program, so far as the Bosporus may be concerned?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. So far as I am concerned, I can see nothing in appeasement. I should be opposed to any such appeasement program as the Senator suggests.

Mr. BREWSTER. Especially with reference to a nation which is standing so resolutely by our side at this time?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. That is correct.

Mr. BREWSTER. There are the usual rumblings of diplomatic intrigue in the discussions proceeding among the four great powers.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I think the Senator will agree with me that that was one of the things that was so disastrous in the conferences in which some of us felt that China was betrayed.

Mr. BREWSTER. So much for one end of the Mediterranean. I shall now invite the attention of the Senator to the other end of the Mediterranean, Gibraltar, and to its strategic importance in connection with the world-wide picture which has always prevailed. I wish to refer to the amendment which was adopted under the sponsorship of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] and the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON]. It has been a matter of concern to many Senators, and it was the subject of an overwhelming vote of both House and Senate when the amendment was offered. Is the Senator aware of the fact that under the provision which was adopted 6 months ago, not one dollar of assistance—and I quote the exact language—"has been extended to Spain"?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am not aware of that.

Mr. BREWSTER. That is the fact. I should like to invite the attention of the Senator from New Jersey to the language of the Senator from Wyoming in discussing the amendment, indicating what he had in mind, and what I am sure was the intent of both the Senate and the House in their vote. I am referring to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 96, part 9, page 11465, the Senator from Wyoming speaking:

> That is precisely what the Senator from Nevada wishes to do—provide export-import credit aid to Spain. It can be done, it seems to me, more successfully by adopting the technique in the bill which was passed last year rather than by cutting anything out of the appropriation for the rest of Western Europe.

The Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] asked him how this would affect or change the situation, and the Senator from Wyoming replied:

> Mr. O'MAHONEY. I will show the Senator precisely how it changes it. I think that as a matter of realism we have to come to the conclusion now we should no longer be dependent upon vague promises which are not fulfilled and here is a directive of the Congress to perform an act the failure to perform which in the past has been defended on the ground, "Well, we have the legal power and we need no more." Yes, the Export-Import Bank had the power, but for reasons which are difficult to explain on any theory that does not conflict with our announced policy to contain communism the loans have not been made.

The Senator from Wyoming went on to say:

> I think that with respect to the policy toward Spain, if the State Department has opposed Export-Import Bank loans, this is precisely the place to reverse it, because if the Spanish peninsula is not held in the affairs which are now rapidly developing in Western Europe, much if not all of our economic aid to ECA countries will have been lost. If the arguments which are being made today at Lake Success, in the Security Council, under the Presidency of the representative of the Soviet Union and on behalf of the Kremlin policy—if those arguments and those tactics should prevail, it seems to me that there could be no possible question that refusal to deal realistically in Spain will only help to handicap our program. We should match realism with realism, and meet the issue as it is.

The Senator from Wyoming went on as follows:

> The Senator from New York has already answered himself, when a moment ago he rose and interrupted me to ask me a question. His question was: Does not the Export-Import Bank now have the authority to do this? The inference from the Senator's question was, of course, "We are ready to lend this money now. The Export-Import Bank can do it." But the sad fact is that the authority of the Export-Import Bank is not being used and we were told this afternoon the State Department is responsible.

Is the Senator from New Jersey surprised and concerned to find that six months' time has elapsed since that overwhelming vote, and that not one dollar has been advanced, so far as Spain is concerned?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I was not aware of that development.

Mr. BREWSTER. Does the Senator consider that there is any doubt that Spain has adequately presented its case before the Export-Import Bank in order to get the relief which Congress apparently considered was essential?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am not aware of what protestations Spain made.

Mr. BREWSTER. The Senator has referred to the need in India. Is the Senator aware of the fact that the need in Spain is equally great? Is he aware that in Yugoslavia, to which we gave aid some time ago, the wheat crop was 80 percent of the normal crop, and that the wheat crop in Spain for the past 5 years has been 65 percent of the pre-war normal. Would it not seem, under the mandate of Congress and because of human need, that the Export-Import Bank and other agencies of Government might well give consideration to the question either on the ground of expediency, on which the Yugoslav proposal was presented by the Senator from Arkansas, or on the ground of human need, which the Senator from New Jersey so eloquently and properly feels is present in the case of India?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I was under the impression when we passed the legislation that it would go through the regular routine, and relief would be given. I am glad the Senator has brought up the subject.

Mr. BREWSTER. I trust that the members of the Committee on Foreign Relations, in their vision, which extends around Europe and through the Orient, will give consideration to conditions in the Mediterranean, in the interest of carrying out the plain mandate adopted by Congress six months ago.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the Senator.

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield for a question.

Mr. MCMAHON. I should like to say to the Senator from New Jersey that I was not able to listen to his entire address. Unfortunately I had an engagement outside the Chamber and was therefore unable to hear all of it. I did hear the last portion of his address. The Senator knows how thoroughly I agree with him in the thesis which he has expounded, to the effect that the greatest strength that America can bring to the struggle is moral strength. I wish to thank the Senator for what he has said concerning the resolution which was submitted today. He was generous in joining with me and the other Senators in its proposals. I hope that we can now go forward and at least give positive evidence that the Congress of the United States, contrary to the propaganda pouring out of Moscow every day to the effect that we intend and desire the imperialistic enslavement of humanity everywhere, is determined that the world and its people shall be free. I think the Senator has delivered a statesmanlike address and exposition of the truth of our real intentions.

I may say to the Senator that I have taken an excerpt from the news ticker in the cloakroom, dealing with the Kremlin's attitude on our position. It seems to me that the pitch of their campaign is rising in its intensity. I view such development with a good deal of apprehension. It smacks too much on the same kind of techniques which Hitler and Goebbels used as they prepared for their aggressions. I do not know whether it has escaped the attention of Senators. If so, I recommend that they investigate the rising intensity of the bitterness of the releases which are coming out of Moscow, in which we are being accused of plotting all kinds of foul deeds in the world. I assure the Senator it is a study which is well worth while.

I close my remarks by saying to the Senator from New Jersey that I congratulate him on his excellent address.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the Senator for his kind remarks. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

THE WAR IN KOREA AND THE GEOGRAPHY OF AMERICA'S FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, before I take up my prepared address I wish to comment very briefly on the colloquy between the able Senator from New Jersey and the equally able Senator from Minnesota a short time ago, in which they referred to the huge volume of mail which has come to them from their constituents. Every Member of the Senate, and every Member of Congress, has been astounded by the huge volume of mail which has come to him. Thousands and thousands of letters have come to our offices from the folks back home whom we have the honor to represent. Our offices and our staff have been figuratively, if not literally, buried under the avalanche of communications. I believe there has been nothing like it in legislative history, at least not to my knowledge. The communications are not the ordinary run of the mill letters with reference to pending legislation, such as, "Please vote for this," or "Please vote against that." They reflect a degree of bewilderment and confusion which, as I have said, is without counterpart in legislative history. All through them, like a thread through a string of beads, runs one word: "Why?"

They say:

Our boys are fighting in Korea. Why?

There is no declared war. Yet we have upward of 50,000 casualties in Korea. Why?

We are told that the major portion of the so-called United Nations Army in Korea is composed of American troops. Why?

We are told that our intelligence was faulty. We are told that there was some failure, possibly, to evaluate such intelligence as was available. Why?

We are told that there is a possibility, at least, that we will be called upon to send our boys to Formosa, Indochina, the Philippines, and Japan. Why?

We are told that it is necessary to build up an army for the defense of Western Europe. Why?

We are told that it is essential to build up an army of perhaps 3½ million or 4 million men within the coming few months. Why?

We are told it is necessary to impose universal military training on the Nation. Why?

We are told it is necessary to lower the draft age to 18 years. Why?

We are told that the military program may take 10 years. Why?

We are told that it is necessary to have absolute economic control and rationing. Why?

We are told that we are going to have to increase the tax load on our people to an almost unbelievable weight. Why?

Why? Why? Why?

Mr. President, our people are entitled to know. It is because such questions have not been answered that there have resulted confusion, misunderstanding, and some measure of hostility. I have been somewhat critical of the leadership of the Nation, because I felt that it was lax, within the limits imposed by the security needs of the country, not to make the policies and the reason for the thinking behind the policies available to the American people.

Mr. President, ours is a democracy. The people of the United States, under our form of government, are not limited by the famous lines of Tennyson:

Theirs not to reason why,
Theirs but to do and die.

Mr. President, I have received and answered since Christmas more than 6,000 letters of the character to which I have referred. I said that I have criticized the leadership, because it has not made available to our people such information as could be made available to them. The people of my State, as of every other State, are ready to contribute their boys, and they are ready to assume any burden of sacrifice or responsibility if they have an idea of what it is for and what the goals are.

Mr. President, in attempting to answer the letters, I have found it impossible to cover the ground within the confines and limits of a dictated reply. In preparing for delivery in the Senate a speech which might be in a measure a foundation stone for future discussions, I felt that I was lax, because it was so difficult, and the ramifications were so complex, that it was almost impossible for me, within the limits of an address to be delivered on the floor of the Senate, to give any clear explanation.

I am also tremendously concerned because my friends who write to me from Iowa say, "Senator, we have sent you to Washington as our representative. We cannot be on the ground to know what is going on. Will you please give us a simple, clear, concise answer as to what the objectives of our Nation are in the policies which we are undertaking and carrying out?"

The inability to do that is something which has kept me awake at night. We are undertaking here what we call the great debate. Unfortunately, too often that debate has been concerned either with military strategy—whether we think it is militarily possible to defend this area or that area—or with a discussion of general principles.

I was pleased when the able leader of the majority [Mr. McFARLAND] interrogated the able Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] when the latter was making his very eloquent speech this afternoon. He asked the Senator from Ohio, "Is the Senator stating his own conclusions, or opinions which he has received from the generals?" It occurred to me that there were two generals to whom we ought to listen, that is, General Principles and General Experience. The sooner we do that, the better it will be for the Nation and for the world.

I was also much interested a few moments ago when the eloquent Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] spoke of the fact that we should engage not only in defense but in offense. He defined the offense to which he alluded as the offense to bring to bear on all the world the basic principles of brotherhood, and spiritual and heart development.

In an attempt to correct in a small measure my own laxity, I beg the indulgence of the Senate to deliver a prepared address, which, unfortunately, is somewhat abstruse, but I believe that it ought to be in the RECORD as a cornerstone to the discussion which will be carried on later this week, and will certainly be carried on after the appropriate committees have considered such resolutions as the pending Wherry resolution.

Mr. President, it is becoming a commonplace to say that the United States is confronted with a permanent world crisis. It is a crisis unlike any we have known before, and we have been slow to learn how to live with it. One of the first things to learn, as the record of the past 7 months seems to show, is that no foreign policy and no grand strategy which the Government's experts and specialists may devise to meet this sort of crisis can hope to succeed without the full understanding and the fundamental agreement of the vast majority of the American people. It therefore becomes the business of all our people, and of all their representatives, to join in every major step of the long-range planning for foreign policy. If the people and their representatives do not make this their business, if they leave it to the experts to do the job, if they do not therefore understand and agree at least with the broad outlines and the ultimate purpose of our country's foreign policy, the whole structure may collapse or be torn apart from within at the moment of greatest danger.

Today, Mr. President, I am inviting my fellow Senators to join me in a voyage of discovery, or a tour of inspection, to explore the geography of our foreign policy, in the hope that we may return from the trip with a clearer picture of the broad outlines and the ultimate purpose of that policy than some of us may now possess.

THE THREE ESSENTIALS

The foreign policy of the United States is a constant process of seeking to create and maintain an effective balance among three basic elements: First, America's vital interests in the world; second, the commitments made to protect or advance these vital interests; and, third, the power America must have to fulfill these commitments.

I would judge that a country has a solvent foreign policy if it has assumed commitments great enough and broad enough to protect its vital interests but not too great and not too broad to fulfill with the power at its disposal. A country that has made commitments beyond its capacity to fulfill will one day be obliged either to reduce its commitments or to increase its power, if it can, or incur national bankruptcy and defeat.

Whenever in our history we have failed to achieve or maintain an effective balance among these three essentials, we have paid dearly in lives and in treasure for that failure. From 1900 onward, for example, the United States was committed to the defense of the Philippines; yet for 40 years few Americans, except the experts, believed that the Philippine Islands were an area of vital interest to our country. Then in 1941, we learned the tragic facts: we did not have the power to fulfill the commitments made 40 years before to defend those islands. It took us nearly four terrible years of

war to liberate them from the Japanese conqueror.

In the present day, failure to balance the essential factors of our foreign policy might not mean merely the temporary loss of distant island outposts, but the destruction of our Republic itself. If the Senate is to have a debate on foreign policy, it is to these great questions that we should first address ourselves, long before considering the ways and means of implementing the policy or passing judgment on the conduct of one or another of its subordinate aspects.

First, it seems to me, we must seek to define the interests of the United States in the world, reach an agreement among ourselves and our people as to what they are, distinguished accurately among vital and secondary interests, and determine in what order of importance we should rank them. Until this is done, we will continue to walk in the fog of doubt and confusion.

Second, we must survey the major commitments which the United States has made for the protection of its vital interests, in order to ascertain whether we have made adequate commitments, whether we are overcommitted in terms of what our interests require, and whether we may have committed ourselves to protect areas of interest which are not really vital but instead only secondary or apparent.

Third, we must estimate as closely as we can, with the advice and counsel of military and other experts, how great a power we must develop, and of what kind, in order to fulfill the major commitments covering our vital interests.

Then, based on our estimate of what is required, we must assess the power, the resources, and the capacity presently or potentially available, to determine whether we have enough to carry out the commitments made, whether we have a deficit in necessary power, or whether we have a surplus of power and potential, either to hold in reserve or to exercise in the fulfillment of new obligations we may be compelled to make to meet new threats to our vital interests.

If we do these things, Mr. President, I feel confident that we can approach an effective balance among our interests, our commitments, and our power, and I also feel confident that the American people, understanding this, will give our Government unhesitating support in the great tasks ahead.

Wherever our formal commitments and our vital interests in the world do not coincide, or at least do not seem to, there we find the source of the most embittered disagreements within the Congress and among our people. This is most obviously the case with regard to the Far East, especially in Korea, China, Formosa, and Indochina. It is less obviously the case with regard to Western Germany, Central Europe, and the Mediterranean, especially Spain and Yugoslavia.

If we are ever to reach a decision on our Far East policy which our people can wholeheartedly support, we must first agree on whether or not Korea, China, Formosa, and Indochina lie within an area of vital interest to the United States. We must agree on the nature, the extent, and the relative importance of that interest. We must agree on the character of the commitment we will make to protect that vital interest, if we decide such an interest exists.

Until we do this, Mr. President, all the speeches and propaganda and emotional appeals and hysterical accusations by which we are being assailed from all sides will serve merely to deepen and widen the chasm of confusion into which we have been plunging. We shall continue to be torn between the Europe firsters, the Asia firsters, the Formosa firsters, the America firsters, the globalists, and the retreatists, and all the other 999 varieties of parlor strategists and back-door statesmen.

OUR UNITED NATIONS COMMITMENT

First of all, however, I should like to preface a survey of our interests, commitments, and power with a brief discussion of our commitment under the United Nations Charter.

It will be valuable to draw a distinction between two kinds of commitments. One is the kind we make for the purpose of protecting an area of vital interest to the United States, in which we say, in effect, that the protection of that area is so essential to the defense of our own country that we will go to war, if necessary, to protect it. This is a commitment through vital interest.

The second type of commitment obligates us to abide by the principles of an international organization of states. We have made this kind of commitment under the United Nations Charter, which we participated in formulating. We are committed to abide by the principles of the Charter and by the decisions of the constituted agencies of the United Nations, which we also participate in formulating. This is a legal commitment covering our relations with a world organization.

Viewed negatively, the difference between these two types of commitment is that, whereas we might withdraw from our commitment to the United Nations without necessarily imperiling any of the areas of vital interest to us, we cannot withdraw from commitments we make for the protection of areas of vital interest without sooner or later imperiling our very national security. I do not wish to be interpreted as advocating withdrawal from the United Nations; I am merely illustrating the distinction between two kinds of obligations.

A farmer who owns property in a region plagued by prairie fires has a vital interest in protecting his property; he commits himself to insurance policies, buys fire-fighting equipment, and joins his neighbors in a volunteer fire department for their common protection. The farmer also assumes another commitment of a different sort as a citizen; he obeys the laws of his government, pays taxes, and, to the degree he can or will, participates in governing his country. He can withdraw from this latter commitment by changing his nationality and leaving the country. He cannot withdraw from his commitment to defend his vital property interest against prairie fires without risking the loss of both his property and his life.

This analogy leads us directly to the issue in Korea.

When the North Korean armies breached the peace and invaded South Korea, the members of the United Nations were obligated by their legal commitments to that organization to do certain things. The United States took the lead in proposing ways to fulfill these commitments. On June 25 and June 27, 1950, our delegation proposed resolutions which, the Soviet Union being absent, the Security Council adopted with alacrity. Among other things, the Council recommended that members furnish such assistance as might be necessary to repel the armed attack and restore peace.

Thereafter, and throughout the Korean War, the United States and the other countries which have sent men and matériel to Korea under the United Nations banner have been acting on the principle that they are fulfilling a legal obligation or commitment under the United Nations Charter. Yet, from the beginning, it has been the United States that has taken the lead. Why? Was it simply because we are the strongest and richest member? Was it merely because we had troops in Japan close to the scene? Was it because we believed more firmly in the principles of the Charter than anyone else, or that we believed our commitment under the Charter was greater and more binding than that of other countries, and that, hence, we had to do more to fulfill it? There is no doubt that these considerations played an important role.

But is it not strange that so little mention has been made of another consideration? Is it not likely that reasons of vital American interest may also have been a potent factor in inducing the United States to take the lead and to invest nine times more troops and matériel in fighting the Korean war than all the other countries together? Is it not likely that the United States Government, after a period of protracted indecision, finally decided, when the chips were down, that Korea was an area of vital interest to this country and had to be protected, if humanly possible, against conquest by the advance guard of an expanding military empire aiming at the islands of Japan—another vital American interest?

Were not our legal commitments under the Charter, therefore, paralleled and reinforced by the decision that we did have a vital interest in Korea and by the realization that our membership in the United Nations not only obliged us to fulfill a legal commitment but also permitted us, belatedly, to act in defense of our vital interest?

In so reasoning, Mr. President, I do not wish to be regarded as a mind-reader who knows what went on in the high councils of our Government at that time. Events, nevertheless, have a way of speaking for themselves. Standing in a strategic position between Japanese, Chinese, and Soviet territories, the Korean peninsula has long been an area of vital interest to these three governments. As we know, Japan controlled it in this country until 1945.

In that year Korea also became an area of vital interest to the United States. American troops occupied South Korea up to the thirty-eighth parallel. We assumed a commitment to defend those troops, and, by inference, the territory which they occupied. We also occupied nearby Japan.

Many top American military commanders are said to have believed all along that Korea was indefensible against a determined assault from the mainland. Thus, after 1945, although we had a vital interest and a commitment to defend South Korea, we did not have, or believed we did not have, the power to back it up. Our Korean policy was not in balance.

Then, in 1949 after long negotiations we withdrew our troops from Korea. We made no formal commitment to the new Republic of Korea to go to its defense, but limited ourselves to sending economic and military assistance. In these circumstances, we still had a vital interest in Korea, because of Japan, but we had neither a commitment nor the power to fulfill one.

In June 1950 the Soviet Union sent its North Korean puppets to occupy all Korea. The attempt failed. In November Communist China in its turn set out to take over all Korea. The United Nations, America in the lead, has been trying to prevent both the Soviet Union and China from accomplishing their objectives. I should think that this brief recital of events demonstrates that the United States has a vital interest in Korea but has had an indecisive and wholly unbalanced policy for dealing with it.

Finally, Mr. President, would not the innumerable expressions of dissatisfaction, anger, and scorn that we have heard among our people over the failure of other members to respond with proportionate vigor and sacrifice have been somewhat less vociferous if the people had been told, and had believed, that we went into Korea not only for a principle, not only to fulfill an obligation, not only to counter an act of aggression, but also to defend our country in an area of vital interest to our long-range national security?

In June the course we took was almost universally acclaimed as the only honorable and possible one to follow. In January it has become fashionable to denounce and decry that course because it has not led to success. Yet, I ask my fellow Senators, would it not have been wiser and more responsible to have decided long before June 1950, through debate and agreement in the Congress, that the Korean peninsula was an area of vital interest to the United States, or that it was not, and that we were committed to its protection with sufficient power, or that we were not? Must we not now reach that sort of decision with regard not only to Korea but also to Formosa, China itself, Indochina, Japan, and perhaps other countries in the Far East? If we decide these areas are vital to our national security, and if this decision reflects the opinion of our people, must not we then commit ourselves to the protection of our interests there? Or, if we decide they are not vital, must we not prepare a wholly different series of measures for the defense of our Pacific frontier?

Furthermore, I believe that the American people would understand better why other countries have not poured men and materials into Korea proportionate to what we have sent if they realized that, while Korea may be an area of vital interest for America, it may well not be for many other countries. Let us ask why other countries hold back and do not follow our lead against Communist China. Could it be that for many of them China is not an area of vital national interest at all, and that for others their interest in China is altogether different than ours? Had this series of aggressions occurred somewhere else, might not a quite different alinement of forces have arisen to meet it, under quite other leadership?

All I am saying, Mr. President, is that, United Nations or no United Nations, sovereign states have their own paramount interests, and must, if they are to survive, commit themselves in their own way to protect those interests as best they can. We may not approve the way they choose or believe it has the slighest chance to succeed, but we will not be able to alter their course so long as China is not regarded by them as an area of paramount interest or is regarded as an interest quite different for them than it is for us. The task of our diplomacy, it seems to me, is to persuade the other non-Communist members of the United Nations that we and they have one supreme interest in common to us all. But I doubt that we can define that one supreme common interest until the United States has made up its own mind as to what and where its own vital interests are.

Without making any pretense of professional expertness in these matters, and with the hope and expectation that my colleagues will fill the gaps with their own valuable contributions, I should like now to make a rough sketch of what I believe to be the most important among our country's vital interests and the commitments that have been made, or not made, to cover these interests; and, finally, with even less pretense to expert knowledge, I would raise the question of the power and resources we have and those that we need in order to fulfill these commitments.

AMERICA'S VITAL INTERESTS

We have listened to a number of definitions of the purpose of American foreign policy. Some have been specific, some general, some broad, and some narrow. All, however, seem agreed that its purpose is primarily to defend something. I know of no one who defines its purpose as the conquest of the world or the establishment of an empire or any other aggressive aim, except—as referred to by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH]—the type of offensive to which he referred as "the spiritual offensive." If there exists here in America a school of thought which holds that the purpose of our foreign policy should be conquest, imperialism, expansion, or aggression, it is a secret school of thought without publicly avowed exponents either in Congress or in the public at large.

Some say the purpose of American foreign policy is to defend peace, to prevent war, and, if these fail, to be able to fight and win a war. Others say its purpose is, first, to defend liberty, and, second to defend peace, but not peace at the price of liberty. Others have said that it is to defend our way of life and our institutions from conquest by the armies and agents of totalitarian dictatorship. Others again hold that its purpose is to contain communism or to deter aggression. Still others define it as the defense of democracy, or of free society, or of capitalism, or of Christian civilization, or of western culture, or of some other ideal or set of principles.

This sort of verbal definition, of course, is susceptible of infinite variation, with every man exercising his inalienable right to interpret the words in his own way, and to read into the words peace, liberty, way of life, civilization, and so forth, as much, or as little meaning, or as different meanings as he can or will. I wonder, Mr. President, whether we are not likely to lose ourselves completely in a forest of words and slogans if we continue to seek to define in purely verbal terms the purpose and objectives of American foreign policy.

Perhaps it will make for greater clarity and mutual understanding if we define the purposes of our foreign policy more in physical than in metaphysical terms. By physical terms, I mean chiefly geographic terms.

If we can establish with some degree of certainly the geographic areas which are of vital interest to the United States—that is, the areas which we must defend if the United States is to survive—we may reach a clearer conception of what our foreign policy is and what it must be. I realize that this effort will call for a longer view than our daily tasks usually permit us to take, but few will deny that the short view we have consistently taken these last years has led us to the brink of bottomless disaster.

What the American people need more than anything else in the present confusion is a picture of where they stand in the world. I have been hoping that the President of the United States would draw such a picture; and I believe it would be of incalculable value if he were to undertake a series of intimate radio talks with the people, in which he would draw the lines of this picture for all of us to see. While waiting for him to do so, it may be worth while to attempt to sketch some of the broad outlines of the picture, as they appear to one Senator.

What, and where, are America's vital interests? Remembering that its vital interests are those which are so essential to its own national security that it must protect them, by war if necessary, it goes without saying that the Nation's paramount interest is the defense of its own territorial integrity, its own physical security, and its own political independence.

The primary purpose of American foreign policy, therefore, must be to protect that paramount interest—in other words, to protect the territory which we inhabit and the Government under which we live. All the other countless interests of the

United States would obviously be indefensible if we should fail in the defense of our own territory and independence. Of course, I include within this territory all the continental United States, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the Panama Canal, and our other outlying possessions.

Beyond the borders of American territory, however, there lie areas of almost equal importance for the defense of our country. They are as follows:

First. The first area of vital interest to the United States is the North American Continent as a whole. This has been a fact for almost as long as we have been a nation. The defense of the territory, security, and independence of the North American Continent, and of the countries within it, is indisputably essential to the security and independence of the United States.

Second. The second area of vital interest to us is the Western Hemisphere and the countries within it. This has been recognized ever since the Monroe Doctrine was proclaimed. For the United States to remain secure and independent, the territorial integrity and security of the Western Hemisphere and the political independence of the countries within it are basic requirements, and have been for a century or more.

Third. The third vital interest of the United States is the protection of the sea and air approaches to the Western Hemisphere, particularly North America, across the Arctic, Atlantic, and Pacific Oceans. With every new technological advance in communications and transportation, the extent of this area has widened until it now includes all the islands lying on the sea and air approaches to our hemisphere, embracing even those close to the far shores of the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, especially the British Isles to the east and the Japanese and Philippine Islands to the west, as well as Greenland and the islands to the north of Canada.

Regarding these three immense areas spreading outward from the United States, I doubt that there is any fundamental disagreement among our people. Whatever their attitudes may be toward the peoples or the governments of countries located in these three vast regions, most of the American people would agree, I believe, that the defense of these areas is essential to the protection of the United States itself. But if there is fundamental disagreement among us regarding these areas or any segment of them, we should know about it immediately and should settle the question among ourselves once and for all.

It is when we begin to consider the next two areas of greatest importance to us, however, that deep divisions appear and crack the surface of our Nation's unity. Let me, nevertheless, present them in the same form as that in which I have presented the areas of North America, the Western Hemisphere, and the sea and air approaches across the oceans that surround us.

Fourth. The fourth vital interest of the United States lies in the area comprising the countries of Western Europe and North Africa which border on the far shores of the Atlantic Ocean, an area which, if dominated by a conquering military power bent on our destruction, could become an enormous base for launching attacks on our sea and air approaches and for mounting an invasion of areas even more essential to our national security.

Two terrible wars in this century have demonstrated that the United States considers its national security endangered whenever the Atlantic coasts of Western Europe are conquered by a hostile, aggressive military power dominating that continent. When this happens, we prepare for the worst.

If the Nazi power, which in 1940 extended eastward only to the heart of Poland, made us leap to rearm ourselves the moment the western Allied barrier was breached, to what would we be driven today if the Communist power, stretching eastward across all Europe and Asia to the Sea of Japan, should stand at the Channel ports, on the coasts of Norway, and in Morocco?

By virtue of the fact that in the past 34 years the United States has twice gone to war to prevent the permanent conquest of Western Europe by a German military empire, by virtue of the action of Congress in establishing and appropriating funds for the European recovery program, and by virtue of the action of the Senate in ratifying the North Atlantic Treaty, I believe it is beyond question that a heavy majority of the people and the Congress of the United States have for a long time been convinced that the countries along the Atlantic coast of Europe form an area of vital interest to the security of the United States. This conviction is by no means unanimous, but the actions taken by the Congress and by the Government in the face of a threat to Western Europe bespeak a preponderant opinion among our people that that area is vital to American security. How deeply into Europe and into the Mediterranean that interest extends, and how far down the coast of Africa, has yet to be decided and agreed on. Does it reach to the frontiers of the Russian orbit in central and southeastern Europe? Do Greece, Turkey, and North Africa lie within it? These are things we must decide. Only this afternoon, the able Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] interrogated the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] along the line of that question.

Fifth. The fifth vital interest of the United States lies in the area comprising the countries of eastern Asia which border on the far shores of the Pacific Ocean, from which an assault by a hostile conquering military power controlling those countries could be launched on the sea approaches and territory of North America.

By virtue of a great number of American actions in the far Pacific, including our long occupation of the Philippine Islands; the enunciation of the open-door policy for China; the intervention of President Theodore Roosevelt in the settlement of the Russo-Japanese War; the American mission in Siberia during Russia's post-revolutionary civil war; the long, if futile, efforts from 1931 to 1941 to prevent by peaceful means the Japanese conquest of China; the war against Japan from 1941 to 1945 to prevent the permanent conquest of Eastern Asia by the Japanese military empire; and the subsequent efforts to preserve Chinese independence, and, latterly, Korean independence—by virtue of all these actions it seems clear that the Government of the United States and a large proportion of the American people have been for a long time convinced that the countries of the Far East, including both the seaward islands and the mainland coasts of Siberia, Korea, China, and Indochina, do form an area of vital interest to the security of the United States. In the past, distance and unfamiliarity have combined to render difficult the formation of opinion in this country regarding the nature and extent of our vital interests in the Far East, though I imagine this is less true today than ever before. Yet, do we know how deeply into the Asiatic mainland this interest extends? How far south toward Malaya and Indonesia does this interest reach? Are Australia and New Zealand included within it? These are also things we must decide.

It is obvious that there is much less agreement about these last two great areas of vital interest—Western Europe and Eastern Asia—than about the first three I have cited. Therein lies the confusion, the bewilderment, the uncertainty which our people are daily voicing. Some are certain that both areas on the far shores of the oceans surrounding us are vital interests of the United States. Some are certain that neither is.

Others believe that the Atlantic coast of Europe is an essential area for our defense, while the Pacific coast of Asia is not. Still others believe the opposite is true. In addition, there are innumerable gradations of opinion giving various weights to the relative significance of these regions, and other shades of opinion that consider these areas as too narrowly or too broadly defined. At the root of such oversimplified and single-minded proposals as those advanced by the Europe-firsters, or the Asia-firsters, or the America-firsters, lie these fundamental differences over what are and what are not America's vital interests.

I do not see how we dare assume that there is basic unity behind our Nation's foreign policy, when there is no underlying agreement even on what our vital interests are, and where they are to be found. I see no point in pretending that these divisions of opinion do not exist. Every delivery of mail which comes to our desks shows that they exist. I do see great advantages in exposing these differences for all to see, so that we may debate them openly, honestly, and completely. To those who cry, "Beware, the Kremlin is listening," I would reply that these disagreements are a secret from no one, and as long as they persist, their effect will be to embitter American opinion itself and to poison relations with our strongest allies.

Beyond these vital interests to the security of the United States, and the geographical areas in which they lie, I shall not go in my enumeration, because they are of such extraordinary importance as to outclass any other interest, however real, to which we may point. There is no question that the United

States has real, perhaps vital interests elsewhere in the world; they also merit our full attention.

We have troops in Germany, Austria, and Trieste. A Mediterranean country, Italy, is joined with us in the Atlantic Pact. We are furnishing military or economic assistance to Yugoslavia, Greece, Turkey, Iran, and, in the general area of China, to Indochina, Thailand, Indonesia, and Formosa. We have air bases in Lybia, Saudi Arabia, and elsewhere. Most of the oil for Western Europe comes from the fields of the Middle East. Under the concept of containment, which is frequently translated as meaning that the United States should oppose the expansion of Russian power anywhere beyond its 1945 perimeter, the vast regions to the south of the Soviet border would seem to form an area of very great importance.

Yet the interest of the United States in all these places, real and growing as it may be, is not generally considered as of the same order of importance as those in the five areas which I have described.

I hope I have made clear, Mr. President, that we have much to discuss before we have delineated the extent and the character and the order of importance of the areas that are, or may become, of vital interest to America's own defense.

AMERICA'S COMMITMENTS

When we come to the commitments which the United States has undertaken to protect and advance its vital interests, we find that, with several significant exceptions, the areas covered by our commitments coincide almost exactly with the great region within which America has her most vital interests. This is a reassuring discovery, since it suggests that, so far as interests and commitments go, ours are more or less in balance. The exceptions require a separate, most serious study.

I will say at once, Mr. President, that by a "commitment" I mean a solemn pledge, usually embodied in a treaty or agreement with one or more other governments, that the United States Government will go to war, if necessary, to protect the interest covered by the commitment. Again I am stressing the geographic character of commitments and the areas they are designed to cover.

I should remark at this point that I do not regard the so-called Truman Doctrine as a commitment, in the proper sense of the term, that has been undertaken by the Government of the United States. I realize that the word "commitment" is rather loosely employed, but I am defining it, for purposes of this discussion, as a solemn, binding pledge by our Government to engage in war, if need be, for the defense of a specified area of the world which we deem essential for the protection of our own national security. The Truman Doctrine is not a formal commitment of the character of the Rio Pact or the Atlantic Pact or the agreements such as have been made with the Philippine Government. It is not a pledge to defend a specified area of vital interest to American security. There are no treaties or executive agreements, so far as I know, which define this doctrine. It is not a legal commitment such as we have made under the United Nations Charter. To my knowledge, no congressional enactment has placed it on our statute books. The Truman doctrine is a declaration of principle or a pronouncement of intentions by the President of the United States, and is consequently and properly regarded as a proclamation of incontestable importance and vast implications. But it is not a commitment in the sense I have been employing this term.

Mr. President, in starting this survey I see no need for discussing our obligation to defend the territory and independence of the United States and its outlying possessions. We will fight for them no matter what it costs or how long it takes.

First. North America: We are committed to the defense of North America, and the obligation is formally recognized in a number of treaties and agreements with our neighbors. Our commitment to join Canada in her defense is partly set forth in the Ogdensburg agreement reached in August 1940 by the President of the United States and the Prime Minister of Canada, which provided for establishment of a Permanent Joint Board of Defense "to consider in the broad sense the defenses of the north half of the hemisphere." On February 12, 1947, the postwar extension of this agreement and of the Defense Board was recognized in a joint statement by the two Governments. In view of our traditional friendship as well as of the realities of our position as mutually dependent on one another for the protection of the national security of both countries, no treaty, executive agreement, or contractual obligation was entered into. The agreement is none the less real.

Moreover, Canada and the United States are formally allied as signatories of the North Atlantic Treaty.

With regard to our other nearest neighbor there has been in existence since January 1942 a Joint Mexican-United States Defense Commission through which the Governments of this country and Mexico have been working together on common defense problems. As a signatory of the Rio Pact, of course, Mexico is formally allied with the United States and the other Latin-American countries.

It is inconceivable that we would not defend our closest neighbors as if they were ourselves.

Second. The Western Hemisphere: We are committed to the defense of the entire Western Hemisphere by the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance—the Rio Pact—which was ratified by the Senate in 1947. The essential article of this treaty, article 5, declares that "an armed attack by any state against any American state shall be considered as an attack against all the American states."

The security zone defined under article 4 includes all the countries of the Western Hemisphere, and embraces Alaska, the Aleutian Islands, Canada, and the Arctic islands lying to her north, Greenland, the Caribbean islands, and a segment of Antarctica.

Mr. President, exhibit A, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the end of my remarks, contains articles 3 and 4 of the Rio Pact.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONRONEY in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, while the treaty does not make the use of armed force obligatory by any party to it, it is a recognition of a fact that has been true, insofar as the United States is concerned, since the proclamation of the Monroe Doctrine and that is now formally affirmed by treaty—the United States will go to war, if necessary, to protect the territorial integrity and political independence of the Western Hemisphere.

Third. The North Atlantic: When the Senate ratified the North Atlantic Treaty in 1949, the United States became formally committed to the defense of the Atlantic Ocean north of the Tropic of Cancer, the sea approaches across the Atlantic, and all the countries lying on the European shores of the Atlantic except Spain and Germany, as well as of the western Mediterranean and the North Sea.

By article 5 of this treaty, "the parties agree that an armed attack against one or more of them in Europe or North America shall be considered an attack against them all." The same article also provides that if such armed attack occurs, each party will assist the party or parties attacked by taking forthwith "such action as it deems necessary, including the use of armed force."

The security zone defined by the Atlantic Pact in article 6 includes the territory of any of the parties in Europe, or North America, the Algerian departments of France, the occupation forces of any party in Europe, the islands under the jurisdiction of any party in the North Atlantic north of the Tropic of Cancer, and also, the vessels or aircraft in this area of any of the signatory powers.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that exhibit B be printed in the RECORD at the close of my remarks. It contains articles 5 and 6 of the Atlantic Pact.

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

(See exhibit B.)

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, Senate Executive Report No. 8, Eighty-first Congress, first session, the report of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee accompanying the North Atlantic Treaty, makes clear that our commitment under article 5 does not apply to any of the overseas territories outside the North Atlantic area. "The only outlying territories covered," it states, "are the islands of the North Atlantic area, Alaska, the Aleutian Islands, and the islands of the Canadian Arctic." Thus, our Atlantic commitment does not extend into Asia or Africa, except for the Algerian departments that are constitutionally part of metropolitan France.

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

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Would it not be easier for the Senator to tell us what spots we are not going to defend than to tell us the spots we are going to defend? Have we not already taken in most of the earth?

Mr. GILLETTE. I am glad to say, in reply to the Senator's question, that on the next page of my address I shall cover the territory which is not covered by the commitments to which I have been referring.

Our commitment cannot be extended, even on the continent of Europe, without our permission. The treaty requires unanimous agreement to invite other states to join, and the report states that the committee was fully satisfied by the pledge of the President, delivered by the Secretary of State, "that he would consider the admission of a new member of the pact as the conclusion of a new treaty with that member, and would seek the advice and consent of the Senate to each such admission."

The following paragraph in the committee report seems of particular significance in the present connection, and I ask the indulgence of the Senate to read it:

> We have learned that the security of the North Atlantic area is vital to our own peace and security. In accepting the obligations of the treaty, therefore, we merely make clear that we are following a course of action which we would follow without the treaty. If we were to accept the same commitments on a world-wide basis or in areas less vital to our national security, we might well run the danger of spreading ourselves too thin.

In the light of what I have been saying about balancing commitments and vital interests, Mr. President, I think this paragraph from the committee report also merits repetition at this moment:

> Suggestions have been made that the United States enter into similar pacts with countries in the Middle East and Pacific areas. During the hearings members of the committee questioned administration witnesses specifically on this point. It was established that the United States Government is not currently considering participation in any regional or collective defense arrangements.

To the best of my knowledge, this last statement still holds true. Therefore, the only two commitments of a collective, regional character that we have made, covering two areas of vital interest to the United States, are the Rio Pact and the Atlantic Pact—both of which, I need scarcely remark, have been duly ratified by the United States Senate.

Fourth. Occupation areas: We now come to another type of commitment, which, although not defined by treaty or agreement between governments, is nonetheless real. The existence of these obligations is known to everyone. They have been repeatedly considered and approved by the action of Congress. They are part of the heritage of World War II.

As aftermath of that war, the United States has found itself obliged to maintain occupation forces in Berlin and Western Germany, in Vienna and part of Austria, and on the islands of Japan. The presence of these occupation forces raises question as to the nature and extent of the American commitment in these countries, while at the same time confirming the existence of our obligation.

Our legal position in Western Germany is currently defined by a statute of occupation, yet with the establishment of a federal republic in that part of Germany and its rapid resumption of full sovereignty, the terms of the statute will certainly be modified soon if not abolished altogether. Then the role of United States troops in Germany will have to be settled by some new agreement, contract, or treaty. Meanwhile, since the North Atlantic Treaty provides that an attack on occupation troops of the signatory powers shall be considered in the same light as an attack on their territories, some measure of protection is already afforded West Germany under our Atlantic commitment. As in Austria, where, for lack of a treaty, the nature and extent of our commitments are in the realm of the undetermined, but where we have American forces stationed, so in Germany it would seem almost certain that an armed aggression against our occupation troops would be a cause of war—if indeed it were not the signal for an all-out invasion of the rest of Western Europe.

Similarly in Japan, where our legal position as chief occupying power is defined by international agreement, we must await negotiation of a treaty or contract with the Japanese Government before the American commitment in Japan is fully and clearly determined. For the present, it is virtually certain that an armed aggression against United States troops in Japan would be regarded by us as cause for war.

The Prime Minister of Japan, Shigeru Yoshida, writes in the current issue of Foreign Affairs that:

American statesmen and military leaders have declared again and again the determination of the United States to hold on to its defense perimenter in the Pacific, a chain of islands running from the Aleutians to the Philippines, of which Japanese Islands form the central and vital link.

Mr. Yoshida also quotes Secretary Acheson's remarks of a year ago at the National Press Club in Washington, when the Secretary said:

> The defeat and disarmament of Japan have placed upon the United States the necessity of assuming the military defense of Japan so long as that is required, both in the interest of the security of the entire Pacific area and in the interest of Japan's security. I can assure you that there is no intention of any sort of abandoning or weakening the defense of Japan.

I believe, Mr. President, that it can safely be assumed, by us and by all others concerned, that, although we have not yet made formal treaties with Germany, Austria, and Japan, the United States is at present committed to fight for the protection of Western Germany, of that part of Austria not under Soviet occupation, and of the whole of Japan. While the legal right of American troops to be stationed in these occupied areas may not ever have been passed on as such by the Congress, we have repeatedly authorized and appropriated the necessary funds for maintaining the occupation forces. I am not aware that any question has ever been raised as to the moral obligation of the United States (and of the other occupying powers) to defend the defenseless peoples whose countries we are now occupying as a consequence of our military victory over the Axis powers.

It is a serious question, however, whether we have the power at present to fulfill these obligations, and this raises the further question as to whether we should augment our forces in those areas as rapidly as we can, so as to meet the unwritten but nevertheless real commitment we have assumed by our occupation of them since 1945. It will be for Congress to decide, moreover, if—when the occupations officially terminate—we are prepared to consider Western Germany, Austria, and Japan as falling within areas of vital interest to our country's defense.

Fifth. The Philippines: We turn to still another type of commitment. This one is based on the mutuality of interest which the United States and the Philippines continue to share even though the latter country has attained its full independence. On June 29, 1944, the Congress adopted a joint resolution authorizing the President to acquire bases in the Philippines for the mutual protection of the United States and that country. This agreement was signed at Manila on March 17, 1947. Its terms provide that the Governments of the two countries take the necessary measures to promote their mutual security and to defend their territories and areas. We are therefore committed formally to the defense of our bases in the Philippine Islands, and it is impossible to ignore the implication that the agreement also commits us to defend the whole of the Philippine Islands. As a result of an executive agreement authorized in advance by congressional action, the vital interest we have had since the opening of the century is now matched with a commitment to defend it.

Sixth. The Pacific islands: Along the sea and air approaches to the United States across the Pacific Ocean we have commitments to defend a large number of islands. Some, like the Marshalls, the Marianas, and the Carolines, we administer under United Nations trusteeship. Others are smaller Japanese islands taken by right of conquest and held pending negotiation of a peace treaty with Japan. As occupying power and as possessor of important bases, we are committed to defend Okinawa and the other Ryukyu Islands, Iwo Jima, and the Bonin Islands.

This completes my list of commitments undertaken by our Government for the protection of areas of vital interest to American security. Other than the defense of its own island possessions, such as Hawaii, Midway, or Guam, the United States has no commitments to defend areas of the world outside the Western Hemisphere, the North Atlantic, Western Europe, including occupation zones and adjacent waters—but not including Sweden, Finland, Switzerland, Spain, Yugoslavia, or Greece—the

islands of Japan, the Philippines, and certain South Pacific islands. All of these commitments, which imply where they do not specifically state it, constitute pledges by the United States to go to war, if necessary, for the defense of the area covered by the commitment, whether made by treaty, by executive agreement, or by virtue of the presence of American military forces.

Thus, unless my information is faulty—and I welcome corrections where I am wrong—it is not true, as has been rather recklessly charged from time to time, that the administration has made commitments of this life-and-death character without congressional approval or knowledge, except in the sense that negotiations with foreign governments sometimes have created a moral obligation on Congress to ratify or legislate in order to back up diplomatic arrangements on which we are not consulted in advance.

Mr. President, in making that statement, I do not want to be understood by implication to mean that I have approved of all such commitments. In my short address today I am trying—and perhaps I am taking too long—to outline the situation so that our people may know what commitments have been made when they ask, "Why here?" or "Why there?" They should know the answer when they ask, "What responsibility do we have? Why are we going to send our troops here, or there? Under what authority are we doing it? Under whose authority is the action being taken? Who has exceeded his authority?" I have tried to present a survey of the whole field of commitments which have actually been made. In every instance which I have mentioned the commitment was made with the consent of Congress. Although I have criticized the leadership, and still expect to criticize it, it is not fair to say that authority was assumed or usurped in any instance I have mentioned.

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

Mr. GILLETTE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LANGER. It is true, is it not, that every Republican who is now criticizing the President on the question of sending troops voted a great number of times for the other commitments?

Mr. GILLETTE. The Senator from North Dakota is correct, as he almost always is.

There is one commitment made in this past year by the President which did not take the form of a treaty or an agreement and which was not assumed as a legal commitment under the United Nations Charter. This was the President's order to the Seventh Fleet to neutralize the island of Formosa. In effect, this amounted to a commitment to protect Formosa from invasion by the Chinese Communists. Yet it has never been established by any congressional decision that Formosa is to be regarded as an area of vital interest to the United States. On January 21 of this year, however, Ambassador Gross, our deputy delegate to the United Nations, indicated that there has been such a decision reached on the highest level of our Government.

I shall now read what Ambassador Gross stated.

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

Mr. GILLETTE. Of course, I am glad to yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. Was Congress aware and did Congress give its consent to the Russian order with respect to the city of Berlin which caused the United States and its allies, especially the United States, to undertake the airlift in order to supply Berlin?

Mr. GILLETTE. I presume the Senator is referring to the agreements reached at Tehran and Yalta.

Mr. THYE. That is correct. Was Congress aware of the fact that such a situation was to be established, which was to cause our Nation the expense, both in dollars and in physical equipment, and the loss of our men, in order to supply the United States sector of Berlin with food when the Russians imposed their embargo?

Mr. GILLETTE. To the best of my recollection, there was no such information given to the Congress of the United States. I was a Member of the Senate at the time. However, I ask the Senator from Minnesota to keep in mind that when the agreements were negotiated in Tehran and Yalta we were engaged in the Second World War. It was during the war that we entered into the agreements. Again I may say, having some inside information at the time of the character of the agreements, I was not one who approved. The fact remains that they were in the nature of military agreements which were made to meet an exigency of war which was very real at the time. I do not know whether, had I been representing the United States at one of the conferences, I would have agreed to what was agreed to by the then President of the United States, and in the conclusions which were reached. I have sometimes questioned whether I would or would not. However, if my recollection serves me correctly—and I hope it does—at that time there was serious doubt with respect to overtures which we were told had been made by the Central Powers to Russia to make a separate peace, to take Russia out of the war so that the Central Powers would not be compelled to fight on two fronts, but could concentrate their forces to meet our attack across the Channel on the Normandy coast.

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

Mr. GILLETTE. Let me finish this point.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further on that point?

Mr. GILLETTE. Let me finish, please.

The fact that it was militarily impossible, in the opinion of our best military minds, for us to meet the German might on one front. It was necessary that Russia should stay in the war so that the Central Powers could be divided and compelled to meet an attack from two fronts. That necessity was so vital and so real that, much as I deplore some of the agreements which were made at the places mentioned by the Senator and mentioned by me, if I had been there, knowing what the result might have been if we had refused to accede to demands of that kind, I am not sure what I would have done. I have asked myself over and over again, if the question had been placed before me for decision, what my answer would have been. Perhaps if I had been there I would not be so critical as I have been of those who entered into such agreements.

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

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield.

Mr. THYE. There has always been a question in my mind as to what the United States leaders were thinking of when they made such grave concessions to a country such as Soviet Russia. Whether they were military men who sat in the conferences, or whether they were diplomatic representatives of our Government, with the then President, what were men thinking of when they made such grave concessions, when the cordon about Berlin was acceded to? The same thing was true of Vienna, and all of eastern Austria. The productivity of Austria was yielded to Russian control. Those two examples on the European continent would lead us to question the wisdom of those decisions.

The next question, of course, is with respect to Manchuria. An agreement was entered into that Russia should have control over that vast area of China. Then there was the decision as to the thirty-eighth parallel in Korea. Some very serious commitments were made, of which Congress was not aware. That leads us today to be more critical and more demanding in our desire to know what the commitments are. The Senator and I are today attempting to avoid mistakes such as those which have proved to be so terrifically costly to this Nation. They have caused us a great deal of expense in the South Pacific, and have resulted in the loss of many of our youths in the very flower of life.

All this was the result of mistakes in years past. For that reason some of us are asking today that no more secret commitments be made. We say to our leaders, "Let us know what you are thinking. Let us know what plans and agreements you are entering into before you commit this Nation." I can only say to the very able Senator from Iowa that although those commitments may have seemed wise under the pressure of war, yet they were far-reaching and very heavily weighted.

Men should not make such commitments unbeknown to those who are elected by the people of the Republic. The Members of the House are elected every 2 years, and one-third of the membership of this body is elected every 2 years. We are the ones who must answer to the people in our respective districts or States as to what is being committed and what is being done by the Government. Unless we are informed, and unless we can know today, tomorrow, and in years to come, to what this Government commits itself and what agreements it enters into, we are not going to be able to defend our action, nor can we in any sense exercise the

responsibilities with which those who elected us entrusted us.

Personally I hope that there will be sufficient respect for the legislative branch on the part of the Executive and the State Department to be frank and honest and give us information as to what they are confronted with, and what the plans and commitments of the United States are to be.

I thank the Senator for yielding so much time to me.

Mr. GILLETTE. It was a pleasure to yield to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota. Let me say that I am in accord with his statesmanlike remarks. In addition to some of the commitments to which he referred, other commitments were made at that time which seemed necessary to meet the exingencies of the situation. I have mentioned them over the years. I question now, and will question so long as I am a Member of the United States Senate, the commitment of this Nation under usurped authority, authority which no agency of the Government possesses, without going through the constitutional processes under which recognition is given to the responsibility of the legislative branch.

The question which the Senator just asked was in accord with his responsibility as a Senator from the State of Minnesota. He is discharging his duty. He does not need to apologize for it.

What I have tried to do in the outline which I have given here today is to answer the questions which the people are asking the Senator from Minnesota and me and every other Senator—such questions as, "Why are we doing this?" or "Under what authority is that being done?" I have tried, by a survey, to show the commitments which have been made. I have quoted from them, and have read them, telling when they were were made, and when the Congress, by action, gave its approval. I am not by implication or suggestion—heaven forbid—giving my endorsement to commitments which have not been reached through constitutional processes. I assure the able Senator that I very much appreciate his contribution.

Mr. THYE. I thank the Senator for yielding so much time.

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

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I was not in the Senate during the years referred to by the Senator from Iowa. I assume, of course, that the agreements reached at Yalta and Tehran were neither reported to nor approved by the United States Senate. But is it not a fact that agreements which were made under other circumstances and in different areas also were not reported to or agreed to or approved by the United States Senate?

I have in mind, for example, the great conference which was held at Casablanca. As a result of that conference, which was not reported to or approved by the Senate, we were able, in conjunction with our allies, to drive the German forces out of Africa and to make safe the entire Middle East. We were enabled to develop an easy and rapid route to India, and to provide for the invasion of Sicily, and finally of Italy.

Is it not also true that the historic agreement which was entered into in 1943 or 1944 to open up a second front in the war by an invasion of Normandy on the north and of Italy on the south, was not reported to or approved by the Senate? Yet I cannot believe that anyone would question the wisdom or necessity of those great and historic movements. Had those agreements not been made by those who were fighting shoulder to shoulder with us, on our side, the entire history of the world, in my opinion, might readily have been changed.

Mr. GILLETTE. I thank the Senator from New York.

I may add to what I have already said that at the time I was critical when information came to me of the purported agreements which had been made. I questioned very much whether they should have been made. But I repeat what I said a moment ago, that I have asked myself hundreds of times whether, had I been in the same position of those then in authority, had I been President of the United States or authorized to speak for the United States, I would not have entered into the same agreements.

If, for instance, word came to me—and it did come to me indirectly at that time—that Germany had made overtures to the Soviet Union for a separate peace, what would I have done had I been in authority? Let us assume that Germany had said, in effect, to Russia, "What are you fighting for? What do you want? You have been bled white? You have killed millions of our boys and we have killed millions of your boys. What do you want? Do you want the Dardanelles? All right, you may have them. Do you want a warm seaport in the Adriatic? All right, you may have it. Do you want the Baltic States, Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia? All right, you may have them. What do you want? Do you want these things? Then why do you continue to be a cat's-paw for Great Britain and the United States, if you can obtain the things you want? We will give you everything you want if you will make peace with us now."

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield.

Mr. THYE. It would be difficult for any nation to feel it was a cat's-paw after an invading army had driven into it and had destroyed many of its cities, as the Hitler arm had destroyed many of the cities of Russia, had devastated the countryside, had bled white great districts of the country by killing or taking captive many of its children, women, and men—all who were not in the military forces. It would be quite difficult for Russia, facing an enemy such as Hitler's army, which had so invaded it and had so destroyed many of its cities, to think of giving up and not seeking revenge.

I believe that Russia was seeking revenge, and that our Nation, the United States of America, did not have to plead with or beg very strongly that Russia continue in the war. It was not necessary for the United States to give an assurance to Russia that she could have Poland, that she could have Eastern Germany, that she could have the city of Berlin, with the land immediately surrounding it, and with no corridor for us to enter Berlin. It was not necessary to give to Russia eastern Austria, with all its industrial potentialities, leaving only the mountainous summer resort area of Austria under the control of the countries that were allies of the United States.

So I say that we must have to draw on our imagination to quite an extent to reach the conclusion that we had to make overtures to Russia in order to keep Russia with us in the war, after Hitler's army had invaded Russia, destroyed so many of its cities, mutilated its manpower, annihilated the resources of the section of Russia the Hitler army entered, and committed unspeakable acts of cruelty against the women, the children, and the aged of Russia. We will have to draw quite strongly on our imagination to be able to say that we had to make overtures to Russia to induce her to remain in the war.

Mr. GILLETTE. In view of what the able Senator from Minnesota has just said, I withdraw the complete endorsement I gave to his remarks made a little while ago. I cannot follow him into the realm of conjecture. I cannot follow him into the realm of what might have been. The fact of the matter is that we were faced with a military situation, as I recall conditions at that time, preparing for an attack across the Channel, an invasion of the Normandy coast, which at best was a terrible and a dangerous venture. It was an impossible venture if the Central Powers could bring their whole force to bear. We could not at that time enter into the conjectural field and say, "Well, maybe Russia will not make peace with Germany. Maybe she will recall the German attack on Stalingrad. Maybe she will recall the devastation of the Ukraine. Maybe she will not make peace. But maybe she will."

Mr. McMAHON and Mr. THYE addressed the Chair.

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

Mr. GILLETTE. I will yield as soon as I complete my statement. If she had made peace with Germany would we not have been in a dangerous position? We would have been in an impossible position militarily. Again I say that perhaps no man has been more critical than I have of the concessions which have been made to Russia; but I recognize the realities, and I repeat, I have asked myself over and over again: What would I have done had I been in the position of authority and a military decision had to be made? Yes, a military decision in connection with implementing a policy that was laid down by allied nations.

Will the able Senator from Minnesota excuse me while I yield to the able Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON]?

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I had just one thought in that connection. I may

say, if the Senator will be kind enough to yield one more moment, that if my memory serves me a right, Russia was insisting and criticizing the United States and countries allied with us because we did not establish a second front in order to give Russia a little relief from the full impact of Hitler's army.

Mr. GILLETTE. That is correct.

Mr. THYE. So, I think Russia was pleading with and begging us, and we were not at that particular time the one that was begging and pleading with Russia to remain in the struggle. Russia was the country that was begging of us to establish a second front. Yet we made the concession with regard to the city of Berlin, with no corridor for us to get into it, and the concession with respect to Vienna, and the concession dividing Germany and dividing Austria. For that reason I feel that in the event Congress had had an opportunity to look at the chapters which were being written then, we might have been a little bit more realistic and not been quite so generous in the concessions which were made at that particular time.

Mr. GILLETTE. I think that is undoubtedly true, but it was information which could not have been given out at that time when we were at war with the Central Powers, and confronting the greatest military force that had ever been assembled. The measures were those which were taken to meet the problems which arose as to whether we would establish two fronts or whether we must concentrate on one. The fear that we could not cope with the enemy on more than one front was information which could not have been made available at that time. The enemy had enough information as it was respecting our military potential, so we could not make that information available to them.

Mr. McMAHON and Mr. FERGUSON addressed the Chair.

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

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield first to the Senator from Connecticut, after which I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. McMAHON. I wish to compliment the Senator from Iowa on his intellectual integrity. The Senator from Iowa is trying to place himself in the position of the men who were at the conference and who were connected with the events which took place at the time, rather than trying to be a grandstand quarterback. I suppose the greatest example of the reiteration of errors being accepted as true is the constant outpouring we have heard in this Chamber about the conferences held at Yalta, Tehran and Potsdam. I desire to say now that Winston S. Churchill was the signatory for Great Britain to every one of the documents. I do not believe there are many who will rise to challenge the statement that he has been one of the great leaders of history. He is a man known for his perspicacity in matters pertaining to military strategy.

The Senator is correct in saying that these were military agreements made in the face of information the men in authority had at the time. At Yalta they were told that we would lose a million more men upon the shores of Japan if an invasion were made of that country. Perhaps that invasion would not have taken place, and it did not take place, but that is one of the factors which Mr. Churchill, as well as Mr. Roosevelt, had to weigh.

I should like to point out to the Senator from Minnesota that so far as the Potsdam Agreement is concerned, Mr. Churchill was at Potsdam for two-thirds of that conference; and he, too, approved the agreement. I, for one, am looking forward with a great deal of anticipation to Mr. Churchill's forthcoming book, in which he will discuss his participation in those conferences, because I think it will do much to correct some of the misapprehensions about them.

Mr. President, the present difficulties in the world have been caused, not by the agreements which were made at those conferences, but by the breaking of those agreements. At those conferences, free elections in Poland were promised. However, we know that free elections in Poland did not occur. When that promise was broken, we had the choice of doing one of two things: Either do what we did, and swallow the fact of the breaking of the promise; or else make war to enforce the promise. At that time I did not hear from any Member of this body, any Member either on the other side of the aisle or on this side of the aisle, a suggestion that we go to war.

At the time when the Yalta conference was held, there was no assurance that the atomic bomb would be used, and would be used effectively. There was no assurance that we would not soon find our forces fighting the enemy on the mainland of Japan. I, for one, think it was necessary at that time to do all that possibly could be done to insure that Russia would agree to join us in the war in the Far East; for if at that time things had not turned out as they subsequently did, and if it had not been found, subsequently, that we did not need to have the Russians come into the struggle in the Far East, we would have had to make—alone—that invasion, an invasion in which hundreds of thousands of American boys would have died on the shores of Japan.

So, Mr. President, it is easy enough to answer after the event has occurred. However, that does not alter the situation and the problems confronting our leaders at the time when those conferences were held.

So I am delighted that the Senator from Iowa has raised this question. It is something upon which the American people need education. I wish to say that when all the ills of which we are now the victim are paraded as being the result of the conferences at Yalta, Tehran, and Potsdam, I, for one, will rise to challenge that thesis, because I think such a conclusion is demonstrably in error and can be refuted.

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

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does not the Senator from Iowa distinguish between agreements of the kind referred to by the Senator from New York, in connection with the landing of troops at Normandy, and the agreements which were made in regard to the way we would fight the war in North Africa—agreements purely and simply as to military, strategic acts—as compared with the agreement made at Yalta, in which a division of the world was agreed upon? Does not the Senator distinguish between those two kinds of agreements, one of which was of immediate military importance and the other of long-range political significance?

Mr. GILLETTE. Certainly, Mr. President, I see a difference. However, all the agreements which have been referred to in the debate were made in the light of a military need and the necessity for military implementation. There were differences. One could be a strategic decision; one could be made on the field of battle; or one could involve other areas of land or an over-all picture of the area or of the cementing factors in connection with which the Allied Powers had formed a coalition. Of course there are differences. However, there is the one common denominator, namely, that all those agreements were made in time of war, and to carry out a military mission.

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

Mr. GILLETTE. Of course.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it not true that the Potsdam agreement was made after the end of the war in Europe?

Mr. GILLETTE. Oh yes. The colloquy I had with the Senator from Minnesota was with reference to Tehran and Yalta.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Tehran agreement was made in December 1943; the Yalta agreement was made in February 1945; and the Potsdam agreement was made in August 1945.

Mr. GILLETTE. Yes. In our colloquy, no reference was made to the Potsdam agreement. It was mentioned by the able Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] has now said those agreements have been breached by the Soviet Union. Does not the Senator agree that because of the breach of those agreements, they are no longer binding upon the United States of America, even if they ever had any binding effect? Is not that a fact?

Mr. GILLETTE. If the Senator from Connecticut said that, at least I did not draw that conclusion from what he said.

Mr. FERGUSON. Did he not say those agreements had been breached by the other side?

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, if the Senator from Iowa will yield, let me say that I did say that; but I drew no conclusion that the breaching of them by the Soviet Union released us from the obligations we had assumed. I do not pass on that point at all. I am interested about the conclusion the Senator from Michigan wishes to draw from the fact that they have been breached, and I am interested in knowing what he

thinks the breaching of them gives us a right to do.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I wish to draw this conclusion, and I now state it on the floor of the Senate——

Mr. McMAHON. The Senator is nowhere else.

Mr. FERGUSON. I wish to draw the conclusion that the United States of America should repudiate those agreements, first, on the ground that there was no authority, under the Constitution of the United States, to make them; and, second, that even if they were made with authority—and they were not—they have been repudiated by the other party, and, therefore, have no more binding effect upon the United States of America, and the time has arrived when they should be repudiated.

Mr. McMAHON. Very well; so now they are repudiated. So what? What does the Senator want us to do now?

Mr. McFARLAND, Mr. FERGUSON, and Mr. LEHMAN addressed the Chair.

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

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield first to the distinguished Senator from Arizona, the majority leader; and then I shall yield to the Senator from New York—assuming that the Senator from Michigan has concluded.

Mr. FERGUSON. I have other questions to ask, but I am willing to wait.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, let me ask the distinguished Senator from Iowa whether I correctly summarize the statement he has made: We followed a certain course during the war, and we won the war. Now no one, even if he is critical of that course, can truthfully say that he knows we would have won the war if we had followed a different course.

Mr. GILLETTE. I thank the Senator from Arizona for that contribution.

Now I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Michigan has tried to differentiate between the kind of agreement made at Casablanca, and in connection with the invasion of Normandy, and the Tehran and Yalta agreements.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, if the Senator from Iowa will yield, let me say I did not try to differentiate or distinguish between them; I did distinguish between them.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Michigan, if I may, that there is no distinction, for the agreements reached at Yalta and the agreements reached at Tehran were just as definitely military in character as were the other agreements to which reference has been made.

I am quite certain that the distinguished Senator from Michigan will realize that the agreement which was made at Tehran was the one under which the Soviet Government promised its aid in liberating China and in saving the United States the rigors and agony of acting alone in the invasion of Japan.

This afternoon I have heard statements made which are so typical, in my opinion, of many pieces of wisdom which come after the act, instead of before it. The impression has been given here that at the end of 1944 the war was over, and that we did not have to make any concessions to the Soviet Government or use such influence and power as we had to get Russia to join us in the war in the Far East.

Mr. President, I happened to be in France in December 1944. Prior to that time, everything from a military standpoint had been going along splendidly. However, as the Members of the Senate will recall, on or about December 1, 1944, and for a month thereafter, the Battle of the Bulge occurred. Having been fairly near the scene of that battle, I can say to the Senate—of course, I realize that some of our colleagues may have forgotten about this, because it occurred 6 years ago—that the people of France, who had been liberated only several months before then, and the people of Great Britain, and, I am very confident, the people of the United States, were very much frightened at the developments which had occurred because of the progress made by the Nazis in the Battle of the Bulge.

It is all very fine to say now that we should have done this or should have done that; but I admire the Senator from Iowa very greatly for having had the courage to say here what many of us have felt, and what some of us have publicly expressed, that it is much easier to criticize after the fact, and to be wise after the fact, than before.

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

Mr. LEHMAN. The Senator from Iowa has the floor.

Mr. THYE. It will take me only a moment.

Mr. GILLETTE. I hope Senators will be a little more considerate. I have been on my feet for almost 2 hours, and I am an old man.

Mr. THYE. The Senator looks very young, I may say.

Mr. GILLETTE. I should like to conclude. In view of the fact that the Senator from Michigan engaged in colloquy with the Senator from New York, I should yield to him briefly, and then to the Senator from Nevada; and then, if my good neighbor, the Senator from Minnesota, insists, I shall yield very briefly to him.

Mr. THYE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, in order that the RECORD may be correct, I merely want to call attention to the fact that the landing in Normandy occurred on June 6, 1944.

Mr. LEHMAN. I believe that is the date I gave in my brief remarks.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it not true that the Senator from Iowa has sought in his remarks today to leave the impression that the United States of America was threatened with a representation that, unless we made the agreements at Tehran and Yalta, which have been described here, our ally, the Soviet Union, was going to desert the ship and go back to the Germans, where it had been previously? We, of course, know that the Russians originally had a treaty of friendship with the Germans, which they repudiated. The effect of their deserting the Germans ultimately brought them side by side with America, Great Britain, and the other allies, but is not the Senator trying to indicate that they were about to go back to the Germans unless we made these agreements? If that is true, then were the agreements not made under such threats, such blackmail, that they should no longer be considered binding upon the United States?

Mr. GILLETTE. I should not want to draw any such conclusion. I may say in reply to the distinguished Senator that I not only wanted to leave the impression to which he just referred, but those of us who were accorded information at the time were told definitely that that was a factor, and that it was a fact that that possibility was considered—not a probability, not a possibility, but a fact—and in connection with a military decision, every factor must be taken into consideration. Whether they would have done it or not, I do not know.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator has indicated that he was "in the know."

Mr. GILLETTE. Oh, no.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan certainly was not.

Mr. GILLETTE. I beg the Senator's pardon. The Senator from Iowa has been here a number of years, and it is surprising how infrequently he has been let in "on the know." In fact, the Senator from Iowa has often felt that the door was definitely closed against him.

Mr. FERGUSON. Would the Senator say that he and the Senator from Michigan fared about equally in that respect? But is it not true that the President of the United States, returning to this country, stated to a joint session of the Congress that no agreements had been made that affected the Pacific War or the Far East, whereas we now know that very extensive and very serious agreements of a political nature affecting the Far East were made with the Russians?

Mr. GILLETTE. Is the Senator referring to the Potsdam agreement?

Mr. FERGUSON. No; I am referring to the Yalta agreement.

Mr. GILLETTE. My memory does not serve me on that.

Mr. FERGUSON. I am sure the record will show that; and I was wondering how, with that statement in the RECORD, it would be possible for the Senator from Iowa to know that there was a threat sufficient to cause the yielding to these agreements.

Mr. GILLETTE. The Senator from Iowa at that time was a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. The information to which I have alluded — perhaps unfortunately, at this time—was information which I gained at that time. It was certainly a factor in the conclusions which were reached.

I yield now to the Senator from Nevada.

WE GAVE MANCHURIA, BERLIN, AND NORTH KOREA AWAY WITHOUT SAFEGUARD

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, inasmuch as we are endeavoring to keep the record straight, I should like to ask the Senator a question in line with the discussion between the Senator from Iowa

and the Senator from Connecticut. I should like to ask him whether it is not a fact that the Yalta agreement virtually gave, or had the effect of giving Manchuria to the Russians; in other words, through turning over the transportation systems and the harbors to the Russians we gave them control of Manchuria—the bread basket of China. Is not that true?

In addition, it was without the knowledge of the Chinese themselves, or of the Nationalist Government which was in power at the time; and later pressure was brought to bear on Chiang Kai-shek to accept the agreement.

Mr. GILLETTE. I thank the Senator from Nevada. I may say in reply that, trusting entirely to memory, I have been forced far afield in this discussion. I was discussing an entirely different matter. I was attempting, in my poor way, to cover the field of commitments which we have undoubtedly made, and obligations under which we are now functioning; so that I, along with other Senators, could give something by way of answer to our people when they ask, "Why are we doing this? Why are we doing that? Under what authority are we doing it?" We should have something definite to present in reply.

I wish to add—and then I hope the Senator will excuse me—that no Member of the Senate will fight any more strenuously than will the junior Senator from Iowa any attempt on the part of the executive department or of the judicial department to infringe upon the responsibilities and duties of the legislative department. On this floor I have, in times past, made a very lengthy talk on the question of the execution of agreements by the executive department without submission to the Congress.

If the Senator will bear with me, I shall repeat what I said on that occasion. I submitted to the State Department at the time a query as to what it considered a treaty which must be submitted to the Senate for ratification, and what it considered an executive agreement. The reply of the State Department, which I have in my file, stated the difference in this way: A treaty is a contract which must be submitted to the Senate for ratification; an executive agreement is one which does not have to be submitted to the Senate. I cited at that time something I had heard as a boy. I was told the way to distinguish a male pigeon from a female. The method was, to put corn in front of the bird; if he picked it up, it was a he; and if she picked it up, it was a she.

Mr. President, so long as I can speak, and so long as I am a Member of the Senate, speaking on this floor, I shall jealously fight to the extent of my ability in defense of the responsibility and authority of this legislative body under the Constitution of the United States.

Let me repeat that I merely wanted today to outline the kinds of obligations which had been ratified, commitments which had been made and either expressly or by implication had been ratified by the Senate of the United States. I had no desire, and I certainly did not expect, to discuss the agreements made at Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam, under the personal guidance of the Senator from Minnesota or the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a brief moment?

Mr. GILLETTE. I had not quite finished.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I should like to get on the record one more date, namely, of the Cairo Conference of November 22 to November 26, 1943.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. To whom did the Senator from Iowa yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I understood the Senator yielded to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. GILLETTE. I had been yielding to the Senator from Michigan. I now yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I hope I have not diverted the distinguished junior Senator from Iowa from his theme. I had no intention of doing that. On the contrary, I want to compliment him on the job he is doing in documenting this evidence, because it is very important. We gave Berlin to the Russians without any means of egress or ingress. I shall not take the time of the Senate now to enumerate the many other instances when similar serious mistake were made. I have in times past stated them to the Senate in some detail.

Russia actually entered the war 2 days after the first atom bomb was exploded in Japan. I suppose she waited to see whether the bomb would actually explode. The distinguished senior Senator from Connecticut indicated that the reason we wanted to assure ourselves of Russia's support was that maybe we were not sure the atom bomb would explode.

Mr. President, of course, it was, and is well known that Japan had been trying for a considerable time to surrender before we used the bomb and before Russia came in.

I thank the Senator for yielding to me.

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

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, the only reason for making the comments I made when the very able Senator from Iowa was speaking was to endeavor to get all the facts in the RECORD. I like the Senator from Iowa too well to disagree with him.

I am reminded of the old Chinese proverb, which is as follows:

> Look back that you have the wisdom to intelligently look forward.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, since the Senator has been kind enough to refer to my courtesy, I hope he will continue to be kind enough to permit me to conclude my remarks.

I was about to read what Ambassador Gross said, as follows:

> We have reserved and continue to reserve the right to make certain that the question of Formosa will be handled in a way completely consistent with our national interest and security.

It might be wise, Mr. President, if this is the official American position with regard to one of the most controversial areas on earth, for a resolution to be considered by the Congress supporting, or rejecting, that position, so that there will be no doubt anywhere of our intention. Certainly, before we are committed to go to war, if necessary, in the defense of Formosa, Congress must agree, and express its agreement, that Formosa is a vital interest to American security. Once this has been determined, we can then determine the relative importance of Formosa in our scale of vital interests in the Far East, as lesser or greater or equal to American interests in Japan or the Philippines; and with these factors in mind we can more readily determine the nature and the extent of the commitment we shall make for its defense. Should it be the judgment of Congress that America has no vital interest in Formosa, we would of course take a quite different course. All I am asking is that the determination be made, one way or the other.

THE AREA OF THE GAP

The United States, as we have seen, has commitments in one form or another from the Adriatic coast of Italy westward across the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans to the western shores of the Japanese and Philippine Islands. Nowhere east of the boot of Italy, all the way eastward through the Mediterranean, the Middle East and into Southeast Asia up to the Pacific shores of Indochina, is the United States committed by treaty, agreement, occupation force or otherwise, to go to war for the defense of any country lying along that huge stretch of territory.

Our military assistance goes to many of the countries in this area but this in no sense obligates us to go to their defense. As things now stand, the only way we could become involved in any outbreak along this line would be in case the United Nations took action recommending or deciding that the United States and other members send forces for the defense of a country attacked in that area.

Yet this immense territory, extending from the middle of the Mediterranean to the Pacific shores of Indochina, lies along the longest land frontier of the Soviet orbit. At no point thereon is the United States, except by United Nations action, pledged to the defense of a victim of aggression.

There are sound historical reasons for this. In our time, this whole stretch has been largely a zone of British, and to a lesser extent, French influence, vying, of course, with Russian influence, both czarist and Communist. America's interests there have certainly grown greater since the war. The first application of the doctrine of containment, if you wish to interpret it as such, came in Greece and Turkey. Even prior to that, in the late winter of 1946, we countered the Soviet pressure on Iran and were able to keep the Russian power from pouring into that country. The great oil fields of the Middle East, which we have both an economic and a strategic stake in keeping out of Soviet hands, are an area of real importance to the United States.

If these areas should be lost to Soviet control, there is no knowing how far the disaster might spread: Europe deprived at a stroke of its source of oil, the

Suez Canal overrun, Africa laid open to penetration and conquest, 400,000,000 Hindus and Pakistanis swallowed up into the manpower machine of the Soviet Union.

Here is the great gap in application of the doctrine of containment. Here the United States has defined no truly vital interests; at least it is most doubtful if the American people are now persuaded that such interests exist. Here we have no firm commitments to go to war for our own defense by defending these distant regions. Here we have no sufficient power to fulfill commitments even if we had them.

The primary responsibility for guarding this area is not America's. That responsibility lies chiefly with the British Commonwealth of Nations, and is shared at the Far East terminal by France in Indochina. The Commonwealth countries having vital interests in this region would seem to include the United Kingdom, India, Pakistan, and Ceylon, in the front rank, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa and the other British African states in the second rank.

American interests may be great in this area, especially in checking expansion of Soviet power, but they do not appear to be vital interests to the same degree as the areas surrounding the oceans between which we live. Our role there is necessarily secondary, subsidiary, and auxiliary.

If the day should come when a commitment to go to the defense of this vast region, or any part of it, is proposed to the American people, I hope and pray that we will have long since reached an agreement among ourselves whether or not, in the light of our long-range security, of the techniques of modern warfare and of the global situation vis-à-vis the Soviet Union, the United States does have vital interests in that area, interests so vital to our Nation's security that we must engage in war if need be to protect them.

CONCLUSION

Before closing, Mr. President, I want to touch only for a moment on the question of the power we shall need to fulfill the commitments we have made or may be compelled to make to protect our vital interests.

The chief domestic issues which we will debate in this Congress are meaningless except in terms of our foreign policy. Foreign policy today is the determinant of domestic policy. Taxes, production, manpower, prices, wages, profits, housing—all these basic issues of national policy cannot even be discussed except in relation to what our foreign policy is and is going to be. The decisions we make this year and next will shadow all we think and feel and do for decades to come, indefinitely. Military expenditures this coming fiscal year will take 73 cents of each budget dollar. How many men, tanks, trucks, planes, ships, bombs; how much wheat, cotton, and meat; what rate of taxes and how much debt; all these depend on the power we intend to mobilize. But how much power must we have? What areas will our forces protect? Where shall they be sent if total war is deferred but the permanent crisis goes on? Answers can be found only in what our foreign policy requires, and what that policy requires can most easily be seen by studying the geography of our position.

Mr. President, because of my strong conviction that we must reach agreement on the essentials before we can agree on ways and means, I have not proposed answers of my own to the questions I have raised. Let us by all means debate frankly and freely, but let us debate with a view ultimately of forging an ironclad base of fundamental agreement. On this base, and only on this base, can we construct an enduring and effective foreign policy suited to the age in which we live.

EXHIBIT A

ARTICLES 3 AND 4

INTER-AMERICAN TREATY OF RECIPROCAL ASSISTANCE

Article 3

1. The high contracting parties agree that an armed attack by any state against an American state shall be considered as an attack against all the American states, and, consequently, each one of the said contracting parties undertakes to assist in meeting the attack in the exercise of the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense recognized by article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations.

2. On the request of the state or states directly attacked and until the decision of the organ of consultation of the inter-American system, each one of the contracting parties may determine the immediate measures which it may individually take in fulfillment of the obligation contained in the preceding paragraph and in accordance with the principle of continental solidarity. The organ of consultation shall meet without delay for the purpose of examining those measures and agreeing upon the measures of a collective character that should be taken.

3. The provisions of this article shall be applied in case of any armed attack which takes place within the region described in article 4 or within the territory of an American state. When the attack takes place outside of the said areas the provisions of article 6 shall be applied.

4. Measures of self-defense provided for under this article may be taken until the Security Council of the United Nations has taken the measures necessary to maintain international peace and security.

Article 4

The region to which this treaty refers is bounded as follows: Beginning at the North Pole; thence due south to a point 74 degrees north latitude, 10 degrees west longitude; thence by a rhumb line to a point 47 degrees 30 minutes north latitude, 50 degrees west longitude; thence by a rhumb line to a point 35 degrees north latitude, 60 degrees west longitude; thence due south to a point in 20 degrees north latitude; thence by a rhumb line to a point 5 degrees north latitude, 24 degrees west longitude; thence due south to the South Pole; thence due north to a point 30 degrees south latitude, 90 degrees west longitude; thence by a rhumb line to a point on the Equator at 97 degrees west longitude; thence by a rhumb line to a point 15 degrees north latitude, 120 degrees west longitude; thence by a rhumb line to a point 50 degrees north latitude, 170 degrees east longitude; thence due north to a point in 54 degrees north latitude; thence by a rhumb line to a point 65 degrees 30 minutes north latitude, 168 degrees 58 minutes 5 seconds west longitude; thence due north to the North Pole.

EXHIBIT B

ARTICLES 5 AND 6

NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY

Article 5

The parties agree that an armed attack against one or more of them in Europe or North America shall be considered an attack against them all; and consequently they agree that, if such an armed attack occurs, each of them, in exercise of the right of individual or collective self-defense recognized by article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations, will assist the party or parties so attacked by taking forthwith, individually and in concert with the other parties, such action as it deems necessary, including the use of armed force, to restore and maintain the security of the North Atlantic area.

Any such armed attack and all measures taken as a result thereof shall immediately be reported to the Security Council. Such measures shall be terminated when the Security Council has taken the measures necessary to restore and maintain international peace and security.

Article 6

For the purpose of article 5 an armed attack on one or more of the parties is deemed to include an armed attack on the territory of any of the parties in Europe or North America, on the Algerian departments of France, on the occupation forces of any party in Europe, on the islands under the jurisdiction of any party in the North Atlantic area north of the Tropic of Cancer or on the vessels or aircraft in this area of any of the parties.

THE RAILROAD STRIKE

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the Senate has had the opportunity of listening this afternoon to some very able speeches, particularly one by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] and one by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

Mr. President, the Nation has suffered a paralyzing railroad strike, and it is not over yet. The stoppage of rail transportation as a result of "sickness" among employees of operating brotherhoods is so ridiculous that mention of it is nauseating.

No officer or member of the brotherhoods has offered to condone this type of curtailment of railroad transportation.

After studying the chronological record of the conductors' and trainmen's wage dispute, one must admit that it has been poorly handled; in fact, it has been mismanaged and mishandled.

In checking this case history, one must conclude that the administration did not have the courage to act and act properly. When the President of the United States provided for Government seizure of the railroads on August 25, 1950, he became directly responsible for the continued operation of the railroads.

It is not my intention to discuss the merits or the demerits of the agreement signed at the White House on December 21, 1950, or the rejection of the settlement by the general chairmen of the trainmen's organization on January 5, 1951, and the rejection by the general chairmen of the conductors' organization on January 7, 1951.

There are always two sides to a question involving wages and working conditions. As Governor of the State of Kansas, I had an opportunity to sit, with

other governors of States traversed by the Missouri Pacific lines, in arriving at a settlement of the strike and wage dispute last year. This gave me an opportunity to study the problems that are presented to both the employer and the employees. At that meeting the governors and the representatives of the governors of the States were able to work out an agreement that brought about immediate operation of the railroads.

It is my contention that the administration should have acted similarly in the present situation. The fact that they did not take advantage of this opportunity and use the full influence of their offices has cost the Nation and will continue to cost the Nation a continuing serious loss in the movement of commodities. It is to that subject that I want to devote a few minutes of my time. It is my intention to discuss frankly the effect of this rail tie-up on the movement of grain and commodities in the Midwest.

At my request, Ralph Clark of the Association of American Railroads, has supplied me with figures on the receipts of empty boxcars by western roads from eastern and southern connections. These daily reports show the effect of the first strike, which began December 13, 1950, and ended 3 days later. On December 13, 652 cars were delivered to midwestern roads through Chicago, St. Louis, Peoria, and Memphis.

On the 14th, the second day of the strike, 374 cars were delivered, and on that 8-day week end an average of 253 cars were delivered. On the second week end following the strike, December 22 to 25, an average of 362 cars were delivered. On the third week end, December 29 to 31, an average of 557 cars were delivered. I am using these figures to prove the point that even though the strike is over, it takes weeks before the movement of cars gets back to normal.

The daily average movement of cars to the midwestern railroads through regular points for November 1950, was 929. For December, 550, and for January, 838. These average daily movements show that even after 50 days following the end of the first strike, railroad movement of cars to that area had not reached the average of the month preceding the strike.

The present strike, which has not yet ended, has lasted 10 days instead of 3 days, which was the length of the December strike. It is reasonable to assume that it will be late spring before the movement of these badly needed cars will be back to normal operation.

Another factor entering into the movement of cars is, of course, the extreme cold winter through which we are going. This again affects the movement of rail transportation.

My office has received literally hundreds of requests from Kansas grain dealers and shippers for cars during the past few weeks. Typical of these telegrams is the following from the Dean Grain Co., of Agra, Kans.:

AGRA, KANS., *January 23.*

Senator CARLSON: Reference item Topeka Daily Capital issue January 20 advising you from Wichita grain box car supply showing improvement. Missouri Pacific branch railways serving south of here have been receiving more cars possible reason for this favorable report from that receiving station. However, certainly does not apply this and surrounding Rock Island railway stations as grain car situation has been getting worse past 30 days. We have 160,000 bushels grain here in store. Sixty thousand bushels of it bought and sold waiting cars for shipment the past 30 days and have had standing order since first of the year for 30 box cars to move it. We only been furnished four grain cars since first of the year. Our elevators here have been blocked for 2 weeks and grain piled on ground. Elevators at Kirwin 6 miles south of here on Missouri Pacific received eight cars one day last week and elevator manager advised us did not have sufficient grain to load all of them as both Missouri Pacific branch railways south of here have been receiving sufficient box cars to keep open and operating for the past 30 days. Please investitgate and advise why this so poorly managed and unequal distribution of the box cars that are available for grain loading.

DEAN GRAIN CO.
C. H. DEAN.

My office has had the finest of cooperation from the Association of American Railroads and the officials of the railroads operating in this area, yet the situation was very serious and now it is critical.

On February 1, 1951, there were 1,298 elevators blocked in the grain area, and of this number 170 were in Kansas. It is very unusual to have elevators blocked in January. Normally this situation prevails in June during the harvest month.

The stocks of grain in the grain area on January 1, 1951, were greatly in excess of the same period in 1950. On January 1 this year in Kansas we had 174,461,000 bushels of wheat in all positions, and on that same date in 1950 we had 158,904,000 bushels.

Holdings of all grains in Kansas on January 1, 1951, were 207,554,000 bushels, compared with 178,701,000 bushels in 1950.

I hesitate to think of the serious delay and the actual loss in the movement of this grain, not only in Kansas, but in the entire Midwest.

This loss and difficulty must be charged to those who are responsible for the operation of the railroad transportation system.

I had intended to discuss only the loss to grain producers and grain dealers, but this morning I received a telegram which I think should be brought to the attention of the Senate. It is from the Berrys Hatchery, of Atchison, Kans., and Newton, Kans., is dated February 7, 1951, and reads:

One hundred thousand baby chicks hatched today are homeless and must be destroyed because cannot ship to customers account rail strike. Have destroyed thousands baby chicks in past week. We have half a million chicks hatching within week, all sold for delivery to broiler plants and egg farmers throughout United States that cannot be delivered and must be destroyed unless rail strike is settled. Over 200,000 chicks in brooders on orders to hundreds of farmers that must be shipped at once or will lose them. Situation very critical and will mean bankruptcy to thousands of hatcheries throughout country and loss of millions of pounds of food next summer and winter unless positive action is taken at once. Domination of entire business economy by a few men is disastrous to American principles and way of life. Urge immediate action to prevent further losses to industry and to future food production

BERRYS HATCHERY,
GEORGE BERRY,
ERNEST BERRY.

NEWTON, KANS.

No doubt this same situation prevailed in many sections of the Nation, and the loss referred to is a loss which cannot be justified at a time when the Nation needs full production to prevent inflation, and for badly needed food.

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

Mr. CARLSON. I am glad to yield .

Mr. THYE. I was very much impressed by the able remarks of the Senator from Kansas relative to baby chicks. A baby chick does not have much value from the standpoint of food. However, if an individual hatcher must destroy thousands of baby chicks, it may well amount to his ruin. Give a baby chick a few weeks, and it is a broiler or a fryer. Give it a few months, and it is a productive bird. Therefore it is very important to have movement of baby chicks from the hatchery, because if the baby chicks are not moved within a few days after they are hatched, they must be disposed of. I was impressed by the reference to baby chicks and the problems that have resulted from the railroad tie-up.

We in the Northern States have endured one of the most severe winters we have experienced in many a year. Excessive snow has blocked transportation by truck. The excessive cold weather during the past 2 months has depleted our coal reserves. Without boxcars and without adequate railroad transportation, the entire northern area, not only the State of Minnesota, is faced with an emergency. Unless we get coal there will be a great deal of suffering, to say nothing about the loss to our industrial and food-processing plants.

On behalf of the people of the Northwest I thank the Senator from Kansas for his very able speech. By his able presentation the country can see how we are being affected by the present railway tie-up.

Mr. CARLSON. The distinguished Senator from Minnesota is absolutely correct. Next spring, even before the harvest, when the Commodity Credit Corporation grain is needed, as we begin to move, in April and May, we shall really feel the effects of the strike which is taking place in January of this year.

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

Mr. CARLSON. I yield gladly.

Mr. LANGER. I may say to my distinguished friend from Kansas that this is an old question. Five years ago, under the Democratic administration, a member of the Republican Party submitted Senate Resolution 185. The distinguished former Senator from Kansas, Clyde Reed, who perhaps knew as much about railroads, railroad freight rates, and boxcar shortages as any man who has sat in the Senate, conducted an investigation. I want to ask my distinguished friend if it is not true that we find incompetency on the part of officeholders in many departments of the Government? For illustration. this morning

I showed that a small manufacturer of spark plugs filed a complaint in 1937, 13 years ago, and up to now no decision has been rendered in the case. When I heard about it on the fourth day of December, 20 small firms had gone into bankruptcy. Three great big outfits control the field. Eventually a decision will be rendered, I presume.

With respect to the antitrust statutes, there is not a Senator, including my distinguished friend from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], who is a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, who does not know of the laxity in the enforcement of the antitrust laws.

Mr. FERGUSON. There is no doubt about it.

Mr. LANGER. During all these years not one person has been put in jail for violation of those laws. Our officials are sworn to uphold the law. A farm organization in my State brought an action before a Government Commission, and it took 6 years to get a decision.

Mr. President, justice delayed is no justice at all.

The distinguished Senator from Kansas is speaking on this very important subject today. Where is the fault? A moment ago the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] mentioned the fact that the Commodity Credit Corporation did not get its wheat out, but left it in the elevators, as the distinguished Senator from Minnesota has said, until about the time the new crop comes in. The elevators are blocked all over the Northwest, and it is necessary to pile up the wheat and the flax.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, it was the able Senator from Kansas who referred to the blockade of grain in the elevators. I want to give credit to the able Senator from Kansas, because he was the one who brought out that thought and made it known to us.

Mr. CARLSON. I appreciate the remarks of the Senator.

Mr. LANGER. What happened? It was brought out at the last hearing, 3 months ago, that the Northern Pacific Railroad Co. had only 6 or 7 percent of its cars there. It was shown that we manufactured 34,000 cars for England, 4,000 cars for Mexico, and 4,000 cars for the Argentine. No cars were manufactured for us at all. Today, when inquiry is made, as I am sure my friend from Kansas has made inquiry, it will be said, "Oh, we are manufacturing 100,000 cars now, or 120,000 cars, or 150,000 cars." I submit that under the present administration the farmer has been completely neglected so far as concerns the transportation of products which he raises. He is suffering a loss, as my distinguished friend from Kansas knows only too well. We know that instead of being able to store his grain, the farmer has had to haul it to the elevator and take the best cash price he could get. That is the situation all over North Dakota.

I compliment my distinguished colleague and friend, the former Governor of Kansas. He is intimately acquainted with the situation. I compliment him for presenting the facts. I hope that, following the lead of the distinguished former Senator from Kansas, Clyde Reed, he will keep right on, with a few others of us from the Northwest, until we get justice for the farmers. I finish my question by asking whether or not he is not going to do it.

Mr. CARLSON. I am indebted to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota for his comment on this important subject. I appreciate what he has said in behalf of the distinguished late senior Senator from Kansas, Clyde M. Reed, whom I have the honor to succeed. He was an outstanding authority on freight rates, and was recognized as such not only in Kansas but in the Nation. If I could only approach in a small way his knowledge on this subject, I should be very happy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a table showing some of the figures on the movement of cars, together with a statement showing the chronology of the conductors' and trainmen's wage dispute.

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

Receipts of empty boxcars by western roads from eastern-southern connections (via Chicago, St. Louis, Peoria, Memphis)

	No. cars
First strike:	
December 13	652
December 14	374
December 15–17 (average 253 daily)	761
December 18	823
December 19	481
December 20	605
December 21	591
December 22–25 (average 362 daily)	1,447
December 26	710
December 27	573
December 28	320
December 29–31 (average 557 daily)	1,671
January 1	400
January 2	507
January 3	677
January 4	801
January 5–7 (average 577 daily)	1,731
January 8	616
January 9	874
January 10	737
January 11	903
January 12–14 (average 837 daily)	2,511
January 15	1,273
January 16	1,287
January 17	1,029
January 18	1,213
January 19–21 (average 756)	2,270
January 22	985
January 23	1,013
January 24	1,903
January 25	966
January 26–28 (average 703)	2,110
Second strike:	
January 29	779
January 30	888
January 31	288
February 1	297
February 2, 3, 4, 5	419
Daily averages:	
November 1950	929
December 1950	550
January 1951	838

Average boxcar loadings and boxcar deliveries—Kansas roads (Union Pacific; Rock Island; Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe; Missouri Pacific; Chicago-Burlington-Illinois)

Grain and grain products:	1950	1949
4 weeks January	+32.7	+28.2
National	+31.7	+19.5

TOTAL BOX LOADINGS

National, 3 weeks, January	+7.0
Box deliveries to western roads, Jan. 1–30 (average 838 daily)	25,149

CHRONOLOGY OF CONDUCTORS' AND TRAINMEN'S WAGE DISPUTE

March 15, 1949: Submitted proposals to amend existing agreements to provide 5-day 40-hour workweek for yard employees without reduction in pay, time and one-half for Sundays and holidays. Graduating rate of pay for conductors and trainmen according to weight on drivers of locomotives being used. Modification of other operating and pay rules.

April 1949: Conclusion of initial conferences on individual railroads, under procedural machinery of Railway Labor Act. Railroads authorized three regional committees to participate in concerted handling with union's committees.

September 22, 1949: National conferences began.

December 14, 1949: National conferences terminated.

December 15, 1949: Railroad invoke services of National Mediation Board.

January 16, 1950: Mediation commenced.

February 14, 1950: Arbitration proffered. Railroads agreed to submit dispute to arbitration, but conductors and trainmen rejected arbitration.

February 17, 1950: Announcement by unions that strike date had been set for 6 a. m., February 27, 1950.

February 24, 1950: President of United States created Emergency Board to investigate dispute; comprising members were Justice Roger I. McDonough, chairman; Judge Mart J. O'Malley; Prof. Gordon S. Watkins.

March 2–May 9, 1950: Hearings of Emergency Board.

June 15, 1950: Emergency Board recommended: (1) A 5-day 40-hour workweek for yard employees with increase in basic rates of 18 cents per hour, to become effective October 1, 1950. (2) That in lieu of daily earnings minimum guaranty, rates of pay of yard employees be increased 2½ cents per hour. (3) That carriers be given right to lift restrictions on interdivisional runs; pooling of cabooses should be permitted; and certain other rules changed.

June 20, 1950: Parties met in Chicago to discuss recommendations of Board.

June 22, 1950: Carriers wired acceptance of Board's recommendations, but unions assailed report.

June 27, 1950: Mediation Board again met with parties, conference continuing through July 8, then recessed to convene at Washington on July 17.

July 11, 1950: Unions wired President of United States that Board's recommendations were rejected and that they would use every power at our command to bring about a just and satisfactory settlement.

July 17–August 15, 1950: Mediation between parties continued in Washington with Dr. Steelman participating from August 7.

August 4, 1950: Unions requested President to seize railroads.

August 16, 1950: Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen called 5-day strike of yardmen at three terminals, strike to be effective from August 21.

August 17, 1950: Unions called 5-day strike of trainmen and yardmen on two railroads from August 22.

August 19, 1950: Dr. Steelman suggested a settlement. (1) The Board's recommendations. (2) A 3-year peace settlement, including, for yardmen, an additional 5 cents an hour and an automatic quarterly wage adjustment of 1 cent an hour for each 1-point increase in cost of living. (3) An increase of 5 cents an hour for road men instead of no increase as recommended by the Board, with cost-of-living adjustment. The railroads agreed to Dr. Steelman's proposals, but the unions rejected them.

August 23, 1950: Unions called Nationwide strike for August 28.

August 25, 1950: President of the United States provided for Government seizure of railroads, and their operation by the Secretary of the Army from August 27.

September 6, 1950: At suggestion of Dr. Steelman, Mediation Board again conferred with parties.

October 1950: Trainmen's convention at Miami, Fla.; no negotiations between parties under auspices of Mediation Board held.

November 20, 1950: Negotiations renewed at White House with Dr. Steelman.

December 11, 1950: Wildcat strikes in certain large yards; temporary restraining orders were secured by the Government in three locations.

December 15, 1950: President of the United States termed strikes unlawful and said yardmen should return to work. Employees did return to work on or about December 16. Joint conferences between the parties continued at the White House.

December 21, 1950: Memorandum of agreement was signed at the White House which provided: (1) A 40-hour week for yardmen, the actual effecting of which was postponed until January 1, 1952. (2) A 23-cents-per-hour wage increase to yardmen, retroactive to October 1, 1950. (3) A 2-cent wage increase to yardmen, effective from January 1, 1951. (4) A 4-cent wage increase to yardmen, if and when the 4-hour week becomes effective. (5) A 5-cent wage increase to road men from October 1, 1950. (6) A 5-cent wage increase to road men from January 1, 1951. (7) A quarterly adjustment of wages, 1 cent for each 1-point rise in cost of living for both yard and road men. First adjustment to be made April 1, 1951. (8) Establish rules recommended by Board. (9) In consideration of above, agreement to be effective until October 1, 1953.

January 5, 1951: General Chairman of Trainmen's Organization reject settlement of December 21, 1950.

January 7, 1951: General Chairman of Conductors' Organization reject settlement of December 21, 1950.

January 18, 1951: Unions again conferred with Dr. Steelman, who in turn referred them to the National Mediation Board.

January 30, 1951: Wild-cat strikes began at various large centers.

February 8, 1951: Most operating men back at work.

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

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I was called out of the chamber while the Senator was speaking, so he may have referred to it, but has not the difficulty in the rail situation arisen from the refusal in recent years to abide by the findings of the Railway Labor Board, and from political appeals to the White House, which enabled politicians to accord what they believed to be political consideration for political advantage? Now the men feel that they can go a step further. It was the practice of both the present and preceding President to attempt to settle these matters by political means rather than by arbitration.

Mr. CARLSON. I am in thorough accord with the statement of the Senator from Maine. Before he entered the Chamber I stated that the President was directly responsible for the mishandling of this strike. It should have been taken care of immediately. I mentioned the fact that the governors of nine Midwestern States took hold of the Missouri Pacific strike, and that an agreement was reached. The same thing could have been done in Washington.

UNITED STATES VERSUS WILLIAM REMINGTON

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, last evening a jury in a Federal court in the city of New York decided a very important case. It was the case of the People of the United States against William Remington. The jury in that case decided that Remington had lied when he had denied ever having been a member of the Communist Party. That case and its decision were significant for a number of reasons.

In the first place it established as a legal principle that to be a member of the Communist Party in the United States, and a part of its apparatus, one does not have to be a card-carrying member of the party. In other words, the decision recognizes the underground nature of Communist operations. This is highly important as evidence of a realistic view of the nature of the Communist conspiracy.

The case was also highly important for its very nature. It again focuses attention on the fact that in recent months we have found the only method which has been effectively pursued by the executive branch of the Government in relation to disloyalty has been trials for perjury. I cite the case of Alger Hiss, and now the case of Remington, as well as the case of Carl Marzani. The reason is this: The Congress of the United States has been very active against disloyal persons. Believing that the security of the United States was involved, the Congress has made certain investigations on the question of loyalty and subversion. It has brought to light certain facts which would otherwise have been buried. Once brought to light public opinion dictated that there should be prosecutions, and perjury charges have been the means of bringing to justice these people in Government whose disloyal activities were exposed by the Congress.

When the jury in the Alger Hiss case came in it convicted Mr. Hiss and acquitted the Un-American Activities Committee of the House. When the jury came in last night and the jury foreman said, "We find the defendant guilty as charged," that jury convicted Mr. Remington of perjury and acquitted the United States Senate. It will be recalled that in 1948 Mr. Remington was the subject of an investigation by a Senate subcommittee of which the Senator from Michigan was then chairman.

At the time the Senator from Michigan was seeking to bring out the facts in relation to Mr. Remington the Senate was subjected to severe criticism. The President of the United States said, in connection with those same hearings, "That is nothing but a 'red herring'." But, Mr. President, a jury in Federal court last night found that it was not just a "red herring," but that it was a serious matter of vast implications and deep meaning.

The fact that these cases have been successfully prosecuted as perjury cases leads one to ask why the job cannot be done as well behind the cloak of secrecy—and I am talking about the Government's loyalty program—with which the executive department surrounds itself in such matters. Why cannot the same job be done by the Government within its own household as can be done out in the open, in a trial before the Federal court.

I ask this question: Is perjury more damaging to the public interest than disloyalty? I repeat the question for emphasis: Is perjury more damaging to the public interest than disloyalty?

Loyalty hearings are star-chamber proceedings. But unlike the original star chamber the secrecy operates for the benefit of the accused, and they do not bring out all the evidence. But when it comes to a court case, after a grand jury has indicted an individual for perjury, the FBI is called upon to dig up the evidence, and it produces it as demonstrated by the Hiss and Remington trials. Why cannot the same FBI be asked by the Loyalty Board to obtain evidence? The reason is that one proceeding is held in secret, and the other is in public. Exposed to the light of public scrutiny in open court, the Government has no alternative but to employ its best prosecutive talents.

Mr. President, it is an amazing thing that there were placed in evidence in the New York trial of Remington statements from the files of the Civil Service Commission, which has charge of the Loyalty Board, which were never even used before the Loyalty Board when it had the Remington case before it.

The Loyalty Board, as you know, cleared Remington after the Senate subcommittee had first brought his case to light. I say that decision of the Loyalty Board in the Remington case rendered a great disservice to the public interest and the United States. It retained in Government employment a person who, under the findings of the New York jury, could not possibly be considered as anything but a grave security risk. We had adduced concrete evidence that he was delivering classified Government data to an admitted courier for a Communist spy ring. It is more than irony, because it was a travesty of justice, that the Loyalty Board decision permitted William Remington to sue that courier for libel in the civil courts, and by reason of its decision to obtain damages, although I must say that the settlement was not made willingly by the courier who had known she was telling the truth. The Board's decision allowed William Remington to obtain back pay from the Government of the United States for the period of his suspension while under investigation, and to go back on the payroll and work for the Government. I say all that is a clear consequence of trying to do things by executive decree, instead of trying to do them under the law.

The decision of the jury has cleared the Senate of all discredit heaped upon it following the Remington hearings in 1948. I recall not only the President's cry of "red herring" while the Remington hearings were in progress, but a bitterly clever piece of abuse heaped on the Senate subcommittee in the magazine New Yorker. That magazine painted a picture of injured innocence in a "profile" of William Remington. I wonder if now the magazine New Yorker will want to supplement its account of that case with a more up-to-date "profile" on Mr. Remington, its picture of injured innocence.

The Senate was halted in its investigation of the Remington case by the refusal of the President to produce pertinent documents. In effect the matter

was left to the Loyalty Board, however unwillingly. The full circumstances under which the Senate committee was forced to abandon its pursuit of the Remington case were set forth in a report which the Senator from Michigan filed June 19, 1948.

I wish to read what we said in the report, which is Senate Report No. 1775 of the Eightieth Congress. I read from page 20:

> The request of the Executive Departments for information in the Remington case is a reasonable request. If the executive branch persists in its present policy of refusing to grant that request, the true facts cannot be learned by the subcommittee or the public. Both are entitled to the facts.

Mr. President, it was impossible for us to secure all the facts for the public's benefit. For instance, an admiral in the United States Navy came before us and gave us highly incriminating facts about Remington, off the record. But when he was formally summoned to testify as a witness under oath, he said that he had orders, direct from the President of the United States, that he could not give the committee or the public the facts concerning Mr. Remington.

The folly of the Loyalty Board's clearance of Remington, after Congress had pointed the finger at him and carried its charges as far as possible, is now shown by the decision of a jury of the United States court. This points directly to the weaknesses of the present loyalty program.

The startling fact is that under existing interpretations of the Loyalty Board's functions, Remington could return to the Federal employment tomorrow, so far as the Board is concerned. A jury has found that he committed perjury when he said to the grand jury that he had never been a Communist. Yet under the interpretation by the Loyalty Board of the Executive order under which it functions, William Remington could tomorrow return to the employ of the United States, if he were otherwise free to do so. I understand the judge last night sent him to a detaining point where he would not be able to offer his services in voluntary Federal employment.

Mr. President, I ask this question: What then is wrong with the loyalty program? Basically its very name is deceptive, and its present existence does no more than deceive the public.

Its only justification is as a security program. Why be concerned with disloyalty except for security reasons? Yet in practice it is only remotely a security program when it ties itself to the vague meanings of loyalty. Consequently it has dangerously lulled the public into a false sense of security. This so-called loyalty program has been palmed off on the public and has been accepted as a security program, but it simply is not that. Right now, as in the past years, we need a security program. We need one desperately. And we need a new one, as is clearly shown by the Remington case.

The Loyalty Board which is the final authority in the loyalty program claims it has been tied down by the terms of the Executive order under which it is constituted. If so, it has been tied down by a strained interpretation of its own directive, which interpretation requires (a) that disloyalty—as against the question of security risk—must be proved; and (b) that the proof must be of the instant, that is the individual now, at the time of the hearing, must be proved disloyal. Evidence of past disloyalty, in other words, is not to be permitted to color the decision as to present loyalty. This is to say that if yesterday I was known and proved to be a card-carrying Communist, but today that same evidence of disloyalty could not be produced, I would be cleared of any charges of disloyalty as affecting my fitness for Government service. I submit that simply offends common sense and good judgment. But it is the present basis of operations for the Loyalty Board.

Let me read from the Executive order which constitutes the Loyalty Board, the part which gives rise to that construction. It is Executive Order 9835, dated March 21, 1947, and I read from part V, on "Standards":

> The standard for the refusal of employment or the removal from employment in an executive department or agency on grounds relating to disloyalty shall be that, on all the evidence, reasonable grounds exist for a belief that the person involved is disloyal—

And I want to underscore the words "is disloyal"—

> to the Government of the United States.

Prior to that particular Executive order there was in effect another War Service Regulation, dated February 28, 1942. From part 2, section 3, I read as follows:

> An applicant may be denied examination and an eligible may be denied appointment for * * * (g) "a reasonable doubt as to his loyalty to the Government of the United States".

This is one of the reasons which were "sufficient cause for removal from the service" prior to the operations of the present Loyalty Board, but the standards stated therein have since been changed.

Mr. President, an order was issued in February, 1942. In March, 1947, a new order was issued upon creation of the new loyalty program. The Loyalty Board says that under its interpretation of the changed directive, it cannot do the same things under the new order that were possible under the old wartime order.

The fact is, Mr. President, that the Loyalty Board has surrounded itself or been surrounded with restrictions and limitations so that it cannot function in the public interest. The consequence has been that the Board has recognized all the Commie lines of imaginary rights, such as the "right" not to be accused and the "right" of freedom from guilt by association.

Mr. President, before these Commie line "rights" were brought out the basic rights in the Constitution and under the law of the United States were sufficient. The Commie rights are just phony baloney rights, and there is nothing in our system which says they should ever have been recognized by the Loyalty Board when it was charged with trying to preserve the security of the United States of America.

While the two Executive orders are apparently similar in purpose, the effect of their interpretations are miles apart. It follows from the interpretation of the present Executive order that the conviction of Remington would not bar him from present employment in the Government. That conviction, despite the volumes it tells about the man does not prove that he is now disloyal, I emphasize the words "is now disloyal" because they are the key words in the interpretation of the Loyalty Board's directive.

Mr. President, I cannot avoid the conclusion that the President, in issuing the new Executive order in 1947, deliberately and intentionally changed the wording of the 1942 order so that the present interpretation might be had. By doing so he has sought to close forever the book that contains the records of the Communists and the fellow travelers in the Government of the United States of America.

If that interpretation by the Loyalty Board is allowed to stand, it will freeze in the Government service, and will conceal them there, all persons who in the past have been disloyal to the Government. It will protect them from the discipline and the policing of public opinion.

In such case, all that disloyal Government employees will have to do will be to conceal their present disloyal activities, because their past, by this interpretation, is said to be of no concern to the Government and the public. Of course, Mr. President, such persons have had sufficient warning, and have gone underground. Why would not they conceal their present activities? I say that unless we can open the books of the past activities of Communists and fellow travelers in the employ of the Government of the United States, we shall never be able to get at them.

Are we going to be so naive as to believe that the Soviet Union, with its spies all over the world, in all other countries, has not attempted to have them penetrate the departments of the Government of the United States of America? Do we not know, from the Hiss case and the Remington case, that the Soviet has had its spy rings in this country and in our Government? Mr. President, the job for the United States to do is to ferret out those spies, and get them out of our Government.

The United States must recognize that the first and the greatest weapon used by the Soviet Union in its conspiracy to take over all the world is the penetration by its spies of the other nations and their governments. If the Soviet Union is unable to succeed in doing that, it will use its satellite armies, as it has done in Korea. There is every reason to believe that if the Soviet Union is unable to succeed by means of either its first method or its second method, it will use the Red Army. That is a pattern of strategy against which we must defend ourselves.

So, Mr. President, I again say that we should anticipate Communists and fellow travelers are in the departments and agencies of the Government of the United States. Our job is to ferret them out, not to permit them to be protected

by means of an Executive order which will freeze them in the Government of the United States and will conceal them there.

Mr. President, if this interpretation of the present Board's function is correct, then the past activities of a person in the Government service will be permitted to throw no light at all on his present intentions or his present integrity for public trust. Under present circumstances, the Board will only ask, in regard to such a person, "Is it proved that he is now disloyal?" The Board will not ask, "Was he once disloyal, and if so, does that have a bearing on his present loyalty and fitness for public trust."

Mr. President, I have reasons for believing that the present Loyalty Board understands that difficulty and that weakness, is not satisfied with the present condition, and realizes that the present situation is a farce and a phony. I hope something will be done about that matter very soon. However, the time is growing late. I hope the Board will be able to examine the past activities of Government employees. We have been reminded that a Chinese philosopher once said that it is well to study the past, in order to be able to anticipate what will occur in the future.

Mr. President, one result of the limitation now imposed as a result of the order and its interpretation, namely, that it is necessary to prove that such a person is now disloyal, has been that 60 percent of the regional Loyalty Board cases, in regard to findings of disloyalty, have been overturned. Apparently the regional boards have not strained at the interpretation which governs the parent board.

Mr. President, the Board also is weak because in practice it does not seek all available evidence. It is not even empowered to do so by means of subpoena. Just think of that, Mr. President. The Board is created to ferret out those insidious persons who have been placed by the Communist Party in our Government service, but the Board cannot make use of the power of subpoena in order to obtain evidence against such persons.

Recently a new executive commission to inquire into all phases of subversion was appointed. But it, too, is without the power of subpoena. How far will that Board be able to go? How far will it be able to do a proper job? Do we wish to have a proper job done? If we do, why do not we take all possible steps to make sure that a proper job will be done, instead of reposing trust in executive decrees, not laws? It is the idea that decrees will solve the problem that makes it impossible for a proper job to be done, because the decrees must emanate from those who have vested interest in the errors of the past. In order to insure that a proper job will be done, we must see to it, among other things, that any agency handling such matters will have the power of subpoena, so that it may obtain the evidence it needs, and so that the persons who testify before it will be required to tell the truth, under threat of punishment for committing perjury.

Mr. President, the net effect of the loyalty program's operations has been to cloak all the security weaknesses of the executive branch of our Government. That cloak or cover has been maintained by means of the absolute refusal of the executive branch to disclose the details of its internal operations to the inquiries of Congress, so that security procedures may be strengthened.

The standards of disclosure are those which have been formulated and adopted by the executive branch of our Government itself. The executive branch claims that the standards which have been adopted are based on the national interest. However, that claim boils down to an apparent belief that the national interest would suffer from revelations of internal weakness and administrative error in the executive branch of our Government.

Mr. President, that conclusion on the attitude of the executive branch is borne out by a spectacle enacted just last week. The Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, when dealing with export controls, wished to examine the minutes of the export control and advisory committees which acted as advisers to the Secretary of Commerce. The Senate committee wished to make inquiry regarding the shipment of cotton to China after the beginning of the Korean War. However, the executive branch of the Government would not permit the committee to obtain those minutes; it was claimed that to do so would adversely affect the security of the Government and of the Nation. When the matter was pressed, a statement was made that to permit the committee to examine the minutes would have an adverse affect on the best interests of the United States. Why, Mr. President? Because the minutes of the advisory committee were in terrible shape, and it was thus claimed by the executive branch that exposure of the inefficiency of the advisory committee would be harmful to the security of the United States. Mr. President, I ask the American people if that is good reason for keeping such minutes secret. That case is the most recent in a long series of similar refusals by the executive branch to cooperate in the inquiries of Congress.

Incidentally, that case is also very interesting because of its relationship to the Remington case. At the time Remington was before the committee—and at that time the committee inquiry was pronounced "a red herring"—he was secretary of the ad hoc committee of the Office of International Trade, the identical agency that is responsible for permitting the shipment of cotton to China after the beginning of the Korean War. Just as we were blocked in 1948 from gathering further evidence on Remington, the executive branch of the Government today does not wish any evidence on why such shipments were made to come to the knowledge of the public.

Mr. President, what we need is a security program. The present so-called loyalty program does not provide that.

A high Government agency, I understand, has been working for the past year to set up some kind of a genuine security program. Late as is that effort, it is commendable. But the fact is that not a thing has been done about it. Why? When we see the interpretation of this order freezing the past activities of Government employees, and not allowing such activities to be inquired into as a means of determining the wise course for us to pursue in the future, we can see why nothing has been accomplished by that agency, even though it has been working for a year in its endeavor to obtain a security program.

Next, Mr. President, this matter involves the necessity for a set of sound, practical security standards. As a working basis, I suggest a study and consideration of the report on the Remington case which I have cited. I wish to read one paragraph from that report, and then I shall ask unanimous consent that the remaining portions which I have marked, on pages 2 and 3 of the report, be printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

Let me read this part at this time:

> No person has a right to work for the Government. Working for the Government of the United States is a privilege which should be extended only to those in whom the greatest trust may be imposed. This distinction between a right and a privilege is a most important one in the consideration of a program to guarantee the loyalty of Government employees.

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

There being no objection, the portions of the report referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> In our zeal to rid the Government of subversives we must constantly be alert to protect individual rights. While fighting to preserve our democracy we must not forget to practice democracy. The subcommittee desires to stress how important it is that all of our constitutional safeguards remain inviolate. We must be mindful, however, that Communists clamor loudest about constitutional guaranties in their efforts to undermine our democracy. For this reason we must think clearly to avoid the confusion which the Communists hope to create. Arguments about constitutional guaranties should be analyzed to see if they apply to the facts at hand.
>
> No person has a right to work for the Government. Working for the Government of the United States is a privilege which should be extended only to those in whom the greatest trust may be imposed. This distinction between a right and a privilege is a most important one in the consideration of a program to guarantee the loyalty of Government employees.
>
> Freedom of speech, freedom of political belief, freedom of assembly, and the right not to be forced to testify against oneself, are basic rights guaranteed to all our people by the Constitution. However, we must not be confused as to the extent of these rights. Let us consider three cases by way of illustration: (1) Today a person in our country has a right to be a Communist and to speak out in behalf of communism if he violates no law such as espionage or conspiracy. By so doing, however, he forfeits any privilege he may have had to work for the United States Government. Surely no one can seriously claim that a person dedicated to overthrowing our form of government is entitled to the privilege of working for that government; (2) in a criminal case a man has a right to a trial by jury and can force the Government to prove his guilt beyond a reasonable doubt based on testimony other than his own. He cannot be convicted on suspicion. However, a man may forfeit his

privilege to work for the Government by constant association with known subversive elements. All Communists are potential espionage agents, and a Federal employee who constantly associates with persons of that ilk forfeits his privilege to work for the Government just as a man may forfeit his privilege to work as cashier of a bank if he constantly associates with known thieves; (3) under our Constitution a person has a right at any time to refuse to answer any question as to his conduct if by answering he would incriminate himself. If he is a Federal employee and he refuses to answer questions as to his loyalty, obviously he forfeits any privilege he has to continue working for the Government. It is analogous to the case of a cashier who, when questioned as to a shortage in his books, refuses to answer on the ground that his answers would tend to show that he is guilty of a crime. In refusing he has exercised a right guaranteed by the Constitution. But when the president of the company revokes the privilege of the cashier to work for the company by firing him he, too, has exercised his right under a free government. Certainly our Government must exercise at least as much care as the operator of a private business in employing persons it can trust.

Our Government, then, should guarantee the rights of all its citizens and should be zealous to prevent any diminution of these rights. On the other hand, it should be equally as vigilant to see that the privileges of citizenship are not abused by the very persons who seek to destroy all rights and privileges.

Stated in terms of loyalty, the program of our Government should have this aim. Communists and other subversives, their sympathizers, and their intimates should be forced out of Government and kept out of Government. Considering the insidious cunning and deceit of a Communist, any reasonable doubt as to the loyalty of a person should be resolved in favor of the Government. There are a sufficient number of persons whose loyalty is above question that self-interest alone should demand that the Government not employ persons of doubtful loyalty. To date this aim has not been accomplished.

Mr. FERGUSON. Third, we need a real determination to put into effect a genuine security program. No program will be successful without that determination. But to assist such a program I suggest the adoption of genuine security tests as the standard of Government employment; instead of vague loyalty standards hampered by requirements of current positive proof. This can be accomplished by adopting the principle that Government employment is a privilege and not a right.

I also submit that any loyalty board must operate on the basis of the right of subpoena, and it should exercise it. Further, it should require that the FBI and the other agencies that can look up evidence for them shall get all the evidence, instead of the Board's taking what is handed them on a platter by an interested board of the particular department, more often than not composed of the personnel employing these particular people.

Fourth, we need a policy of disclosure in the executive branch, so that the public may have the facts, and, on the basis of the facts, may be assured that security risks and subversives are not operating within the walls of the Government and within the Government agencies.

Mr. President, this is a matter which touches the roots of our existence. America is not only in a hot war, but is very much in a cold war. Our men are dying, and we prepare, through the appropriation of billions of dollars—and we are asking $70,000,000,000—to save our material wealth and our lives. But what are we doing to save the internal structure and the ideals which are America? If, through internal penetration and subversion, we lose this structure and the ideals that we have, the walls of this Chamber will be but stones. It is a matter of what the principles stand for inside—of what we stand for on principle, inside. It is a matter of ideals. It is the recognition of the inalienable rights of the people, of government by consent of the governed. Those are the things concerned in the prevention of a conspiracy to overthrow that which is sacred to all of us.

Are we, or are we not, going to do the necessary job of internal defense? That is the question. The jury in the case of the people versus Remington has told us how little we have done in that first line of defense in the recent past.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. Is the distinguished Senator from Michigan aware of the fact that a Thomas Blaisdell, Assistant Secretary of the Department of Commerce, defended Remington, Michael Lee, and several other characters of that ilk, who have later been either convicted or fired from their jobs?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes, I am familiar with that.

Mr. MALONE. Does the Senator know where Mr. Blaisdell is at this time, after having resigned from the Department of Commerce? The Senator probably suspects that we are gathering evidence from him.

Mr. FERGUSON. I saw in the press that he was employed as a professor; I think, as a professor of political science, in a university; which I think was in the State of California.

Mr. MALONE. The University of California. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, Mr. Blaisdell is, I am advised, adviser on international relations; which, of course, enables him to continue his work in the great State of California.

If the Senator will yield further, I should like to ask whether he is familiar with the work of Mr. Gladieux who, I believe, was assistant to the Secretary of Commerce, and whether he knows where Mr. Gladieux is now?

Mr. FERGUSON. The name does not strike a responsive chord. I am afraid I am not familiar with it.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. Gladieux resigned, because there was a direct connection with Communists, apparently; at least we thought there was, and we are still working on it—and he is now with the Ford Foundation, I am informed. These men continue their work, even after they become disconnected with the Government.

I should like to ask the Senator, again, whether he is familiar with the resolution, S. Res. 230, introduced by the junior Senator from Nevada, following disclosures by the distinguished Senator from Michigan, and whether he is familiar with the discharge of Mr. Remington and Mr. Michael Lee, following an investigation conducted by the Commerce Committee. The junior Senator from Nevada had offered a resolution on the floor of the Senate and asked that a committee be appointed to investigate the loyalty and general work of employees of the Department of Commerce.

Following all those disclosures, and the firing of these two characters, one—Remington—quit immediately, but Mr. Lee hung on. He, at first, had been held to be not actually disloyal. This was prior to the time of the hearing conducted by the Commerce Committee. But he was held to be a dangerous security risk. The junior Senator from Nevada was aware of that when he was questioning him. But Lee refused to resign. Remington resigned, after Mr. Sawyer fired him. He was almost immediately indicted, and now, as the distinguished Senator has outlined so ably, he has been convicted.

Is the distinguished Senator from Michigan aware that before Secretary Sawyer finally fired Mr. Lee he cleared him of any charges of disloyalty, despite the fact that he had been found actually disloyal by the Loyalty Board of the Department of Commerce, and therefore, as the distinguished Senator has explained, Mr. Lee could go back to work at his old job, if any Department of Commerce head saw fit to hire him? There is nothing on his record; he has been cleared of all such charges. Is the Senator aware of that?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am only familiar with it from reading the press. Naturally, I did not follow it as closely as did the Senator from Nevada, because he was greatly interested in the Lee case and has followed it.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. I think it may be well to complete the RECORD regarding Remington. I hold in my hand the latest dispatches which show that Judge Gregory F. Noonan, before whom the case was tried, this afternoon sentenced Mr. William W. Remington to the maximum sentence possible for his crime, namely, 5 years imprisonment and a $2,000 fine. I think it is gratifying that the judge at least has recognized the enormity of this situation.

What interested me was the point made by the Senator from Michigan as to the position Remington had occupied as chairman of the Export Control Board. I should like to call the Senator's attention, in that connection, to the testimony of General Marshall before our committee, that there was an embargo for 10 months on the shipment of the matériel to the Chinese Nationalists; that thereafter the embargo was lifted; but General Marshall said that for 10 months thereafter it proved impractical to resume ship-

ments. Apparently Mr. Remington was a key to the situation. In other words, the downfall of the Nationalists apparently was contributed to in no small measure by the manipulations of this man which were made possible, and our boys are paying the price and the penalty for it today. That is the long reach of the activities of a man who finally, after this long time, stands convicted.

I hold in my hand the record of hearings on the nomination of Thomas C. Blaisdell, Jr., to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce, when some of us, on February 23 and March 22, 1949, seriously questioned Mr. Blaisdell about Mr. Remington, and when Mr. Blaisdell defended Mr. Remington. I have here the statement by Mr. Blaisdell when he was defending Mr. Remington. He said he was a nice fellow, he had known him, and he was all right. I asked Blaisdell whether Remington had not misled him in getting a job. He said he did not think he had; he thought he was all right. So I read now the very question of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] quizzing Mr. Remington in this other hearing, which is found on page 22 of the hearing:

Mr. FERGUSON. Now do I understand today that you want to leave this with the committee, that you in effect misled Blaisdell on not having knowledge of certain facts, that you stated it in such a way as to conceal certain facts?

Mr. Remington—and I think this does him some credit—admitted to me as follows:

I now believe that I misled him.

The thing that intrigues me is that, although Remington admitted to the Senator from Michigan that he had testified that his superior, Mr. Blaisdell, when he was getting his job, was defending him saying he was just an innocent young boy, yet Remington was considered a suitable man to carry out a tremendous responsibility.

I notice that the Senator from Nevada in his statement of March 1950, when we were still trying to get consideration in the matter, stated that it was not a "red herring." The Senator from Nevada pointed out that when an investigation is made, the investigators will run into some curious phenomena. For instance, Assistant Secretary of Commerce Thomas Blaisdell, a protégé of Henry Wallace, has been defending Michael Lee; he also defended William Remington. Remington, it will be recalled, admitted cooperating with Elizabeth T. Bentley, a confessed Soviet spy.

Blaisdell seems to have had Remington with him in the National Resources Planning Board, the War Production Board, the Naval Intelligence in London, and the Department of Commerce. I now understand that Remington is back in the Commerce Department, but supposedly carefully kept away from the "sensitive" jobs.

I admit, as the Senator from Michigan has pointed out, that we receive a little more cooperation from the executive departments than we get from the top. The Secretary of Commerce was before us, and he testified that he had not been informed about it. He said, "I did not know of this." He was asked, "Who is responsible for not knowing about it? Now that you know about it, what are you going to do?"

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I pointed out that it is absolutely true that after Congress gets the grand jury to recognize the facts and to indict a man for perjury in connection with his relation and his activities in the Government, the Department of Justice is able to obtain evidence and get a conviction beyond a reasonable doubt. But think of it: It was possible to convict this man Remington in a court of justice beyond a reasonable doubt—not an imaginary doubt, but a reasonable doubt. Yet he was cleared of disloyalty charges before a mere executive board.

Mr. BREWSTER. And the department for which he worked could find no reason to dismiss him.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. Blaisdell resigned from the Department of Commerce a few days before Remington went on trial, knowing, I assume, that he was going to defend him. He probably decided that it was time to get out. We know Lee's record: we know Remington's record. He is a convicted felon. We know the record of Gladieux, who was connected with the Ford Foundation. How much more there is in that case Senators can check——

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

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. The junior Senator from Nevada pointed out that Mr. Gladieux was Assistant to the Secretary of Commerce, and presumably, though there is no valid proof, because the evidence had not reached the Secretary, according to his statement, it was assumed by everyone that Mr. Gladieux was involved. He claimed to be innocent of the whole thing. Mr. Whitney, if he were so inclined, could blow the lid off a great many of these things.

Mr. BREWSTER. In his resignation I think he made it quite clear that the reasons for quitting were good and sufficient. I refer to Mr. Whitney.

Mr. MALONE. At the time the junior Senator from Nevada made his statement on the floor and asked for a committee to investigate the subject, there must have been someone in the gallery who attended to it—it could not have been done in any other way—for an evening newspaper carried the usual denial and stated that he had been cleared of the charges.

Mr. Macy's testimony in the hearings on Senate Resolution 230 on March 28 to April 4, 1950, admitted that he was in error in saying that notwithstanding the junior Senator from Nevada, although he did not disclose it at that moment, had definite information that while Mr. Lee had not been convicted of absolute disloyalty, the recommendation was made that he was a poor security risk. So the junior Senator from Nevada asked that he be sworn as all other witnesses were sworn. If he had stated under oath that he was cleared, we would have had Mr. Macy, and if he had admitted it, we would have had Mr. Lee. It was one or the other.

Mr. FERGUSON. I think the whole question is one of security.

Mr. BREWSTER. And they know it.

Mr. FERGUSON. But they will not apply any rules or regulations to oust persons as being bad security risks. They fix it so that it must be found at the time of the trial that he is a disloyal person.

In other words, he must be actually an espionage agent and disloyal at the moment he is being tried. Under their interpretation, before a person can be ousted it must be shown that at the time of the trial he is disloyal. That is not a security test. Just think of a program being sold to the people as protecting their security under an Executive order reading as this Executive order is now interpreted to read.

If the President of the United States thinks the proper interpretation of his order is not being made, why has he not corrected it? He could do so simply by changing his order, or by removing his Board if he thought its interpretation of his order was not correct.

While the Remington trial was in progress, Arthur Krock wrote an article which I placed in the RECORD showing clearly the basis on which the Loyalty Board interprets its functions and the scope of its authority. Not one thing has been done about it by the President, who has the final responsibility for the loyalty program he initiated.

Mr. BREWSTER. Would the Senator expect that the investigations by committees would be characterized as asinine by those persons in high authority in the executive department?

Mr. FERGUSON. The committees were trying to render a service to the people of the United States. I take it that the words "red herring" and "asinine" are really one and the same. I understand the President did describe a committee report today as being asinine.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. I should like to say that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce was kind enough to ask the junior Senator from Nevada to sit with the committee. We asked for the minutes of an executive session of the Loyalty Board in reference to the hearings on Mr. Lee. Mr. Blaisdell said that by order of the President, he had to refuse. All they needed to do, in order to save the time of the Senate and of other agencies which were working on the case, was simply to lay the minutes of the Board before the committee. But, by order of the President, they were withheld.

I should like to read into the RECORD a short paragraph to show the distinguished Senator from Michigan further supporting evidence that he is exactly correct.

Senator BRICKER. That is right—personal characteristics as well as his ability.

In other words, had he been examined before he had been hired.

Mr. BLAISDELL. Correct, sir. And a review of this man by the Department, as I say, the Secretary of Commerce himself has found that Mr. Lee, to the best of our knowledge and on the basis of all the information we have been able to secure, is competent, able, and loyal and has done his job properly.

Mr. President, I wish to point out to the distinguished Senator from Michigan that at that moment the Loyalty Board of the Department of Commerce had held this man to be a poor security risk.

Mr. FERGUSON. I thank the Senator for his comment. I yield the floor.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, it seems that it is almost necessary for a person to have been investigated at least once for treason to his Government, or at least suspected of disloyalty, to be recommended for appointment to high position in the Government.

THE CASE OF HARRY RUSSELL, CITED FOR CONTEMPT

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, during the past few days several of my distinguished colleagues have expressed their views concerning the opinion of Judge Letts in the contempt case against Harry Russell, which was decided on Monday, February 5. Harry Russell was a very reluctant witness before the Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce. Russell refused to answer a great many questions pertaining very directly to the work of the committee. The Senate had cited Harry Russell for contempt because of his failure to cooperate with the committee, and the office of the United States attorney of the District of Columbia quickly prosecuted the case with vigor. Mr. Fay, the United States district attorney for the District of Columbia, presented the case immediately to the grand jury, and Russell was indicted on some sixty-odd counts. The case before Judge Letts was handled on behalf of the Government by William Hitz, assistant district attorney for the District of Columbia, and it was handled very well indeed. The case was fully presented and well argued by Mr. Hitz on behalf of the Government. Mr. Fay has stated that similar cases which are pending before him will go forward. We are very glad to note that he does not feel the decision of Judge Letts is any more than the opinion of one district court judge, and that it is not binding as to the action that should be taken in the other cases.

Judge Letts granted Harry Russell's motion for a judgment of acquittal, and this result is not appealable. If it were appealable, I am satisfied that the Supreme Court would reverse Judge Letts, because in my opinion he extended the rule of the Blau case beyond logical reason. The opinion in the Russell case by Judge Letts, in the judgment of the Senator from Tennessee, merely stands as the opinion of one district court judge. I think the opinion of Judge Letts is clearly in error under all the decisions of the Supreme Court, including the Blau case.

As I have publicly stated, I do not believe that the decision in the Russell case should be considered a precedent which would result in the acquittal of other persons cited for contempt of the Senate or the House of Representatives. Each case, in my opinion, must be judged on its own merits and on the basis of the particular facts involved.

My view is, in part, based upon a reading of certain portions of the court's decision which appear to relate to matters of opinion and observation, as distinguished from an application of principles of law. In this respect, I have in mind the portion of the opinion wherein the court, after referring to the background of the committee, the resolution of the Senate authorizing the committee, and an interim report of the committee, stated that all these matters were pertinent to Harry Russell's state of mind at the time when he refused to testify.

The judge said:

In all probability, he had in mind the purpose of the investigation and the trend it had taken. He must have had in mind that the committee regarded him as a big shot in interstate gambling activities. He may well have concluded from the initial questions propounded to him that the committee was unfriendly to him and hostile to him. He may have become alarmed at the manner of the committee's approach. Surely that approach was not patterned to put him at ease.

The court thinks he had reasonable grounds for his apprehension. Certainly this is true if the suspicions entertained by the committee were justified, and the court thinks in all likelihood this defendant knew of the suspicions so entertained by the committee.

In all fairness I do not believe that every judge hearing other contempt cases would find that a resolution of the Senate and an attitude of a Senate committee must be so kind and conciliatory as to put all witnesses at ease.

In investigative hearings a majority of the witnesses appearing before a Senate committee are unfriendly. Is Congress to be deprived of its necessary investigative function because it is unable to put a witness at ease when he appears before a Senate committee? The investigative function is a very vital part of the work of the House of Representatives and the United States Senate. I may say that if this opinion were the law, which I do not think it is, the carrying out of such investigative work by Senate and House committees would be greatly, unfairly, and improperly impeded, because if we must meet the requirement of putting a witness at ease and not show a hostile attitude, then of course we would be prevented from eliciting information from many witnesses. As a matter of fact we know that some of the most valuable information is secured from unfriendly witnesses. If a witness can merely refuse to answer, among other reasons, because the committee does not feel kindly to him, or does not put him at his ease, of course Senate and House committees are at a great disadvantage.

I cannot conceive of the result which the court apparently envisions, namely, that the Senate must divorce itself in the course of the conduct of hearings from any unfriendly thoughts concerning witnesses that might appear before it. Each one of us knows of some witness or other who has appeared before a Senate committee toward whom he could not feel friendly.

As a matter of fact, our committee had every reason to believe on the basis of testimony and of investigation that Harry Russell was intimately connected with the Capone outfit. Furthermore, it appeared that Russell had in some fashion muscled his way into the S. & G. syndicate which controlled bookmaking in the Miami area. With all this knowledge, we tried to give Russell the fairest of hearings. Actually, when Russell first appeared and stated that he had not consulted an attorney as to his rights, we put his hearing over to another day in order to give him the fullest opportunity to consult a lawyer. Nevertheless, when Russell appeared the second time, he appeared without counsel and made no effort to reciprocate the cooperative attitude of our committee.

I wish to point out—and Judge Letts would have done well in my opinion to have at least taken notice of it—that after the hearing was postponed for several days in order to enable Mr. Russell to engage counsel, he stated, on his return that he did not want counsel although he had consulted an attorney, and that the attorney had stated the law and his privileges to him exactly as the chairman of the special committee had done during the previous hearing.

Certainly these facts would show that in Russell's case, as in all other cases, the committee has made every effort to be fair to the witnesses. Of course, the persons whom we ask to testify are very often those whom we suspect of being intimately connected with organized crime in interstate commerce. We do not approach the hearings without some knowledge of the facts and, therefore, we must have suspicions and feelings toward those persons who are the big shots in the criminal world.

Another reason for my view that the Russell decision will not be binding on other cases of contempt and that such cases will have to stand on their own facts and merits is the fact that our courts have created a line of decisions which may be read as permitting many questions of the type that we asked Harry Russell.

I have in mind a line of cases beginning with Mason against United States which was decided by the Supreme Court in 1917. That was a case in which a witness before a Federal grand jury was compelled to state whether he saw a game of cards being played at his own table in Alaska where, under Federal laws, the playing of cards for money was a crime.

Since the Mason case, we have had Camarota against United States decided by the Third Circuit Court of Appeals in 1940. In that case, a witness was required to answer questions relating to the sale of wire service to bookies, even though subsequent answers might incriminate him as to Federal income-tax statutes. Harry Russell was asked many

easier questions than those involved in the two cases I have discussed, but in some instances he declined to answer questions relating to whether he knew people or whether he had ever met people, whether during a certain time he had ever been in Miami Beach, whether he had ever consulted a lawyer, and many other questions of that kind. Certainly, such questions would not, nor the answers thereto, incriminate a person under the Federal statutes, for I know of no Federal law which makes it a crime to know a person with a criminal record. Some of the persons about whom we asked him did not have criminal records. I do not know of any crime of which he could have been guilty by reason of having been in a certain place or in a certain section, because certainly a citizen of this country has a right to go anywhere he wishes.

I could go on at this point to cite a great many more cases which have held that questions such as those asked of Harry Russell must be answered. I believe it is unnecessary to do so at this time. However, I did want to take this opportunity to point out that legal precedents exist which might very well be observed in other jurisdictions and by other judges before whom contempt cases are brought.

I might add that the recent Blau case—the Communist case—decided by the Supreme Court does not appear to apply to Harry Russell's case and might not apply in other cases because Harry Russell himself indicated that he did not really fear a Federal prosecution as is shown in his own words when he said to the committee: "I don't think, Senator, that I have committed any crime."

In all these cases the refusal to testify was on the ground that it might incriminate the witness. The refusal must relate to some definite fear, something which is real. It cannot be a mere fantasy or a possibility. Furthermore, under other decisions of the Supreme Court, it cannot be the fear of prosecution under a State law. With respect to many of the questions asked Harry Russell, refusal to answer could be based only upon a fantasy or a fear very far removed from any possibility of the answer incriminating him.

Mr. President, I say that if congressional committees are to have any power at all to obtain information from witnesses, the rule laid down by Judge Letts cannot be a sound rule of law. Certainly if a person has a real fear, and if his answer might really incriminate him in connection with some Federal offense, under the fifth amendment he has the right to decline to answer; and that is as it should be. But to allow a person to refuse to answer merely because he has some faint and fantastic idea that a question might incriminate him or might be a link in a chain which might incriminate him, when he will not even specify the Federal statute or law which he has in mind, would be taking away from congressional committees a very necessary power to compel witnesses to testify in order to obtain information which investigating committees must have.

I wish it understood that I have full respect for our judicial authorities. I never like to make any criticism of any judge's opinion. We all have our own opinions. Various judges have different opinions. However, I felt that I must take this occasion to point out that certain factors which Judge Letts found to be so important in the Russell case would not necessarily appear so important to another judge hearing a case of alleged contempt against the Senate.

I wish also to point out that in my opinion Judge Letts' decision does not follow the decision of the Supreme Court in the Blau case and other decisions of the Supreme Court. In order for a witness to refuse to testify on the basis of the fifth amendment to the Constitution, there must be a real fear that his testimony would incriminate him, and it must be in connection with some Federal statute which he has in mind. He may not refuse to testify merely because the committee is unfriendly to him, or because he has some unreal, remote, fantastic idea that his answer might lead to some chain of events which would incriminate him.

The matter has been fully discussed with members of the special committee. We feel that it is our responsibility to bring to the attention of the Senate recommendations for contempt proceedings against witnesses who refuse to answer questions which we feel are pertinent, when no showing is made that the answers to the questions might incriminate them. We feel that there will be different results before other district judges in the cases which will be presented to them.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. McFARLAND. I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 18 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, February 12, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 8 (legislative day of January 29), 1951:

BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

F. Joseph Donohue, of the District of Columbia, to be a Commissioner of the District of Columbia for a term of 3 years and until his successor is appointed and qualified, vice Guy Mason.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE

George G. Jeck, of Atlantic, Iowa, to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Iowa, to fill an existing vacancy.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Hon. Charles J. McNamee, of Ohio, to be United States district judge for the northern district of Ohio, vice Hon. Robert N. Wilkin, retired.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Thomas E. Fairchild, of Wisconsin, to be United States attorney for the western district of Wisconsin, vice Charles H. Cashin, resigned.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

Edgar W. Scarborough, of Florida, to be United States marshal for the northern district of Florida, vice Jordan B. Royall, deceased.

William Quillen Treseder, of Utah, to be United States marshal for the district of Utah, vice Gilbert Mecham, retired.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named midshipmen (aviation) to be ensigns in the Navy from the 5th day of June 1951:

Wallace A. Burgess	Thomas D. Lewis
Eugene B. Conrad	Ralph A. McCroskey
Valleau E. Curtis	John DaC. Meyer
Gresham G. Downs	Donald A. Miller
Walter A. Ellinghausen, Jr.	John M. Neel
	Charles P. Pressly III
Clarence Erkelens	Gilbert D. Saul
John R. Gunderson	Thomas B. Smiley, Jr.
Arthur D. Jessen	Stephen D. Stevning
John M. Key	Jerry "D" Wolfe
Edward D. Kuball	

The following-named (Naval ROTC) to be ensigns in the Navy from the 5th day of June 1951:

Charles L. Cotter	Robert E. Hodgson, Jr.
Roland S. Dick, Jr.	Joseph A. Juhlin, Jr.
Paul C. Gaertner, Jr.	Arthur G. O. Roe
Frank U. Garrard III	Robert L. Sheppard, Jr.
Jack T. Hamilton	James L. Thwing

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy (special duty officers):

Joseph R. Geraud	Robert H. Nicholson
Harold Hoag	Franklin E. Porter
Paul R. Kramer	Edwin P. Preston
Charles E. McDowell	James M. Wallace, Jr.
David W. Miller	James D. Wilder

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to the grades indicated in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANT COMMANDERS

James K. Cunningham.
Halvdan G. K. Faaland.
Charles P. Root.

LIEUTENANT

James A. McLaughlin.

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

Luther W. Brady, Jr.	James B. Lynch
William R. Daniel	Thomas G. Lyons
Robert L. Davis	Kenneth W. Meinert
Seldon C. Dunn	George W. St. C. Moore
John E. Gill	Robert G. Reaves, Jr.
David Gillette	George W. Thoma, Jr.
Theodore C. Hooker	Edgar E. Thomas, Jr.
Gilbert M. Kinzer.	Earl A. Thompson

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Chaplain Corps of the Navy:

John P. Byrnes	John L. Moran, Jr.
Samuel R. Hardman	Harlin E. Tillberg
Lucian C. Mattiello	James H. Veary
Don M. Michael	

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to the grades indicated in the Dental Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANT

Thomas H. Mayo.

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Earl R. Williams.

The following-named to be ensigns in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

Addie E. Baker	Thedia A. Michael
Elizabeth A. Bispham	Henrietta A. Mulhollan
Helen J. Black	Rose A. Pachiano
Betty A. Gibson	Jane M. Parrick
Lola M. Green	Edla M. Plosila
Doris E. Marsch	Angelina T. Pommier
Lucille A. Matchus	Anna C. Read
Millicent E. Merrick	Ellen G. Warren

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANTS

Doris F. Bentley	Josephine E. McCarthy
Arline W. Harding	Clara T. Szczypin
Edythe A. Head	

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Frances J. Jacobson.

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Line of the Navy, for Limited Duty Only, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LIEUTENANT COMMANDERS

Albert L. Ballard
Edward H. Bayers
Louis E. Biechlin
Joe M. Danielski
Edward M. Doran
Harold C. Gabriel
Carll T. Gleason
Eldon L. Guhl
Harry A. Guthrie
Clarence C. Hawk
Marion H. Hawkins
Stanley J. Lewandowski
LeRoy Loewer
James R. McKenzie, Jr.
Robert E. Mansard
Kenneth A. Mundy
Rollin M. Reed
Victor A. Schmalfeldt
Horace D. Schultz
William E. Taylor
George S. Watson
Ephraim R. Weaver
Juston W. West

LIEUTENANTS

Thomas E. Acton
William F. Adams
John C. Arthur
Dwight F. Asmus
Thomas E. Bager
John W. Barden
George R. Becker
Henry F. Berck
Alvin C. Bergquist
Joseph Buehlman
Silas M. Blakely
Harold B. Boaz
Alfred V. Boutin
Jim W. Bryson
Donald F. Byers
Don M. Cameron
Allan R. Carlson
Evan M. Chanik
Homer W. Chellew
Jack G. Churchill
William T. Coulson
James D'A. Dodge
Gordon B. Dosskey
Ivan H. Douglas
Harold M. Dubree
Jesse W. Dunwoody
Robert J. Erickson
Leon S. Ertle
Marion S. Evans
Eudore A. Forcier
Laron S. Franklin
William E. Fuller
Ned A. Gardner
John G. Gillissie
John Greksouk
Lyle T. Griffis
Truman F. Grubl
Harry D. Hall
Russel L. Hendrickson
Frederick J. Hicken
Glenn W. Holmes
Leo T. Howard
Paul E. Huffman
Clayton F. Johnson
Harvey B. Jones
Gaddis G. McKee
Richard R. Matthews
Johnnie E. Mattis
Bernard A. Middleton
Edward C. Miller
Joseph F. Miller
LaVern C. Moore
LeRoy Perkins
George W. Perrin
James E. Plowden
Aquilino L. Ponciroli
Robert R. Ragsdale
Elsworth C. Reynolds
Chesley W. Richey
Meredith C. Riddle
William H. Robb
Donald E. Runyon
Walter Schauer
Ray W. Seiwert
John R. Shannon
Paul A. Smith
Russel D. Smith
Will L. Stalnaker
Robert B. Stickles
Ralph C. Thomas
James L. Thompson
Joseph B. Tiara
John S. Walden
Frank W. Warrick
Walter R. Watkins
Boyce St. C. Webb
Robert E. Wheeler
Paul H. Williams

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

George A. Ales
William G. Bigony
Rudolph M. Buselmeier
Howard W. Carr
Albert F. Christener
Craig McD. Coley
Fred W. Davenport
Claude L. Dickerson
Telofil Dmoch
Donald D. Dunton
Eugene R. Forsht
Herbert A. Franck
Donald Gaither
Claude E. Hale
William F. Harris
Claude J. Hinds, Jr.
Paul A. Hunt
Charles E. Johnson, Jr.
Gordon W. Jones
Charles E. Landahl
Allan E. McArthur
Charles H. McMakin, Jr.
William R. Morgan
Lawrence O. Nasset
Eugene A. O'Brien
Ross Peters
Lewis J. Polansky
Charles W. Postlethwaite
Wilbur E. Reed
Linus H. Schuh
Harold J. Shapard
Robert A. Stahl

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Supply Corps of the Navy, for limited duty only, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LIEUTENANTS

Andrew F. Bevill
Kenneth P. Dehart
Eddie M. Johnson
Edmund J. Prosch
William R. Whitney
Clarence R. Wright

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

Robert L. Jones
Don C. Mandeville
Raymond H. Stutheit
Joseph H. Tetrault

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy, for limited duty only, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LIEUTENANT

Harlan L. Bowman

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Justin D. Denman

IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers of the Navy for permanent appointment to the grade of lieutenant (junior grade) in the corps indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Line

Paul F. Abel
Carolyn E. Abrams
William Abromitis, Jr.
Richard C. Adams
William K. Adams
Francis J. Alberto
Thomas E. Alexander
Frank J. Alfonso
Richard L. Alford
Benjamin G. Allen
Hoyt E. Allen
Richard P. Allen
Robert C. Allen
Walter L. Alt
Gordon A. Anderson
Ralph L. Anderson
Roy C. Anderson
Jack F. Andrus
Robert P. Armstrong
William S. M. Arnold
James J. Ashford
Carl B. Austin
John D. Austin
Edward M. Axtell, Jr.
William R. Ayers
Joseph F. Bachman
Homer D. Bailey
Donald R. Baird
Daniel Balish
William R. Ball, Jr.
David P. Barker
Warren W. Barker
William H. Barnes 3d
Max D. Barr
Russell Bartmes, Jr.
William H. Barton, Jr.
William R. Bartow
George M. Bates
Richard W. Bates
Joseph R. Bavle
John A. Bayers
David A. Beadling
Francis T. Bean
Richard L. Beatty
Jerry T. Becker
Donald R. Behrens
Harry E. Belflower, Jr.
Gregory M. Bell, Jr.
James R. Bell
Richard M. Bellinger
Manuel A. Benero, Jr.
Syd "A" Bennett
Archie E. Benton
Herbert P. Benton III
Robert E. Berggren
Rex R. Berglund
Kenneth L. Bernstein
Harry E. Betts
Benjamin W. Bevis
Oral J. Bilderback
Patrick P. Billingsley
John H. Bilkey
Louis Bilyk
Stanley W. Birch, Jr.
Carl Birdwell, Jr.
Arthur C. Black
Carl E. Blaes
Douglas I. Biancheri
Walter T. Blakney
Edith M. Blauvelt
Floyd H. Blizard
Robert P. Blount, Jr.
Richard V. Bodmer
Tudor M. Bogart
Charles D. Bolan
Louis J. Boland
Philip H. Bolger
Herbert L. Bondurant, Jr.
Raymond J. Borntraeger
Eugene H. Bouslog
Eugene S. Bowers
Franklin L. Bowersox
Richard C. Boyd
Keith D. Boyer
Claiborne S. Bradley
Richmond D. Brannen
William J. Brantley
Joseph J. Braun
Cullen D. Bray
Martin F. Bremus
Ernest M. Brides
Kenneth B. Brisco
Francis E. Brooks
William N. Brock, Jr.
Charles H. Brown
Charles O. Brown
Eldon W. Brown, Jr.
George Brown
Oliver F. Brown
Ralph W. Brown, Jr.
Woolson S. Brown
Stuart M. Brownell
John M. Brozena
James S. Brunson
James D. Bryan, Jr.
Paul G. Bryant
Douglas P. Buchanan
Beaumont M. Buck
Robert G. Buechler
Stanley H. Bueg
Norwood W. Bullington, Jr.
Clarence V. Burch, Jr.
Ernest Burks, Jr.
Kenneth A. Burrows
Roger T. Burson
Ronald S. Burton
James E. Callahan, Jr.
David W. Carey, Jr.
Earl C. Carpenter Jr.
Ramon L. Carpenter
Charles C. Carter, Jr.
Rodney B. Carter
Ernest C. Castle
Nicholas A. Castruccio
Samuel F. Catterlin
John D. Caylor
Horace B. Chambers, Jr.
William D. Chandler III
Edwin M. Chapline
Roger A. Chapman
Adrian E. Chavannes
Thomas P. Cheesman
Robert S. Chew, Jr.
Michael L. Childress
William T. Chipman, Jr.
Eugene R. Christie
Robert G. Claitor
James V. Clampet
Graham S. Clark
Wyndham S. Clark, Jr.
Richard J. Clas
John G. Clifford
John D. Clithero
Richard A. Cochran
Joseph E. Codemo
James N. Comerford
Jack H. Conable
William E. Conniff, Jr.
Robert C. Conolly 2d
Albert E. Conord
Joseph E. Coogan
Murray C. Cook
Patricia Cook
Charles P. Coulter
Jack Cowden
Richard S. Coy
Virginia Craig
Richard H. Crangle
John M. Cravens, Jr.
Catherine M. Crombie
Edward J. Cronin
Howard S. Crosby
James S. Crosby, Jr.
Vernon L. Crow
Samuel R. Crowell
Stewart P. Crowell, Jr.
John R. Crumpton, Jr.
Thomas W. Cuddy
Daniel W. Cullivan
Robert J. Cutler
Bradley L. Daley
Bennie V. Damberg
Donald H. Dansby
James E. Davenport, Jr.
John M. Davis
Charles Dearmond
John DeGoede
Daniel T. Deibler
Leonard V. Delling
Walter M. DeLoach
Richard N. DeMun
Dean D. DeWitt
James B. Dick, Jr.
Kenneth S. Dick
Joseph C. Diedrich
Henry C. Dinger, Jr.
Edward S. Disbrow, Jr.
George W. Dittmann
William D. Dittmar
Lewis L. Dobbs
Henry H. Dodd
Genevieve E. Doherty
Anthony Dombroski
William K. Donnell
Mary E. Donnelly
Claude E. Dorris
Laurens Dorsey
Benjamin S. Dowd, Jr.
William E. Dozier
Richard W. Duerner
Norman L. Dunbar
Norman L. Duncan
Richard T. Duncan, Jr.
Robert D. Duncan
Alex R. Dunn, Jr.
John C. Dunn
James W. Dupree, Jr.
Frederick L. Eareckson, Jr.
Walter M. Earley, Jr.
William F. Easterlin, Jr.
Rex C. Eaton, Jr.
Gerald C. Edwards
Donald L. Egger
Frank N. Eklund, Jr.
Dewey A. Ellis, Jr.
Robert T. Ellsworth, Jr.
Lowell E. Elmore
Gordon R. Engel
Joseph T. Erk
Leland F. Estes
Delmar H. Evans, Jr.
William A. Evans
John Evasovich
John L. Everngam, Jr.
Dorothy J. Eyler
Emil M. Eyler
Alvin K. Fentress
Andrew C. Ferguson
Reginald G. Ferrel
Robert L. Field
Ernest D. Fife
William R. Fisher, Jr.
Donald T. Fitzgerald
Michael J. J. Fleming
Edward B. Fleming
John A. Fletcher 2d
Francis C. Fogarty
James A. Forsyth
Kenneth D. Fosnaught
Fredrick L. Foster
Donald D. Foulds
Benjamin B. Fowke
Alfred N. Fowler
James H. Foxgrover
Andrew L. Frahler
Fred A. W. Franke, Jr.
Ian N. Fraser
William F. Fraser
Jack M. Fretwell
Max G. Freudenberg
Edward Frothingham, Jr.
Wallace S. Gabriel
John P. Gaffigan
Stanton B. Garner
Herbert K. Gates, Jr.
Sidney W. Gaylord, Jr.
Alvin E. Geist
William E. Gildow
Claude F. Giles
William V. Gillen
Donald A. Gillham
Frank C. Gilmore
John G. Gilyard
Gordon B. Gish
Philip C. Gliem
William F. Goodman
George E. Goodwin
Ralph T. Goodwin, Jr.
Raymond I. Gornik
Jack L. Gracey
Morris R. Grady
Richard L. Graham
Warren C. Graham, Jr.
Frederick H. Gralow
John A. Grauer
Ernest J. Gray
Richard Green
James C. Greer
Waldo D. Groom
Louis M. Guerrieri
Richard C. Guess
Roy V. Gunther
Harold Gurman
Edwin K. Hacker
Thomas F. Hahn
Charles R. Hall
Donald B. Hall
Joseph F. Hall
Preston D. Hall
Robert Hall
Robert W. Hall
Norman L. Halladay
Albert B. Hallman
David R. Hamlin
Robert W. Hanby, Jr.
Russell L. Handy, Jr.
Kevin Hanlon
Charles R. Hannum
Arthur W. Hanton
Charles Z. Hanus
Chester J. Hardenburg, Jr.
Joe W. Hargrove
Edgar W. Harlan
Robert J. Harlow
Jean F. Harrington
Elwin R. Harris

Harley S. Harris, Jr.
Wade H. Harris
David L. Hartshorn
Arthur R. Hasler, Jr.
Charles E. Hathaway
Douglas B. Hatmaker
Stanley R. Hawe
Edward A. Hawks, Jr.
Edward B. Hebden
Leonard M. Hendrix
Robert F. Henning
Albert G. Henry, Jr.
James E. Henry
William J. Hepburn
William M. Hepburn, Jr.
John D. Herlihy, Jr.
John G. Herndon
Walter J. Hester
Harry C. Hiatt, Jr.
Alvin S. Hibbs
Lester N. Hill
Rowland P. Hill
Robert P. Hilton
Charles W. Hines
Katherine J. Hinman
William R. Hintz
Richard B. Hodson
Roy L. Hoffmann
Leslie C. Hofto
Hugh S. Holder
Leland A. Holdren
Frederick W. Holler, Jr.
Dorothy V. Holliday
William W. Holm
Dudley Holstein
Matthew V. Hoover
Thomas M. Hopkins
John E. Horan, Jr.
Kenneth A. Horn
John L. Hotes
Lee S. Houchins
Roy A. Howard, Jr.
Claude C. Howell
Floyd E. Hower, Jr.
Donald Hubbard
Harry E. Hunt
Robert D. Huntington, Jr.
Robert E. Huntzinger
David A. Hurt, Jr.
Karl H. Huss, Jr.
William G. Ikard 2d
Richard W. Illgen
James M. Ivey, Jr.
Edward D. Jackson, Jr.
Elmer E. Jackson
Frederick D. Jackson, Jr.
John G. W. Jackson
Eldon A. Jacobs
John W. James
Alan L. Jansen
Robert L. Jasmin
Rollin E. Jeffries, Jr.
James F. Jenista
John L. Jensen, Jr.
Ronald H. Jermstad
Francis C. Johnson
Henry B. Johnson
Jack K. Johnson
Constance L. Jones
Edward G. Jones
Harry L. Jones
Howard W. Jones
Henry F. Kaiser
Robert C. Kaiser
William A. Kanakanui, Jr.
Howard N. Kay
Jack C. Kays
John R. Kearney
Robert G. Keller
Bruce E. Kelley
Roger W. Kelly
Kenneth Kelty
James H. Kendall 2d
Robert E. Kenyon
William H. Kernan
Harry N. Key, Jr.
Thomas F. Kilduff, Jr.
Neal Kincannon
Robert E. King
James W. Kissick, Jr.
Joseph E. Klause
Herbert S. Kline
John W. Klinefelter
Ralph C. Knight
Harold F. Knudsen
Robert A. Komoroff
Edward L. Korb
Francis P. Koval
Albert J. Kralik
Earl R. Krieger
Louis Kriser
John Kriss
Hugh C. Kuhlman
Roderick J. Kulus
Frederick R. Lafferty, Jr.
Arthur Landis, Jr.
Charles M. Lane
William N. Langone
Charles H. Langton
William J. Laubendorfer
Jason P. Law
Paul D. Lawler
William A. Lebert
Robert L. Lee, Jr.
William W. Lee, Jr.
John F. Leicester III
Edwin M. Leidholdt
Alexander Lennox, Jr.
Albert P. Lesperance
Edgar S. Levy, Jr.
Richard E. Lewis
William W. Lewis, Jr.
James E. Liles
Mary J. Linderman
Sara J. Lloyd
Aubrey L. Loeffler
Hubert B. Loheed
Richard L. Lombard
James H. Longworth
Thomas A. Loomis
Warren W. Lord
Albert F. Lovata
John R. Lowdenslager
Charles A. Luff, Jr.
Robert B. Luzader
Robert B. Lyle
Albert C. MacDonald
Stuart C. MacIntire
William E. Madden
William D. Mallinger
Thomas E. Maloney
Richard E. Mankus
Charles W. Mann
Earl Mann
John C. Mape
Arthur L. Markel
Walter G. Markham
Thomas P. Marks
Marvin D. Marsh
George W. Marshall
Lee R. Marshall
Raymond A. Marston
Robert J. Martin
Travis A. Mathis
Thomas E. Matia
Frank E. Matthews
Harley D. Mayfield
Eugene B. W. Meeker
Olive A. Meining
Robert E. Melhorn
James I. Mellencamp
Charles W. Melville, Jr.
Murray Menkes
Clayton W. Merrill
Charles Mertz 3d
Edward W. Meyers
Edward L. Miles
Lee C. Miles
Colvin E. Milham
William T. Mitchell, Jr.
George B. Moore
Howard B. Moore
James R. Moore, Jr.
Randolph Moore
Roderick B. Moore
Sumner K. Moore
William V. Moore
Charles T. Morden
Gloria E. Morenz
Daniel M. Morris
David H. Morris
Donald R. Morris
LeRoy O. Mosher
Eugene C. Moss
Peter R. Moureau
Leonard W. Mulbry
John E. Mulcahy
Justus A. Muller
William L. Mumma
James F. Murphy
William L. Murphy
Eugene R. Murray
James E. Myrick
Robert D. McBain
James A. McCaig
Elmer A. McCallum, Jr.
John K. McConeghy, Jr.
John W. McCord
Richard K. McCorkle
William W. McCue
Jack H. McDonald
Milton C. McFarland
Ralph I. McFarland
Robert S. McGihon
Ted R. McGinnis
Iris C. McGlothlin
Andrew McIntyre
Robert L. McIntyre
Donald A. McIver
Robert B. McKay
Russell R. McKechnie
Marvin "M" McKinley, Jr.
Edward F. McLaughlin, Jr.
Vivian J. McLaughlin
William E. McLuckie
John R. McMahon, Jr.
Thomas D. Nabors, Jr.
Arthur E. Nash
John N. Neal
Robert R. Neely, Jr.
Carl C. Neidlinger
Frederick L. Nelson
Leland E. Nelson
John D. Ness
Leonard H. Nettnin
William L. Neubauer
William L. Newell
Paul W. Nicholson
Richard E. Nicholson
Richard H. Nickerson
Richard D. Nielsen
Frederick M. Nizich
Eugene J. Noblet
Harry M. Noland, Jr.
Dan R. Nolen
Raymond P. Notson
Robert P. Nottingham
Thomas H. Nugent, Jr.
Wedo Nutaitis
John H. Nyhuis
Ronald R. Oberle
Mark J. O'Friel
Robert C. Olsen
Lyle R. Olson
John D. Omvig
Robert W. O'Reilly
Frank W. Orr, Jr.
Edward J. Ortlieb
Burdett A. Otis, Jr.
William B. Otto
Jerry A. Pacilio
Gerald L. Palmer, Jr.
Clarence E. Parker, Jr.
James M. Parnell
Franklin C. Paschal, Jr.
John S. Patton, Jr.
Joseph J. Paulis, Jr.
Jacob L. Pawer, Jr.
Paul A. Peck
Donald W. Perry
Benjamin H. Pester
Edward Phillips
Edward G. Phillips
Ralph T. Phillips
John H. Pickering
William C. Pierson
John A. Pino
Ray C. Pittman
Judith S. Plaster
Ira G. Plouff
Bernard Poppert
Charles S. Porter
Alonzo M. Poteet, Jr.
Louis C. Potter
William H. Potts, Jr.
William Poulakis
Ross S. Power
Louis J. Previati, Jr.
Byron Price
John P. Prisley
Delton B. Pruner
Theodore W. Pstrak
Harlan R. Purdy
Robert O. Pyle, Jr.
Paul L. Quinn
Wesley L. Ralston
Thomas E. Rand
Charles E. Ransom, Jr.
Hugh B. Rardin
Charles C. Ratcliff
Earl L. Reardon
Jackson B. Reavis
William L. Redmon
Walter L. Rees
Alfred J. Reichel, Jr.
Thomas E. Reilly, Jr.
Henry Remsen
Harvey E. Rennacker
Earl F. Resch
Edwin C. Rice
Elmer A. Rice
William L. Richards, Jr.
Ward P. Riggins, Jr.
Guy W. Riggs
Ernest E. Rivers
Knight M. Robbins
Lonnie J. Robbins
Liona R. Roberts, Jr.
Keith H. Robertson
Clarence O. Robins
Beverly M. Robinson
Rufo W. Robinson
Edward B. Rogers, Jr.
Joseph P. Rogers, Jr.
Robert A. Rohr
Allan W. Romans
Brent C. Rosa
Edmund I. Rosendahl
Donald S. Ross
Ernest H. Rose, Jr.
Henry M. Ross
Terry A. Ross
George B. Rothrock, Jr.
Andrew T. Roulston
Clyde A. Reaves, Jr.
Herbert E. Reichert
John Ruggiero
John F. Rule
George E. Russell
John A. Russell
Maclyn K. Russell
Aimo M. Saari
William F. Sallada
Raymond O. Sanders
Kenneth M. Sandon
Charles R. Satterfield
William G. Sawyer
James A. Schader
Arthur S. Schlofman, Jr.
Francis L. Schlude
John F. Schneider, Jr.
Albert R. Schofield, Jr.
Ernest H. Schorz
George M. Schrauth
Lawrence W. Schultheis
Robert A. Schultz
Harold C. Schwan
Richard D. Schwartz
Robert E. Schwoeffermann
Richard U. Scott
Ami W. Sear
Ruell A. Searson
Henry T. Settle, Jr.
William S. Shaffran
William C. Sharpe
Anna M. Shaub
John D. Shaw
Wayne G. Shear
Charles A. Sheehan
Frank H. Sheffield
Peter N. Sherrill
Jack N. Sherwood
Albert F. Shimmel
Richard E. Shimshak
Alfred L. Shiner
Dorothea H. Shinn
Frank J. Shoemaker
Lewis B. Shultz
Edward S. Siergiej
Donald R. Simon
Louis H. Simmons
Paul A. Sims
Walter H. Singleton
William N. Small
Charles A. Smith
George E. Smith
George F. Smith
Harold F. Smith, Jr.
Robert C. Smith, Jr.
Robert H. Smith
Nicholas W. Smusyn
Robert K. Smyth
Harland C. Snyder
Charles M. Sodersten
Robert W. Somers
Emory R. Sourbeer, Jr.
Thomas C. Spalding
Raymond W. Spangrud
Ralph R. Speicher, Jr.
Richard H. Sprince
Richard J. Springe
Edward F. Stacy
William A. Staff
Donald E. Stanley
Thomas E. Stanley
Reynold F. Stelloh, Jr.
Bailey D. Sterrett, Jr.
Charles W. Stevens
Robert L. Steward
Arthur J. Storeide
Charles G. Strahley
James B. Stricker, Jr.
Richard Struyk
Max W. Stults
William R. Stuyvesant
Robert T. Styer
George H. Sullivan, Jr.
John P. Sundberg
Joseph L. Sunderlin
Edward P. Supancic
Francis J. Suttill, Jr.
Douglas D. Swift
Dillan W. Taff
Joseph P. Tagliente
Stewart E. Tangeman
Duane A. Tarpenning
Robert M. Tatum
Boone C. Taylor
Robert L. Taylor
Karl R. Thiele
Albert J. Thompson
James J. Thompson
James L. Thompson
Malcolm E. Thompson
Keith E. Thomson
David R. Thornhill
Frank S. Tiernan
Robert E. Tigner
Robert E. Tisdale
Ernest E. Tissot, Jr.
Dennis W. Tomlin
Herbert N. Townsend
Thomas C. Trafzer
Kenneth M. Treadwell
Paul R. Tripp
James R. Trommlitz
John C. Tsiknas
Neely E. Turner
James F. Turney
Nicholas J. Vagianos
Robert W. Van Kirk, Jr.
Robert F. Valentine
Eldon P. Varner
Savino Vesco
Carlos C. Villarreal
John E. Vinsel
John C. Vogel
Robert H. Wade
William F. Wade
Quentin W. Wagenfield
William G. Wagner
Daniel P. Walchko
James W. Walker, Jr.
Robert N. Wallis
William G. Walston
Glenn W. Ward
James F. Ward, II
Charles E. Waring, Jr.
Lawrence C. Warren
Richard K. Watson
Dean E. Webster
William Wegner
Elbert N. Wells
James K. Welsh, Jr.
Howard W. Westervelt, Jr.
Otis V. Wheeler, Jr.
Richard O. Wheeler
Charles J. White
John F. White, Jr.
Joseph P. White
James R. Whitehead
Charles A. Whitmore, Jr.
Eugene H. Whittlessey
Lloyd C. Wholey
Alan S. Wilhite
Gilbert Wilkes, 3d
Peter A. Williams
Stanley Williams
Stanwix M. Williams
William E. Willingham, Jr.
George M. A. Willows
Joseph A. Wilson
Thomas B. Wilson, Jr.
John G. Wissler
William K. Witthaus
John C. Wold
Arthur O. Wolf
Dwight E. Wood, Jr.
Robert C. Wood
William H. Wood III
Kyle H. Woodbury
Thomas Woods II
Guy G. Wooten
David L. Wright
George S. Wright
Walter J. Wright, Jr.
Robert E. Wurlitzer
Robert T. Wurzbacher
Louis J. Yakich
Billy G. Yarbrough
Karel E. Yedlicka
Richard E. Young
Robert M. Young
David E. Zacharias
Ellis M. Zacharias, Jr.
Robert A. Zajichek
Walter P. Ziarnik
Austin L. Zicht
Jack P. Zimmerman

SUPPLY CORPS

Augustine A. Albanese
Edmund S. Armstrong
Robert P. Barber
William H. Bason

James D. Bennett
Floyd E. Bergeaux
James C. Billings, Jr.
Mack B. Bingham
Roger C. Bliss
William H. Borchert
Charles R. Braley, Jr.
William G. Brendle
James H. Breunlin
John M. Bristow
Leonard E. Brock
Robert T. Broili
John W. Bruner
Ramon L. Burke
Elwood A. Carmer
Dan M. Carpenter
James H. H. Carrington
LeRoy T. Carter
William F. Cecil
George I. Chegin
Francis J. Chester
Norman D. Chetlin
Henry A. L. Church
Donald H. Corson, Jr.
James A. Cox
Cassel O. Crain
Wayne R. Crozier
William J. Crutchfield
Michael Dasovich
Martin J. Deutch
William F. Doddy
Harry C. Dolbeck
Howard H. Dolch, Jr.
Robert F. Dunbar
Kenneth W. Dunwody, Jr.
Vaughn H. Earley
Glendale M. Eaton
George P. Edgerton
Leonard D. Ellingwood
Melvin I. Freedman
Homer Fults
Gerald K. Gamber
Robert L. Ghormley, Jr.
William F. Glase
Lewis E. Gleason
John C. Green
William M. Hamilton
Herschel B. Hamric, Jr.
Paul C. Herndon, Jr.
Harvey R. Humphrey
Dale E. Jackson
William H. Jeffery
William E. Johnston
Harold Kearsley
Andrew Khourie
Milton E. Kreyenhagen
Robert S. Leventhal
Charles L. Lewis
Walter E. Linthicum
Harold B. Lipschutz
John J. Mahaffey
James R. Martin
Richard C. May
Raymond A. Medlin
Donald C. Mehaffey
Roy D. Monnie
Karol M. Morphew
Edwards M. Morris
David F. Morrow
Lawrence C. Murdoch, Jr.
George A. Murphy
Walter M. McCandless
William J. McMordie
Carl H. Newman
Wilson M. Obendorfer
Dean O. Powell
John B. Pringle
John W. Randall
Raymond B. Renne
Harold L. Robiner
Charles E. P. Schappacher
Ben R. Schmidt
Robert V. Schmidt
Homer D. Simons, Jr.
John G. Slattery
James H. Smeds
Morris M. Smith
Ralph A. Smith
Roy F. Smith
Wilburn A. Speer, Jr.
Warren E. Steele
Philip A. P. Stine
Hart R. Stringfellow, Jr.
Charles L. Suit III
Charles C. Swanke
Darrell E. Swenson
Clarence G. Tatum
Kay K. Thurman
George D. Tracy
Howard A. True
Kiehl E. Underhill
Richard E. Utman
Wesley W. Van Malsen
Wayne S. Vroman
John W. Walsh
Stephen J. Walsh
Robert L. Weaver
Kenneth B. Webster
James E. Weibel
Harry K. Welge
Paul B. White
Warren P. White
Robert G. Whitman
Emmett J. Wild
Leslie W. Williams
Fred I. Woodworth, Jr.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Domenico N. Bibbo
Charles W. Calhoun
Robert G. Carroll
Francis W. Day
James C. Day, Jr.
Robert E. Dickman
Sydney W. Dunn, Jr.
Arnold W. Ebert
Richard M. Fluss
Ray W. Foreaker, Jr.
Herbert R. Foster
Howard D. Graessle II
Charles W. Gulick, Jr.
Arthur E. Hackett
Wayne C. Hall, Jr.
Robert F. Harsch
Jerry D. Harshman
George L. Hoffmann
Charles B. Hogan
Steven K. Kauffman
William Kleck, Jr.
Edward F. Krueger
Robert S. Lee, Jr.
George A. Leighton, Jr.
Edward L. MacCordy
Nestor P. Michaleczko
John W. Murdock
Philip J. McEleney
Edward A. McManus
Raymond D. Phillips
Robert R. Raber
Harry L. Rimmer, Jr.
Charles D. Rohay
Colonel J. Shook, Jr.
David M. Smith
Jack M. Thornburgh
Richard L. Tinklepaugh
Nicholas F. Truog
Robert C. Vance
John D. Watson, Jr.
Marvin A. Weir
Dexter M. Welton
Frank D. Wilson
Robert L. Winkler
Robert P. Woodworth
Robert F. Jostberg
Anson C. Perkins

NURSE CORPS

Arlene B. Albany
Betty J. Alexander
Edna L. Archibald
Jane F. Arseneault
Marguerite Asci
Geneva W. Babitsky
Margaret T. Barrow
Anna M. Belaire
Ann A. Bergen
Marie M. Boatman
Wanda C. Bowman
Reba M. Bradford
Eileen A. Butler
Joan E. Burch
Janice M. Burcham
Marion A. Burger
Jean D. Cairns
Virginia M. Cardillo
Mary E. Carmickle
Emma L. Carroll
Cristina H. Chacon
Margaret E. Chapman
Kathleen J. Christensen
Nell M. Chumley
Patricia M. Clark
Virginia M. Cleary
Josephine L. Croftchik
Nancy J. Crosby
Dorothy K. Cummings
Helen Daroska
Betty M. Davis
Mary M. Deak
Daisy L. Deem
Mary I. Deksnys
Nettie A. DeLisa
Florence J. Delynko
Winifrede Devan
Helen M. DeWitt
Vivian M. M. Dicke
Geraldine K. Dignen
Janet F. Dixon
Patricia L. Dowell
Catherine R. Dupuis
Barbara Ellis
Alyeene L. Emfinger
Dorothy K. Erickson
Joan T. Ernst
Marilyn Ewing
Lorraine V. Feifer
Jean M. Fitzpatrick
Dessie J. Flood
Elizabeth A. Folan
Lillie M. Frank
Dorothy M. Frison
Dorothy H. Fuller
Dorothy J. Garber
Norma H. Gardill
Norma J. Geho
Rita A. Gervais
Mary E. Glavin
Bessie Gochis
Rebecca Gomez
Dorothy J. Goodell
Marcia O. Graham
Ruth L. Grass
Betty L. Gregorio
Sara J. Grieve
Alice T. Griffin
Frances T. Griffin
Rosemary L. Gunn
Dorothy G. Haiduven
Shirley A. Harbaum
Laura C. Haring
Anna G. Hart
Rhoda C. Hilke
Beverly A. Hoellworth
Joan L. Huber
Leslie E. Hylton
Barbara E. Hull
Louise M. Jablonske
Louise F. Jakshe
Virginia M. Jennings
Marie A. Johncola
Marion G. Johnson
Betty J. Jones
Catherine B. Jones
Eva D. Jones
Lenora M. Judy
Esther T. Kaczmarek
Phyllis N. Keene
Helen A. Kenyon
Margaret E. Kissinger
Frances S. Klein
Vila L. Knuth
Aldona Krushinski
Patricia R. Laisure
Clara J. Leoni
Veronica A. Lesho
Jean M. Little
Cornelia F. Long
Elsie M. Lovely
Kathleen M. Malloy
Ann Manley
Dorothy L. Martin
Lois C. Merritt
Dolores Michalski
Marcel A. Mickiewicz
Jeanne M. Milles
Betty M. Millsop
Dorothy E. Moore
Doris M. Mortimer
Arline L. Murphy
Mary P. McCarthy
Esther G. D. Nielsen
Shirley E. Norman
Cecile R. Normandin
Elizabeth J. O'Brien
Mary E. H. O'Brien
Kathleen J. O'Kane
Regina M. Olko
Celia Olshefski
Maribelle Page
Angie L. Pettit
Jean B. Pieczarka
Charlotte R. Pierce
Luisa A. Power
Martha J. Preuss
Evelyn F. Przybylek
Muriel E. Ramage
Gloria V. Rapp
Velva D. Ray
Muriel H. Riley
Nathalie A. Roark
Agnes M. Roberts
Ruth C. Robinson
Phyllis A. Rodenbaugh
Patricia A. Roe
Helen Roller
Katherine E. Roth
Dorothy L. Rowe
Edna J. Rundell
Madeleine J. Ruppert
Margaret Russell
Owedia M. Searcy
Florence J. Settlemyer
Katherine G. Shea
Carolyn J. Shearer
Mary C. Sheridan
Dorothea M. Short
"E." Marie Smith
Leona Soback
Angeline J. Spotto
Melva Stankovich
Anna M. Stary
Ruth M. Stephens
Gloria J. Sterling
Mary J. Stevenson
Margaret J. Stewart
Lillis L. Stoops
Betty J. Streeb
Ellen E. Stricklin
Mae B. Stumm
Dorothy N. Sweetman
Bernice Szostak
Alfreda Szkodna
Lucy I. Tarvin
Elizabeth Taylor
Mary R. Thames
June R. Thurnau
Dolores Troskoski
Virginia C. Trujillo
Katherine Vagenas
Barbara Warner
Mary M. Wein
Marjory H. Werme
Frances C. Whitlock
Ann E. Wiggins
Lillian R. Wojnarowski
Joan A. Wunder
Loree Young
Kathryn E. Zabel
Dorothy Zulick

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 1951

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Walter B. Pruett, Methodist Church, Carrollton, Ill., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, who art on earth as well as in heaven, we thank Thee for the privilege that is ours of bearing various responsibilities these days. Realizing that we cannot do well enough the deeds that must be done unless we turn to Thee, we pause now to commune with Thee. Grant unto us, we pray, the insight to see clearly the problems that face us and are our responsibility, the wisdom to find the best possible solution for each problem, and the strength and courage we need to do the things we thereby feel to be according to Thy will.

These things we pray as Thy most humble children. Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to address the House on Monday and Wednesday next for 30 minutes each day, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may sit today during the session of the House.

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

There was no objection.

TAXES ON LIQUOR

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial from the New York Mirror.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, in the past few days the Secretary of the Treasury has suggested that additional taxes be levied upon spiritous liquors. We are all cognizant of the necessity of raising revenues in these trying times. However, those who are suggesting that taxes be placed upon items that are already highly taxed seem to forget the law of diminishing returns. The high tax that is now in existence on liquors has been the cause of increased bootlegging. Reports from Secretary Snyder's own Department admit that there is more bootlegging today than at any time since the repeal of prohibition. Wherever a gallon of illicit untaxed liquor is sold, a gallon of licensed legitimate liquor is not sold and the Government loses at least $9.

Some people who should know allege that 20 percent of the liquor that is being consumed in this country today does not pay any Government tax since it is illicitly manufactured. There is no doubt that the illegal liquor is inferior in taste, contents and body, but because of its cheapness can more than compete in certain circles with a licensed product. If we are going to place an additional tax on liquor, you may rest assured that the flood of bootlegging liquor throughout the country will cause a serious loss of income to our Government.

[From the New York Daily Mirror of February 1, 1951]

THAT MAN IS HERE AGAIN

G-men and Suffolk County cops made a call Monday on a dilapidated house in a remote section of North Babylon, Long Island, where the United States Government lost $1,795,500.

Uncle Sam took that rap in uncollected taxes. The State of New York was also a loser, to the amount of $157,500.

Not to keep you in suspense, the raided house contained a 500-gallon-a-day still, which had been happily cooking up 190-proof whisky for a period of 7 months.

Well, naive as we are, we had believed the bootlegger went out of business with the death of prohibition. So we investigated.

Here are some of the results:

Bootlegging is a bigger business today than at any time since the eighteenth amendment went off the books in 1933.

In 1949, for which complete statistics are available, Federal, State, and local police officers throughout the United States confiscated 18,884 stills which had a combined capacity of 529,416 gallons daily. These stills are estimated to have operated an average of 90 days each before they were knocked off.

For each day they functioned, there was a Federal and State tax loss of $5,543,920, or a total tax loss of $498,952,800 for the 90-day average period.

The basic Federal excise tax on whisky is $9 per 100-proof gallon, and the average State tax is $1.48 per 100-proof gallon. (New York State tax is $1.50.) It should be noted that there are many other taxes on legal liquor, but the above are the principal and basic ones.

Only in the last peak years of prohibition was the bootlegger more active than he is today.

In those dry years, enforcement officers were confiscating stills at the rate of 25,000 a year—a figure which compares with the 18,884 stills put out of business in 1949.

The incentives for the distiller and distributor of "rot gut" illegal whisky are the same as they were during prohibition and in about the same degree—big, quick, easy money.

He starts right off with a $10.48 (per 100-proof gallon) tax advantage over his legal competitor. He can sell a gallon of his poisonous product, usually 190-proof, for as low as $4 or $5.

One gallon of bootleg whisky of 190-proof can be cut into 2 gallons of salable liquor.

The bootlegger, of course, has few of the other expenses of the legal manufacturer.

He does not have to pay for insurance, analysis, warehousing, or financing. True, his product may be injurious to health, even fatal, but what does he care? He is not liable.

We have always believed that the American people, when they junked the eighteenth amendment, were not so much voting liquor back in as they were voting bootlegging, gangsterism, and vast empires of corruption out.

We don't know what the full solution is to the present, and rather alarming, rebirth of the illegal hootch business.

Obviously, more enforcement is necessary to protect the Government's own legal sources of taxation. The Federal Government today does not have enough "revenooers" to more than whittle away at the edges of the bootlegging industry.

Obviously, also, liquor is something which should be taxed, and taxed heavily, but there is a point beyond which taxation cannot go.

In other words, Government—Federal and State—should not recreate, by taxes, a corrupt and abominable situation which the people killed by ballot.

RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS

Mr. RAMSAY. 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 West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSAY. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] for proposing, and the Committee on Ways and Means for accepting, the amendment prohibiting future trade concessions to Soviet Russia and those nations she dominates. I am also sympathetic with the original amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin, which was ruled not in order, and which would have applied to existing agreements.

I am hopeful that the action of the committee in agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin indicates that favorable consideration will be given to a resolution, introduced by me and a number of my colleagues during the Eighty-first Congress, and reintroduced in this Congress. My resolution provides "that it is the sense of the Congress that the President should take such action as may be necessary to rescind any foreign-trade agreement negotiated with any foreign country, or any instrumentality thereof, under the provisions of section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, if the Secretary of State is of the opinion that the government of such foreign country is Communist controlled."

When this resolution had been pending before the committee last Congress for many months, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SECREST] filed a discharge petition, which, unfortunately failed.

I had intended to offer this resolution as an amendment to H. R. 1612 yesterday, but because of the tradition to recognize only members of the committee, was not able to offer it. The point of order raised against the first proposal of the gentleman from Wisconsin precluded my offering it as a substitute, and the rapidity with which the committee accepted his second proposal, prevented its being offered a second time. To secure any relief to American industry, the principles announced in the amendment, must apply to existing treaties.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, we can obtain action on the resolution itself. I believe if we do, it will pass, and grant to our industry the relief sought to prevent unfair competition.

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE AIR COORDINATING COMMITTEE — MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 55)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith for the information and consideration of the Congress the Annual Report of the Air Coordinating Committee for the calendar year 1950.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 8, 1951.*

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 37) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Armed Services is authorized, until otherwise provided by law, to employ two additional clerical assistants, to be paid from the contingent fund of the House at a rate of compensation to be fixed by the chairman in accordance with section 202 (c) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, after "202", strike out "(c)" and insert "(e)."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 42) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the further expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by clause (1) (Q) of rule XI incurred by the Committee on Un-American Activities, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $200,000, including expenditures for employment of such experts, special counsel, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by said committee and signed by the chairman of the committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. The official stenographers to committees may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia, if not otherwise officially engaged.

That the funds granted may be expended retroactive to January 4, 1951, and such funds shall remain available until expended.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STANLEY. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Is there an amendment to the resolution?

Mr. STANLEY. There is no amendment.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. May I inquire as to how the amount carried this year compares with the amount carried last year?

Mr. STANLEY. In the first session of the Eighty-first Congress there was appropriated $200,000; in the second session an additional $150,000 was appropriated of which $25,000 was unexpended as of January 1, 1951.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. This carries the amount, then, that was appropriated during the first session of the last Congress.

Mr. STANLEY. Yes, the first session of the Eighty-first Congress.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I may say to the gentleman from Virginia that I am, of course, in favor of the continuance of this committee. I think it has done a splendid job, but I have been considerably worried, to tell the frank truth, by the fact that the committee has not met since January 1. Many people believe that there was a little slow-down in the committee last year. I hope those beliefs are not well-founded. But I think when the committee is asking for money at this time that we ought to have an understanding as to whether the committee is going to do what it was set up to do, whether it is going to carry on this great work of exposing communism in the United States.

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

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

Mr. WALTER. I may state that the clerks of the committee have not been paid since December, and the committee has not met for the reason that we have had no appropriation. The only staff we have are the people who are willing to serve in the belief that ultimately they will be compensated.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Might I say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the members of the committee are all Members of Congress? They are paid to be here and they ought to have had a meeting before now.

Mr. WALTER. I should like to remind the minority leader that the ranking Member on the Republican side has been ill, and out of deference to him we have been waiting for some information concerning his attitude on certain things we intend to do.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I would like to say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania it is true that the ranking member on the Republican side is ill, but the other three minority members are here and ready to go to work.

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

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

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, this committee was never more important than it is today. Our danger from communism is at home. This country is permeated with them and they are going underground, many of them getting on the Federal payroll. I would like to see this committee get all the money it needs and at the same time I would like to see them speed up some of these investigations and expose the enemies within our gates. While our boys are being killed, or freezing to death in Korea, these Reds ought not to be permitted to undermine their country. For God's sake, let us protect the country at home.

Mr. STANLEY. In reply to the remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts, I would like to state that under Executive order dated March 1947 the President designated the Committee on Un-American Activities as a source of information to check in connection with loyalty investigations in the executive departments and also in other departments, and further to report on the activities of this committee. During 1950 representatives of the executive departments and other agencies, including Central Intelligence, the FBI, the Metropolitan Police, and the United States Secret Service, made over 3,600 visits to the office to investigate and see the files of the committee.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. What did that committee do after they made all of these visits? I do not mean the Un-American Activities Committee. I mean the President's committee.

Mr. STANLEY. Will the gentleman restate his question?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman has been making a great point of the fact that the President's committee visited the office of the Un-American Activities Committee.

Mr. STANLEY. That was in reply to the gentleman's statement that there had been no activity. I was informing him there had been considerable activity since 1950.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I did not say that the committee was not active.

Mr. STANLEY. The gentleman said there was a slow-down.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. There has been a slow-down of the work of the committee which we all regret, because we take great pride in what the committee has accomplished in the past. We want it to go ahead and do a similar work in the future. I am not protesting this amount, I think it is very small, but I do hope that the committee will be stimulated a little to proceed with its work.

Mr. STANLEY. I thank the gentleman for his observation.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I would like to make a comment and also propound a query. First of all, I think it is quite a tribute to the House Committee on Un-American Activities that the President has seen fit to issue an Executive order permitting the various intelligence agencies and other agencies of the Government to turn to the files of the Un-America Activities Committee for information. This would indicate that the committee has in past years obtained a lot of important information on matters of loyalty; but it seems to me to be rather a sad commentary that while the President of the United States has seen fit to turn to a congressional committee to obtain information on questions of loyalty somehow or other the Congress of the United States has been unable to obtain from the various agencies of the Government under the control of the Executive the information that it desires as to the question of loyalty of many employees.

I rose to ask the gentleman whether or not any of this amount of $200,000 carried in the resolution can be used for the printing of testimony or reports?

Mr. STANLEY. I will say to the gentleman that it cannot be.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. It cannot be used for the printing of hearings?

Mr. STANLEY. In the breakdown of the proposal on expenditures there is nothing to that effect. It cannot be used for that purpose.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I am interested, because there was considerable testimony given last year before this committee as to communistic activities in Ohio, and it was seemingly impossible to get any printed or even typed copies of that testimony during the latter part of 1950. I am wondering if there is any way that that testimony can be made available to the Members of Congress as well as to the people of Ohio who, being rather patriotic Americans, are very much interested in the communistic activities that have been going on in the State of Ohio, and the persons who are responsible therefor.

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

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

Mr. WALTER. I am quite certain that the gentleman from Ohio, zealous as he always is in safeguarding the interests and right sof the American people, will agree that it would be a very dangerous thing to publish the testimony of a man who was committed on several occasions to mental institutions, who was convicted of crimes and whose statements before the committee, statements under oath, were not true as checks made by the investigators of our committee will disclose. There is no reason why any Member of Congress cannot see that testimony, but when they do examine it, I know that they will reach the conclusion that was reached by the members of the committee, that it was very dangerous, to say the least.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Might I reply to the gentleman by saying that, of course, each Member of Congress should have the opportunity to see the testimony and to judge for himself the correctness of the statements that have been made. I certainly have the highest respect for the gentleman from Pennsylvania. However, I am not unmindful of the fact that the gentleman to whom he refers as being a witness before the committee was, for a great many years, a representative of and an undercover agent for the Federal Bureau of Investigation who somehow or other found him sufficiently capable and sufficiently honest to use him and to predicate upon his investigations many of the actions taken by the FBI, and whether he be completely pure as the wind-driven snow or not, I believe that the great State of Ohio and the great newspapers of that State

that helped to reveal these activities have the right to know just what is what, and when is when, and who is who, and to judge for themselves. I am rather of the opinion, with all due respect, that perhaps the people of the State of Ohio are as capable of passing on the veracity and the honesty and the mental capacity of this gentleman as the Members of the committee or the Members of Congress, and I hope that the records may be made available.

Mr. WALTER. Just to keep the record straight, the man to whom the gentleman refers was never an agent of the FBI. He was, to use the technical term that was applied to him by a representative of that organization, an unpaid stool pigeon. I hope that the gentleman will distinguish that status from that of an agent of the FBI.

The distinguished minority leader has talked about the lack of activity on the part of this committee during the last Congress, and in that regard at this point I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks the report on the work done during the Seventy-ninth, Eightieth, and Eighty-first Congresses. I am sure that after the gentleman from Ohio and the gentleman from Massachusetts have examined that record, they will reach the conclusion that the committee did lots more work during the Eighty-first Congress than at any time in the history of the committee.

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

There was no objection.

HEARINGS AND REPORTS RELEASED BY THE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES FROM 1945 TO DATE (79TH, 80TH, 81ST CONGS.)

SEVENTY-NINTH CONGRESS

Titles and dates

Hearings regarding Office of Price Administration, June 20, 21, 27, 1945.

Hearings regarding Communist Party, September 26, 27, October 17–19, 1945.

Testimony of Gerald L. K. Smith, January 30, 1946.

Hearings regarding Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee, April 4, 1946.

Testimony of Louis F. Budenz, November 22, 1946.

Reports

No. 1829: Proceeding against Dr. Edward K. Barsky and others, March 28, 1946.

No. 1936: Proceeding against the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee, April 16, 1946.

No. 1996: Sources of Financial Aid for Subversive and Un-American Propaganda, May 10, 1946.

No. —: Citations by official Federal Government or State or municipal agencies regarding the character of organization named, May 29, 1946.

No. 2233: Report of the Committee on Un-American Activities, June 7, 1946.

No. 2354: Proceedings against Corliss G. Lamont, June 12, 1946.

No. 2707: Proceeding against George Marshall, July 31, 1946.

No. 2708: Proceeding against Richard Morford, July 31, 1946.

No. 2742: Report of the Committee on Un-American Activities, January 2, 1947.

EIGHTIETH CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Hearings on Gerhart Eisler, February 6, 1947.

Hearings regarding Leon Josephson and Samuel Liptzen, March 5, 21, 1947.

Hearings regarding H. R. 1884 and H. R. 2122, bills to curb or outlaw the Communist Party of the United States, March 24–28, 1947.

Testimony of Walter S. Steele, July 21, 1947.

Testimony of Victor A. Kravchenko, July 22, 1947.

Hearings regarding Hanns Eisler, September 24–26, 1947.

Hearings regarding the Communist infiltration of the motion-picture industry, October 20–24, 27–30, 1947.

Reports

No. 209: The Communist Party as an agent of a foreign power, April 1, 1947.

No. 271: American Youth for Democracy, April 17, 1947.

No. 592: Southern Conference for Human Welfare, June 12, 1947.

No. 1115: Civil Rights Congress as a Communist-front organization, September 2, 1947.

EIGHTIETH CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Hearings on proposed legislation to curb or control the Communist Party of the United States, February 5, 6, 9–11, 19, 20, 1948.

Hearings regarding Communist espionage in the United States Government, July 31, August 3–5, 7, 9–13, 16–18, 20, 24–27, 30, September 8, 9, 1948.

Hearings regarding Communist espionage in the United States Government, part II, December 7–10, 14, 1948.

Reports

Report to the full committee of the Special Subcommittee on National Security of the Committee on Un-American Activities, March 18, 1948.

Decision of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia in re *Edward Barsky et al*, Appellants, v. *United States of America*, Appellee (majority and dissenting opinions), March 24, 1948.

Report of the Subcommittee on Legislation of the Committee on Un-American Activities on Proposed Legislation to Control Subversive Communist Activities in the United States, April 10, 1948.

Report No. 1844, to accompany H. R. 5852, April 30, 1948.

No. 1920: Report on the Communist Party of the United States as an advocate of overthrow of the Government by force and violence, May 11, 1948.

Constitutionality of H. R. 5852, Eightieth Congress, second session, June 3, 1948.

Interim report on hearings regarding Soviet espionage within the United States Government, August 28, 1948.

Excerpts from hearings regarding investigation of Communist activities in connection with the atom bomb, September 9, 14, 16, 1948.

Report on Soviet espionage activities in connection with the atom bomb, September 28, 1948.

Index II to publications of Special Committee on Un-American Activities (Dies committee), and the Committee on Un-American Activities 1942–47, inclusive, October 21, 1948.

Citations by official Government agencies or organizations and publications found to be Communist or Communist fronts, December 18, 1948.

Decision of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit in re the *United States* v. *Leon Josephson*, December 19, 1947.

Report of the Committee on Un-American Activities to the United States House of Representatives, Eightieth Congress, December 31, 1948.

Soviet Espionage Within the United States Government, second report, December 31, 1948.

One Hundred Things You Should Know About Communism in the U. S. A.

One Hundred Things You Should Know About Communism and Religion.

One Hundred Things You Should Know About Communism and Education.

One Hundred Things You Should Know About Communism and Labor.

One Hundred Things You Should Know About Communism and Government (see revised edition December 1, 1950).

EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS

Documentary testimony of Gen. Izyador Modelski, former military attaché of the Polish Embassy, Washington, D. C., March 31, April 1, 1949.

Soviet Espionage Activities in Connection With Jet Propulsion and Aircraft, June 6, 1949.

Hearings regarding Steve Nelson, June 8, 1949.

Hearings regarding Tom Babin, May 27, July 6, 1949.

Testimony of Paul Crouch, May 6, 1949.

Testimony of Philip O. Keeney and Mary Jane Keeney and statement regarding their background, May 24, 25, June 9, 1949.

Hearings regarding Communist infiltration of radiation laboratory and atomic bomb project at the University of California, Berkeley, Calif., volume I, April 22, 26, May 25, June 10, 14, 1949.

Hearings regarding Clarence Hiskey, including testimony of Paul Crouch, May 24, 1949.

Hearings regarding Communist infiltration of minority groups, part 1, July 13, 14, 18, 1949.

Hearings regarding Communist infiltration of minority groups, part 2, July 14, 1949.

Hearings regarding Communist infiltration of labor unions, part 1 (local 601, UERMWA, CIO, Pittsburgh, Pa.), August 9–11, 1949.

Hearings regarding communism in the District of Columbia, part 1, June 28, 29, July 6, 12, 28, 1949.

Hearings regarding Communist infiltration of radiation laboratory and atomic bomb project at the University of California, Berkeley, Calif., volume II (identification of scientist X), August 26, 1949; July 1, September 10, 1948; August 14, September 14, 27, 1949.

Hearings regarding Communist infiltration of labor unions, part 2 (security measures relating to officials of the UERMWA, CIO), December 5, 6, 1949.

Testimony of James Sterling Murray and Edward Tiers Manning (regarding Clarence Hiskey and Arthur Adams), August 14, October 5, 1949.

Hearings regarding shipment of atomic material to the Soviet Union during World War II, December 5, 7, 1949; January 23–25, 26, March 2, 3, 7, 1950.

Exposé of the Communist Party of western Pennsylvania, based upon testimony of Matthew Cvetic (undercover agent), February 21–23, March 13, 14, 24, 1950.

Hearings regarding Communist activities in the Territory of Hawaii, part 1, April 10–12, 1950.

Hearings regarding Communist activities in the Territory of Hawaii, part 2, April 13–15, 1950.

Hearings regarding communism in the United States Government, April 20, 21, 25, 29, May 4–6, 1950; July 30, August 7, 1948; June 8, 1950.

Hearings regarding Communist activities in the Territory of Hawaii, part 3 and appendix and index, April 17–19, 1950.

Hearings on legislation to outlaw certain un-American and subversive activities, March 21–23, 28, 1950.

Exposé of the Communist Party of western Pennsylvania, part 2, based upon testimony of Matthew Cvetic (including appendix and index), March 24, 25, 1950.

Testimony of Philip A. Bart (general manager of Freedom of the Press, publishers of

the Daily Worker, official organ of the Communist Party) and Marcel Scherer (coordinator, New York Labor Conference for Peace and formerly district representative of district 4, UERMWA, CIO), June 21, 1950.

Hearings regarding Communist activities in the Cincinnati, Ohio, area, part 1, July 12–15, August 8, 1950.

Hearings regarding Communist infiltration of minority groups, part 3 (testimony of Josh White), September 1, 1950.

Hearings regarding communism in the United States Government, part 2, August 28, 31, September 1, 15, 1950.

Exposé of the Communist Party of western Pennsylvania, part 3, based upon testimony of Matthew Cvetic and documents of Communist Party of western Pennsylvania, June 22, September 28, October 13, 21, 1950.

Hearings regarding communism in the District of Columbia, part 2, December 6, 11–13, 1950.

Testimony of Edward G. Robinson, October 27, December 21, 1950.

American aspects of assassination of Leon Trotsky, July 26, August 30, October 18, 19, December 4, 1950.

Hearings regarding Communist infiltration of radiation laboratory and atomic-bomb project at the University of California, Berkeley, Calif., volume 3, December 20–22, 1950.

Hearings regarding Communist infiltration of labor unions, part 3, August 29, 30, 1950.

Hearings regarding Communist espionage, November 8, December 2, 1949, February 27, March 1, 1950.

Testimony of Hazel Scott Powell, September 22, 1950.

Reports

Spotlight on Spies, released March 23, 1949.

No. 1954: Review of the Scientific and Cultural Conference for World Peace, arranged by the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions and held in New York City, March 25–27, 1949; April 19, 1949.

No. 1951: Report on the American Slav Congress and Associated Organizations, June 26, 1949.

No. 1952: Report on Atomic Espionage (Nelson-Weinberg and Hiskey-Adams cases), September 29, 1949.

No. 1953: Report on the Congress of American Women, October 23, 1949.

No. 1950: Annual Report of the Committee on Un-American Activities for the Year 1949, March 15, 1950.

Index III to Publications of the Committee on Un-American Activities, June 28, 1950.

No. 2986: Report on Hawaii Civil Liberties Committee, a Communist Front, August 24, 1950.

No. 3123: Report on the National Lawyers Guild, Legal Bulwark of the Communist Party, September 21, 1950.

Report on the Honolulu Record, October 1, 1950.

No. 3248: Report on the National Committee To Defeat the Mundt Bill, a Communist Lobby, December 7, 1950.

No. 3249: Annual Report of the Committee on Un-American Activities for the Year 1950, January 2, 1951.

One Hundred Things You Should Know About Communism (revised) series; in the United States of America, and Religion, and Education, and Labor, and Government, and Spotlight on Spies, December 1, 1950.

Public Law 831: Eighty-first Congress, H. R. 9490, Internal Security Act of 1950, September 22, 1950.

No. 2980: Report to accompany H. R. 9490, August 22, 1950.

No. 3112: Conference report to accompany H. R. 9490, September 19, 1950.

No. 2847: Proceedings against Julius Emspak, August 10, 1950.

No. 2848: Proceedings against Steve Nelson, August 10, 1950.

No. 2849: Proceedings against Philip Bart, August 10, 1950.

No. 2855: Proceedings against James J. Matles, August 11, 1950.

No. 2856: Proceedings against Thomas J. Fitzpatrick, August 11, 1950.

No. 2857: Proceedings against Thomas Quinn, August 11, 1950.

No. 2858: Proceedings against Frank Panzino, August 11, 1950.

No. 2859: Proceedings against Ralph Tokunaga, August 11, 1950.

No. 2860: Proceedings against Charles Fujimoto, August 11, 1950.

No. 2861: Proceedings against Dwight James Freeman, August 11, 1950.

No. 2862: Proceedings against Esther Bristow, August 11, 1950.

No. 2863: Proceedings against Rachel Saiki, August 11, 1950.

No. 2864: Proceedings against John Reinecke, August 11, 1950.

No. 2865: Proceedings against Ernest Arena, August 11, 1950.

No. 2866: Proceedings against Koichi Imori, August 11, 1950.

No. 2867: Proceedings against Denichi Kimoto, August 11, 1950.

No. 2868: Proceedings against Pearl Freeman, August 11, 1950.

No. 2869: Proceedings against Marshall McEuen, August 11, 1950.

No. 2870: Proceedings against Ruth Ozaki, August 11, 1950.

No. 2871: Proceedings against Stephen Murin, August 11, 1950.

No. 2872: Proceedings against Jack Hall, August 11, 1950.

No. 2873: Proceedings against Frank Silva, August 11, 1950.

No. 2874: Proceedings against Jack Kawano, August 11, 1950.

No. 2875: Proceedings against John Akana, August 11, 1950.

No. 2876: Proceedings against Yukio Abe, August 11, 1950.

No. 2877: Proceedings against Yasuki Arakaki, August 11, 1950.

No. 2878: Proceedings against Edward Hong, August 11, 1950.

No. 2879: Proceedings against Kameo Ichimuri, August 11, 1950.

No. 2880: Proceedings against Douglas Inouye, August 11, 1950.

No. 2881: Proceedings against Levi Kealoha, August 11, 1950.

No. 2882: Proceedings against Adele Kensinger, August 11, 1950.

No. 2883: Proceedings against Benjamin Kaahawinui, August 11, 1950.

No. 2884: Proceedings against Frank Kalua, August 11, 1950.

No. 2885: Proceedings against Yoshita Marumo, August 11, 1950.

No. 2886: Proceedings against Robert Murasaki, August 11, 1950.

No. 2887: Proceedings against Robert McElrath, August 11, 1950.

No. 2888: Proceedings against Julian Napuunoa, August 11, 1950.

No. 2889: Proceedings against Tadashi (Castner) Ogawa, August 11, 1950.

No. 2890: Proceedings against Hideo Okada, August 11, 1950.

No. 2891: Proceedings against Wilfred Oka, August 11, 1950.

No. 2892: Proceedings against Jeanette Nakama Rohrbough, August 11, 1950.

No. 2893: Proceedings against Mitsuo Shimizu, August 11, 1950.

No. 2894: Proceedings against Frank Takahashi, August 11, 1950.

No. 2895: Proceedings against Shigeo Takemoto, August 11, 1950.

No. 2896: Proceedings against Ralph Vossbrink, August 11, 1950.

No. 2897: Proceedings against Thomas Yagi, August 11, 1950.

No. 2898: Proceedings against Giovanni Rossi Lomanitz, August 11, 1950.

No. 2899: Proceedings against David Joseph Bohm, August 11, 1950.

No. 2900: Proceedings against Irving David Fox, August 11, 1950.

No. 2901: Proceedings against Clarence Hiskey, August 11, 1950.

No. 2902: Proceedings against Frank Hashmall, August 11, 1950.

No. 2903: Proceedings against Talmadge Raley, August 11, 1950.

No. 2904: Proceedings against Esther Tice, August 11, 1950.

No. 2905: Proceedings against Marcel Scherer, August 11, 1950.

No. 2906: Proceedings against Mrs. Louise Berman, August 11, 1950.

No. 2907: Proceedings against Pasquale Leonard James Branca, August 11, 1950.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. May I say to the gentleman in conclusion, for I do not want to prolong this discussion, that, having been unable to see the record to which the gentleman referred, I am unable to judge whether his statement is correct or whether the statements made by the Cincinnati Enquirer, the greatest Democratic paper in the Middle West, in which it exposed all of these activities, or attempted to, and made statements and wrote the complete story of the undercover agents, and quoted FBI agents, by the way, have been correct. If I could read all the testimony I might know.

Mr. WALTER. If the gentleman will yield, the witness about whom the gentleman is talking first testified before the Committee on Un-American Activities during the Eightieth Congress.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Let us look at the record; then we can judge by that.

Mr. WALTER. The then Republican-controlled Committee on Un-American Activities reached the same conclusion that the Committee on Un-American Activities reached in the Eighty-first Congress, and did not release the testimony of the witness that they felt was irresponsible. The then Republican-controlled Committee on Education and Labor also heard this witness during the Eightieth Congress and they also did not release his testimony.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Let us see the testimony.

Mr. WALTER. I extend to the gentleman from Ohio an invitation to go to the Committee on Un-American Activities at his leisure and examine the record.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I appreciate the gentleman's cordial invitation. I hope the other members of the committee will join in that. I should like to see that record. I have been trying to see it for a good many months, and so have the people of Ohio.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STANLEY. I yield.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. May I say to my distinguished colleague from Ohio that I assume we are talking about one Matthew Cvetic, who testified. Is that correct? The gentleman was talking about the testimony of Mr. Cvetic?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. No; the gentleman has one of the eastern Ohio men in mind. I do not believe the gentleman is a member of the Committee on Un-American Activities. I was not inquiring about Mr. Cvetic, or whatever his name is.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I want to point out to the gentleman that I tried to get some information from the Committee on Un-

American Activities, as apparently the gentleman did.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. He is from eastern Ohio, I think.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. No, he is from Pittsburgh. He is alleged to have named some people in eastern Ohio who were Communists. I was interested in finding out about it. Some of the members of that staff over there, who seemed to be perhaps in their own opinion more important than Members of Congress, first decided that I could not see it. Later, perhaps after they screened me, they decided it would be safe to let me look at it, and I did get access to it.

Mr. WALTER. The testimony of Matthew Cvetic, whose name was just mentioned, has been printed and is a matter of public record, so all the gentleman from Ohio has to do is get a copy of his testimony. It is printed.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I realize it is printed now, but at the time I wanted it it was not printed and it was not easy to get from some of the employees of the Committee on Un-American Activities.

May I say further that it is no fault of the House Administration Committee that the Un-American Activities Committee has not had their money before this, because, the minute a meeting was called of the subcommittee on Accounts, we went in there and heard the chairman and the ranking majority member. They asked for $200,000, and the subcommittee unanimously voted to give it to them.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I think the gentleman will agree we are both very much interested, as are all the people in Ohio, in seeing any Communist activities in our State exposed.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. That is true.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. All we are trying to do is get the information, so that we may proceed accordingly. Is that correct?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. That is correct.

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

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

Mr. KEARNEY. Will the gentleman tell me if this resolution, House Resolution 42, brought up today is any different in its language than the resolution that was brought up a year ago?

Mr. STANLEY. There is no difference.

Mr. KEARNEY. If that is so, I should like to ask the distinguished gentleman from Virginia why it is that this resolution then does not cover the expense of printing the testimony of the various witnesses.

Mr. STANLEY. The resolution will be offered when the Committee on Un-American Activities desires to have its hearings published, or it can have certain publications made under its own appropriations, that is already made.

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

Mr. STANLEY. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Of course I am delighted that there seems to be a revival of righteousness at the other end of the Avenue, so far as the Committee on Un-American Activities is concerned. I certainly hope they will now release the Condon letter which the FBI wrote a few years ago.

I call your attention to the fact that on the front page of the paper this morning there is carried the story of the conviction of Remington. I tried to cross-examine Miss Bentley about Remington in the Eightieth Congress and I was denied that opportunity by the then chairman of the committee. Miss Bentley had been a Communist and she knew them and had been associated with them. Every time one of these Communists has repented and turned state's evidence, they have been able to produce documents. But we have never been able to get that letter which the FBI wrote about Condon.

And then they put Anna Rosenberg at the head of the Department of National Defense, you might say. This man DeSola was a Communist. He had turned state's evidence and he pointed to her and said, "She is the individual." They said she was the wrong Anna Rosenberg.

But if you ever saw her or her picture, you would know that nobody could mistake her for someone else. Besides, in the Dies Committee report she is mentioned four times in appendix IX and she is called "Anna M. Rosenberg," in the reference appendix thereto. Yet she has been placed in the most responsible position over the manpower of the Nation. This man Condon is still down there at the head of the Bureau of Standards, after all that information which the FBI dug up. Then that report was concealed and the Committee on Un-American Activities was denied access to it when the Committee on Un-American Activities was trying to expose the Communists within our gates.

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

Mr. STANLEY. I yield.

Mr. YATES. With reference to the charge against Anna Rosenberg, I would like to the say to the gentleman that a committee of another body has come out with a unanimous report on Mrs. Rosenberg and confirmed her appointment unanimously.

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

Mr. STANLEY. I yield.

Mr. POTTER. I am wondering if the members of the committee of the minority have been informed, if the funds become available today, which I assume they will be, when we will have a meeting to organize the committee.

Mr. STANLEY. It is the understanding that the committee is already organized and has been organized from the beginning of this Congress.

Mr. POTTER. If that is true, then they failed to notify the minority members.

Mr. STANLEY. Of course the gentleman would have to get that information from the committee itself. The Committee on House Administration, of course, does not go into the question of the operation of the committee.

Mr. POTTER. Would the gentleman from Virginia yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, so that the Members will know and have some idea as to when the committee will meet to organize?

Mr. STANLEY. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania for the purpose of having the gentleman from Michigan propound a question.

Mr. POTTER. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania have any idea now that the money, as I assume, will be made available, when the committee will have its first meeting to organize?

Mr. WALTER. According to my information, a meeting was scheduled yesterday on the theory that by that time this money would have been appropriated and we would know where we were. But the brother of Mr. WOOD, chairman of the committee, died and was buried on yesterday, and for that reason the meeting was called off.

Mr. POTTER. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. STANLEY. I yield.

Mr. POTTER. I hope the committee will not wait until the ranking minority member gets back from the hospital, as was inferred from your statement, because other members of the committee have been anxious to have the committee organized. It is most embarrassing to pick up the paper day after day and find statements as to what the Committee on Un-American Activities is doing, and not be informed. So I hope the gentleman will convey that information to the chairman of the committee when he returns.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STANLEY. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. How did the committee agree to ask for this $200,000 appropriation if it never met?

Mr. WALTER. The chairman of the committee was called to a meeting, I believe last week——

Mr. STANLEY. A meeting of the Subcommittee on Accounts.

Mr. WALTER. The Subcommittee on Accounts. On the morning of the meeting the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WOOD] called me and asked me if I would accompany him. He suggested that it would be proper to apply for the same amount that the committee had last year. This, despite the fact that added burdens have made it apparent that the money is not going to reach.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The only question I am bringing up is that the Armed Services Committee, for instance, met and voted that they wanted $50,000, and they went to the Committee on House Administration and asked for it. But apparently your committee has not asked for it.

Mr. WALTER. I do not have any other information as to how the amount was arrived at.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Were any of the minority members of the committee consulted about the amount at all?

Mr. WALTER. They are whenever they are available.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. What do you mean by "available"? They are here all the time.

Mr. WALTER. Of course, during the last session of the Congress, with the exception of one or two members on the minority, the other members did not attend.

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

Mr. STANLEY. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I do not know what the discussion is all about, but from past experience I realize the committee is going to get all the money it asks for, and when it asks for it. There is a great deal to what the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] said. Let me illustrate it this way. A week or two ago I received a wire and also a letter from an individual who offered to come down here and shoot a high official in the executive department and to pay his own expenses. I turned it over to the FBI. Yesterday I received a registered letter, four pages all pasted together, and it indicated to me very clearly, if I am any judge at all, that that individual should be in some asylum. That is the way a great many of these things turn out. I can understand why the testimony of some witnesses should not be broadcast, blackening the name of some individual, as has happened in the past. But I am not asking for the printing of any testimony. Time and again we do receive requests for reports of the committee. As an illustration, I have been asked for copies of that pamphlet put out by the committee, One Hundred Things You Should Know About Communism. Then, I have asked for these other pamphlets where the names of individuals are listed and their connections with subversive organizations. I understand the gentleman to say that this request for funds does not include authority to print those reports—or does it?

Mr. STANLEY. It does not.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Then, I hope that sometime the committee will come in and ask for the money to do that. I will have to vote for that appropriation, to provide money sufficient to print these pamphlets that you have already put out at other times but the supply of which has been exhausted.

Mr. STANLEY. The gentleman understands the committee has authority to print its reports.

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

Mr. STANLEY. I yield.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Regardless of what may be said, it is a fact that the resolution now before the House was offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WOOD], chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities, and it appears it was filed on January 3. As soon as the Subcommittee on Accounts had a chance to act on this resolution, the committee did act and approved the amount, $200,000. It is true also that the House Committee on Administration immediately reported this out. The amount is $200,000. It is considerably less than the committee has had in previous years. So far as the Committee on House Administration knows, the Committee on Un-American Activities plans to proceed with investigations forthwith.

Mr. STANLEY. That is correct.

Mr. LECOMPTE. The resolution asking for money for the Armed Services Committee is authorized in a resolution adopted by this House.

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

Mr. STANLEY. I yield briefly.

Mr. KEARNEY. I might say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] that his statement is a little erroneous, because the three minority members of that committee were present every day but we were not consulted in the slightest.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 114) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 38, Eighty-second Congress, incurred by the Committee on Armed Services, not to exceed $50,000, including expenditures for the employment of experts, special counsel, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee and signed by the chairman of the committee and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON THE DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 127) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers provided for by section 5 of Public Law 115, Seventy-eighth Congress, shall consist of two members of the Committee on House Administration to be appointed by the Speaker.

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

Mr. STANLEY. I yield.

Mr. NICHOLSON. May I ask the gentleman from Virginia if one of the resolutions we just passed would allow two new investigators as to contracts by the Army?

Mr. STANLEY. It would allow the employment of two additional members of the clerical force.

Mr. NICHOLSON. For the purpose of looking into contracts?

Mr. STANLEY. No; they are to be members of the clerical force whose duties are to be assigned by the chairman of the committee.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE WHITTEN RIDER

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an article appearing in the Daily News.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, in the last 2 weeks as a result of having been the author of the so-called Whitten rider, which makes an effort to hold down the total number of permanent personnel in the Federal service to the level existing in September 1950, and which further makes an effort to make available to the defense agencies trained personnel from other civilian agencies which it is believed will have less to do and therefore have surplus personnel, I have received numerous calls and visits from permanent employees in the Federal Government who for patriotic reasons have supplied me with information with regard to how many places in Government there are whole sections of employees with little to do.

From these reports which come from within the departments themselves, instead of the department making it easy for such employees to move to places where they will have fulltime work, which they want, these departments are busy trying to get themselves designated as defense agencies and are trying to find something to do or some new program in which they can enlist the department so as to keep these employees.

In hearings before our subcommittee last year, the head of one of our larger agencies denied to me that he had folks who were not busy because, as he said, "I find them something to do."

Unfortunately, too frequently that is the attitude—made work—to keep them busy, instead of releasing them to do work badly needed in the defense agencies. We must see to it that the Civil Service Commission acts now and we must see to it that the old-line departments cooperate.

Mr. Speaker, there are literally thousands of patriotic workers who due to the change in the national situation realize that they are not fully needed nor busy within their own department, who are trained and experienced and would be glad to help the national defense agencies during the period of emergency if the department and the civil service would simply make it possible for them to secure a leave of absence during the emergency with full right of reemployment to their present job.

Mr. Speaker, today every department in Government should be required to send out to each employee that it has in Washington and in many other offices, asking each employee whether he would be willing to take a leave of absence and serve in a national defense agency, if he were assured the right to return to his job at the end of the emergency. From the calls and visits I have had I am led to believe that thousands and thousands would gladly accept such a proposition.

The civil service then should be required to work out a full right to return to the job upon the department's giving such leave of absence. These names would be certified to the national defense agencies.

Legislation should not be necessary to carry out these needed actions. All we need is for the Civil Service Commission and the departments to use the authority they now have. The so-called Whitten rider would have been unnecessary if the Commission had been willing to take this action. The action recommended here is within the intent of that rider and if the Commission and the departments will cooperate additional experienced personnel will be made available to the defense agencies, and additional millions of dollars will be saved.

Such expert personnel could then help the Congress in its effort to hold in check the defense agencies, many of which would mushroom far too fast at great expense. Already reports are coming in that one of the recently established agencies has brought in at $65 per day a large group of advisers, renting of expensive hotel suites for conference rooms when there are hundreds of caucus rooms to be had in Government buildings here in Washington, which could be used without expense, and thousands of just as capable people who would assist in an advisory capacity at far less cost, including perhaps those same people who are here at $65 per day. The same reports come in concerning the setting up of other agencies. Perhaps they do not realize the total amount involved if all did that, or perhaps they are looking at the figures of the national debt as an asset. In setting up new agencies the best personnel people in the regular departments should be borrowed for such purposes.

I have introduced H. R. 110, which would provide a special committee to investigate the use of facilities and manpower. Such a committee with an adequate staff could save millions. I offer as proof the facts set forth in my speech in the House of Representatives on January 29, 1951.

The position I take is not altogether popular with the Civil Service Commission, but it heartens me to know there are thousands and thousands of Federal employees who are on our side in this effort. We must hold down at the beginning, at the setting up. We on the Appropriations Committee, with the approval of the Congress, will do our best to hold down and to cut appropriations where it can be done without injury, but after the money is spent or the commitment made, it is too late for the Appropriations Committee to do much about it. It avails us nothing to close the stable door after the horse is gone.

Under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include an article from the Washington Daily News of February 2, 1951, by Mr. John Cramer, which clearly shows the fallacies of the so-called recent answer of the Civil Service Commission to a speech, mentioned a moment ago, which I made on January 29, 1951, and which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date:

9 TO 4:30

WHITTEN GETS "REPLY"

(By John Cramer)

Your United States Civil Service Commission has come out with what purports to be a reply to Representative JAMIE L. WHITTEN, Democrat, Mississippi.

Representative WHITTEN is the author of the so-called Whitten rider of last late summer, which put most Government personnel actions on a temporary basis.

In a House speech this week, he roundly lambasted the Commission for dragging its feet and generally messing up the handling of Government manpower problems since the start of the Korean crisis.

If Mr. WHITTEN has any slightest doubt about the accuracy of his charges, the Commission's "reply" should set his doubt at rest.

The Commission statement makes certain valid points against the Whitten rider. For example: The fact that the rider discourages former United States employees from reentering Federal service, because it permits only temporary appointments for them—and sharply restricts their grades and pay.

Facts and syntax

Having done this, the Commission then proceeds to some remarkable twisting of facts and, also, syntax.

First. It complains that the "Whitten rider has impeded the movement of Government workers to defense agencies. * * * Specifically, by requiring that all transfers be temporary, many permanent employees have hesitated to give up their permanent positions in nondefense agencies to accept temporary jobs in defense agencies, even with reemployment rights.

That's what the Commission says. The facts are:

That Federal employee transfers during World War II were exclusively on a temporary basis—and this most definitely did not impede the free movement of workers to defense agencies.

Not the rider

That the thing which is impeding such transfers now is not the Whitten rider, but, instead, the Commission's own severe restrictions on reemployment rights for employees who do transfer. Under its rules, the employee transferring to a defense agency can be given reemployment rights only if he goes to a job which the Commission has listed as critical.

This list is a very narrow one—and here is proof: The Army, Navy, and Air Force have several thousand job vacancies here and are finding increasing difficulty in filling them. But most of the vacancies can't be filled by transfers from other agencies, for the simple reason that the Civil Service hasn't yet seen fit to put the particular job involved on its critical list.

That the Commission's transfer program not only impedes free transfers to defense agencies but in fact was designed mainly to make it easier for nondefense agencies to convert back to normal operations after the war. The Commission itself let this particular cat out of the bag when it announced its transfer program in November. It spoke then of the desirability of avoiding chaos in the nondefense agencies after the emergency.

Second twisting

Now here is the second way in which the Commission twisted the facts in its reply to Representative WHITTEN. The Commission's statement said:

"The Commission, long before the outbreak of hostilities in Korea, studied the possible needs of the service in the eventuality of a greater emergency developing. It had worked out detailed plans to be put into effect when the situation required it."

No authority

The Commission further said that it had noted Mr. WHITTEN's comment that the Commission waited months to announce a policy on reemployment rights. The fact is that until Executive Order 10180 was signed the Commission had no authority to require an agency head to grant such rights. The Executive order was published in the Federal Register on November 15. The Commission's new regulation establishing a system of reemployment rights was published in the Register on the same day.

From this you might gather that the Commission had its plans all ready for the pressing of the push button. You might be led to believe that the Commission had no responsibility whatever for its long delay in setting up a reemployment system. You might, quite reasonably, get the idea that the Commission was trying to put the blame on the White House.

Neglected facts

The Commission, however, neglected to mention these facts:

That the Commission is expected, in the ordinary course of things, to initiate Executive orders such as the one on reemployment rights.

That the Commission is expected to carry the big share of the load in preparing such orders.

That its failure to do these things promptly and vigorously was, as this reporter has confirmed, a major reason for the delay in issuing the reemployment rights Executive order.

All this presumably is known to the officials responsible for the Commission's reply to Mr. WHITTEN. It is mentioned here for the benefit of Mr. WHITTEN and others who possibly might be misled by the Commission's fact twisting.

And you are welcome to the conclusion that the Commission was not completely—well, let's say—forthright in its statement.

ROLL-BACK OF PRICES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include various articles, statements, editorials, and newspaper material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRIEST). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing H. R. 2515, a bill to roll prices and wages back to June 25, 1950, and to impose a 100 percent tax on excess profits above the normal peacetime profit of the year 1949.

I have watched with dismay and anger the unwarranted increase in the cost of living. I have taken the floor of this House on a number of occasions to request and to demand that something be done to curb the dangers which the number one domestic problem of inflation presents.

I have attacked the January 26, 1951, order freezing prices and wages at the highest levels and ignoring profits because it is an order which will not control inflation.

Just yesterday, according to the Washington Post of February 8, 1951, Economic Stabilizer Eric Johnston told a press conference that a further rise in

the cost of living for a few months is inevitable. He further stated that by midsummer price levels could be held relatively stable on a plateau for a considerable period, perhaps until the end of the year. The implication is that even into 1952 price rises will continue and that we can look forward to increasing inflation and all its accompanying evils.

Since June 25, 1950, prices in general have advanced in excess of 6 percent to an all-time high, corporation profits after taxes have increased by 21.8 percent, and food prices have advanced on the average of 2 percent a month. Some organized workers have received increases in wages but take-home pay has not been increased, but rather decreased, due to high costs and increased taxation. The unorganized workers, the pensioners, those living on annuities, people working for State, municipal, and county governments—the so-called white-collar class—have received no relief whatsoever and are slowly being ground down.

If a roll-back is not soon ordered we cannot escape more inflation which in turn will be accompanied by more strikes.

We should be ashamed of the so-called stabilization policy we have foisted on the people of this country. We should be ashamed of the way we are deliberately allowing the dollar to lose its value.

We should be aware of the fact, now, that if this mad economic situation continues, we are all going to lose. If that happens, it will be good news to the men in the Politburo.

We have wasted 7½ months in futile talk and useless orders. The cost of living is now 81 percent above prewar levels. We have taken half-way, timid steps when direct and courageous action is needed. The only place where that action can and should be taken is in the Congress of the United States and the people are looking to us for action and leadership.

Mr. Speaker, it is my sincere hope that action will be taken on my bill as soon as possible so that the No. 1 domestic problems of inflation can be met and defeated.

Mr. Speaker, I am inserting at this point in my remarks a speech I made on price control on January 19, 1951, a copy of a statement I made on January 27, 1951, after the price-wage freeze was announced by the ESA, two articles by John Suchy carried in the Missoula Mirror, a laboratory newspaper of the senior seminar class of the School of Journalism at Montana State University, Missoula, Mont., and dated January 24 and 31, 1951, and an article in the Washington Post of February 8, 1951:

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 19, 1951]

PRICE CONTROL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the present inflationary picture is a sorry one indeed. The efforts of the Economic Stabilization Administration to handle and to cope with inflation and price gouging have been very weak and ineffectual. It has been in operation 3 months—3 months marked by timidity, confusion, muddled words, and frenzied inaction.

Run-away prices have been a national scandal since June 25, 1950. At that time, I advocated a wage and price freeze across the board, but was unable to get any action. The Congress, the administration, and the officials selected to supervise the Defense Production Act of 1950 have all fallen down on the job to control inflation.

Mike Di Salle, Price Director, was reported last week to have been ready to impose a 30-day price-wage freeze, but Mr. Alan Valentine, Director of Economic Stabilization Administration, said, "We have come to the conclusion that we do not plan any present across-the-board freeze of prices." What does he mean and who is he trying to help—or to shield? Certainly not the people of this country who are being harassed by the constant increases in everything they have to buy.

Mr. Speaker, the ineptitude of the ESA is such that it should either be abandoned or a new and strong group of officials named to administer the program. How are you going to collect taxes if this inflationary spiral keeps up, and how are you going to impose new taxes if inflation continues?

This is no time for voluntary price controls or vague talk. I urge, Mr. Speaker, that an over-all price-profit-wage control be imposed before another week of profiteering passes by. The people are demanding action and have been since June 25, 1950. The price scandal means cruel and inhuman punishment for thousands of our citizens and imperils our defense effort. The period of inaction in the price-control field has created confusion, bitterness, and frustration.

Big business can—and has—increased prices; organized labor can—and will—demand wage increases; the farmer is protected by support prices, but the great middle group—people living on servicemen's allowances, unorganized white-collar workers, school teachers, State, county, and municipal employees, older persons living on pensions and annuities—all are having trouble making their savings stretch and warding off inflation. Furthermore, redemption of E bonds for the past 9 months have exceeded sales, which indicates that people are being forced to spend beyond their incomes and that inflation is our No. 1 and most serious domestic problem.

The times call for equality of sacrifice in the payment of taxes, the granting by Congress to the Department of Agriculture the right to sell stored commodities to force down prices, and the imposition of direct controls and price ceilings to keep down prices to stop inflation.

We need:

First. A real excess-profits tax of 100 percent above normal peacetime profits—average profits run 51 percent over last year, and some corporations' profits as high as 286 percent.

Second. Elimination of existing tax loopholes so that our economy can be placed on a pay-as-you-go basis.

Third. A roll-back on prices to halt inflation.

Fourth. Legislation to end commodity-market speculative profiteering.

Fifth. A halt to nonessential Government expenditures.

The picture of inflation is a very dangerous one. The need for drastic action is now, and I urge that we enact legislation to roll back prices to October 1, 1950, although I would personally prefer to have the date set at June 25, 1950. The people want action, and they are looking to this Congress for leadership and results in the fight against inflation.

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN MIKE MANSFIELD, DEMOCRAT, OF MONTANA, JANUARY 27, 1951

I am disturbed, disheartened, and angry over the price-wage freeze just announced by the Economic Stabilization Agency.

It is an act of timidity when the times call for decisions of courage and strength. It means in effect that high prices will remain at their highest level and beyond that will go still higher in the weeks and months ahead due to the loopholes in the order. I have consistently maintained that there should have been an "across-the-board freeze since June 27, 1950" and have on several occasions taken the floor to make my position known. The people of the country have taken a deep slash in their take-home pay which this price-wage freeze order helps to accentuate.

This phony freeze is of no benefit to many portions of our people because, while a few will make tremendous profits as a result of high prices, the great majority will continue to suffer increased losses. I do not see how it will be possible to ask the people to pay more in the way of taxes if we allow this order to stand and allow inflation to continue unchecked.

The real solution to the problem would have been for a roll-back to June 25, 1950, of a wage-price profit freeze across the board. However, in view of the difficulty and the immediate danger, the next best step would be to issue an order to put into operation a roll-back of prices-wages to October 1, 1950. The people want action and I am quite certain that they are disgusted with the leadership and administration of the ESA on the across-the-board freeze of yesterday."

[From the Missoula (Mont.) Mirror of January 24, 1951]

FOOD COSTS DOUBLE IN 12 YEARS

(By John Suchy)

Price ceilings are expected sometime this week.

Why they are expected is no mystery to most Missoulians. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, foods cost more than twice as much now in the United States as they did in 1939; the entire cost of living is almost double that of prewar years.

Figures for September 1950, place retail national food prices 2.08 times those of a 1935–1939 base period. The entire cost of living is 1.74 times the living cost of that period. These figures show only part of the facts. More recent wholesale price information shows even greater price increases for late 1950 and early 1951.

To confirm this data, a survey of Missoula merchants indicates that local prices are conforming to the national trend. Usual prices quoted in newspaper advertisments of January 1939, January 1945, September 1950, and January 1951, served as a basis for this survey.

Accurate price comparisons for each item could be best compiled for certain food products which enter into the Government's retail food index. Only these are quoted in this first report.

This survey revealed that Missoula food prices are apparently slightly lower than the national average. However, these prices have increased a somewhat greater relative amount since 1939 than have national food price averages. In other words, food prices in Missoula seem to be catching up with those elsewhere.

In 1939 Missoulians could buy round steak for 18 cents a pound. Now it costs 98 cents, 5.44 times as much as before. This means that it has a price index of 544 against an index of 100 for a 1939 base period. The national retail price index for round steak is only about 300. However, Missoula's meat

prices are probably no higher than meat prices elsewhere.

Local prices and indexes for several essential food products are tabulated here:

	January price		Current local price index
	1939	1951	
Wheat flour (5 pounds)	$0.15	$0.50	333.3
Corn flakes (13 ounces)	.095	.21	221.5
Corn meal (pound)	.028	.10	357.1
White bread (pound)	.10	.22	220.0
Plain boxed cookies (pound)	.125	.35	280.0
Beef rib roast (pound)	.18	.69	327.8
Pork chops (pound)	.19	.64	336.8
Sliced bacon (pound)	.25	.54	216.0
Whole ham (pound)	.25	.65	260.0
Salt pork (pound)	.15	.39	260.0
Pink salmon (pound can)	.131	.62	336.7
Butter (pound quarters)	.32	.88	275.0
Mild cheese (pound)	.25	.49	196.0
Evaporated milk (tall can)	.065	.148	227.7
Eggs (large, dozen)	.27	.63	233.3
Fresh carrots (bunch)	.04	.115	287.5
Dry onions (pound)	.025	.044	176.0
Fresh cabbage (pound)	.07	.08	114.3
U. S. No. 1 potatoes (15 pounds)	.18	.495	275.0
Sweet potatoes (pound)	.06	.125	208.3
Canned peaches (No. 2½)	.21	.29	138.1
Canned pineapple (No. 2½)	.22	.37	168.2
Canned corn (No. 2)	.125	.17	135.5
Canned tomatoes (No. 2)	.09	.19	211.1
Canned peas (No. 303)	.113	.145	128.3
Dried prunes (pound)	.069	.315	456.5
Dried navy beans (pound)	.06	.125	208.3
Coffee (pound tin)	.22	.89	404.5
Lard	.125	.245	195.2
Processed vegetable shortening (pound)	.183	.36	196.7
Oleomargarine (pound)	.22	.38	172.7
Sugar (5 pounds)	.29	.525	181.0

In this limited survey fluctuations in quality could not be accurately gaged. An attempt is made to find average large-retailer prices for each item. Following is a comparison of local and national price indexes as of September 1950, for selected food items:

Food item	Local index	National index
Wheat flour	306.7	192.8
Corn meal	271.4	203.3
Pork chops	310.5	262.1
Sliced bacon	212.0	184.5
Whole ham	212.0	233.9
Salt pork	233.3	181.7
Mild cheese	168.0	227.7
Dried onions	152.0	148.7
Potatoes (No. 1)	[1] 316.7	179.9
Canned peaches	138.1	158.4
Canned corn	[1] 152.0	141.6
Dried prunes	333.0	242.6
Coffee (tin)	368.2	336.1
Processed vegetable shortening	169.4	167.7
Oleomargarine	159.1	173.8
Sugar	170.0	188.4

[1] Indicates new crop not in by September 1950.

A partial picture of local price increases may be obtained by comparing the local price indexes for September 1950 with those of January 1951. A more complete picture may be gained by comparing the prices themselves over several periods of observation. The following table does just that for selected food items:

	January 1939	January 1945	September 1950	January 1951
Wheat flour (5 pounds)	$0.15	$0.24	$0.46	$0.50
Corn meal (pound)	.28	.70	.76	.10
Pork chops (pound)	.19	.33	.59	.64
Evaporated milk (tall can)	.065	.10	.148	.148
Eggs (large, dozen)	.27	.40	.67	.63
No. 1 potatoes (15 pounds)	.18	.69	.57	.495
Canned corn (No. 2)	.125	.14	.19	.17
Dried prunes (pound)	.069	.122	.23	.315
Coffee (pound tin)	.22	.31	.81	.89
Oleomargarine (pound)	.22	.27	.35	.38
Sugar (5 pounds)	.29	.33	.493	.525

[From the Missoula (Mont.) Mirror of January 31, 1951]

MISSOULA PRICE INDEX CLIMBS

(By John Suchy)

What does it cost to live?

Since the Korean war started, the Bureau of Labor Statistics consumers' national price index has been going up about 1 percent a month. On October 15, it stood at 174.8. Last Thursday, when the Government started price controls, it was probably much higher.

Over the divide from Missoula, in Butte, food prices were 214.5 percent higher in October than they were over a 1935–39 base period. An item-by-item survey of Missoula food prices was reported in last week's Mirror.

This is a comparison between late January 1939 and now of prices of some items other than foods that enter into Missoula's cost-of-living pattern. The Bureau of Labor Statistics compiles no national itemized survey for each of these items, so no comparison is listed between Missoula and the Nation as a whole. Differences in quality make it impossible to compare some items.

In January 1939 Missoula and the Nation were worrying about the war in Spain, "Hap" Arnold was calling for a $300,000,000 Air Force expansion program, and the Milwaukee railroad was charging $2.60 for a ski-train round trip to Ronald, Idaho.

A de luxe model Hudson coupe cost $745, delivered at Detroit. Three-year-old 90-proof whisky was advertised at 90 cents a pint. Low-grade hamburger sold at 10 cents a pound.

In 1939 Missoula's one first-run movie theater charged a 40-cent top price, 30 cents in the afternoons. Now the two first-run theaters charge 70-cent top prices. Maximum admission price for the three other theaters was 25 cents. Now it's 65 cents and 60 cents. Children's admissions are now 20 cents, twice what they were in 1939.

Dry goods prices provide a good standard for comparison, since these products of the same brand name differ little in quality over the years. Here are some of them from the same large independent retail department stores—prices of the same brands are compared in all cases:

	January prices			
	1939 [1]		1951	
	Brand A	Brand B	Brand A	Brand B
Sheets, percale:				
81 by 99 inches	$1.39	$1.29	(2)	(2)
81 by 108 inches	1.49	1.35	$4.00	$3.75
72 by 108 inches	1.39	1.29	3.75	3.75
Towels, terry cloth:				
24 by 48 inches	$0.49		$1.50	
20 by 40 inches	.23		.85	
16 by 28 inches	.19		.50	
Heavy wash cloths	.075		.25	

[1] These prices were taken from a January white sale advertisement and are from 10 to 25 percent below normal prices for the time. This store had no January white sale on these items in 1951.

[2] Not available.

In January 1939 another independent department store in Missoula advertised nationally known towels for 5, 9, 13, 18, and 21 cents. These were not manufacturers' seconds. A retail chain store advertised 81 by 99-inch muslin sheets wash 234 times, by test, at 69 cents each.

The same chain store advertised women's cotton print dresses at 44 cents each. Another chain store listed them at 49 cents. They were common in all stores which sold women's clothes at prices starting no higher than 98 cents. Today's lowest mail-order price for cotton print dresses is $2.29.

Listed below are some more January 1939 and January 1951 Missoula prices for comparable items:

In the following, the January 1939 price is given first, January 1951 price, second:

Nationally advertised tires (6:00 x 16): best quality, $15.70, $20.10 (plus $1.12 tax); good quality, $11.80, $14.60 (plus $1.12 tax). Steel cabinet sinks (no fittings), $32, $70. Chain store men's work shoes (cheapest), $1.74, $4.98. Chain store women's shoes (cheapest), $1.77, $4.79. Chain store men's suits (cheapest), $17.77, $36. Chain store sanforized shirts (cheapest), 98 cents, $2.17. Chain store percale print fabrics, 9 cents yard (32 inches), 35 cents yard (35 inches). Furniture (good quality, sale prices): four-piece bedroom suite, $109, $185; mohair living-room suite, $122.50, $229.50; walnut dining-room suite, $69.50, $130; studio couch, $29, $60; 9- by 12-foot rugs, $29 to $90, $69.50 to $175.

About the lowest increase in prices between 1939 and 1951 was in the per line rate for classified advertising in the local daily newspaper. In 1939 it was 14 cents; now it's 15 cents. The same paper used to cost 20 cents a week, delivered by carrier in Missoula. Now it's 35 cents per week.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Post of February 8, 1951]

JOHNSTON SEES NEW PRICE RISES, LEVELING OFF BY MIDSUMMER

Economic Stabilizer Eric Johnston told an impromptu press conference yesterday that a further rise in the cost of living for a few months is inevitable.

He added, however, that by midsummer the price levels could be held relatively steady on a plateau for a considerable period, perhaps until the end of the year.

Johnston's forecast of a steady upward movement in prices accords with a view previously expressed by Price Stabilizer Michael V. Di Salle. He has pointed out that the powerful momentum of past increases, like a car going at 60 miles an hour, cannot be braked down instantly.

Furthermore, under the present price-control law, ceilings cannot be placed on most farm products, because their prices are below the parity levels. Yesterday, a spokesman for Mobilization Director Charles E. Wilson confirmed reports that Wilson is also seriously concerned over this aspect of the problem.

Wilson had been reported as favoring some vigorous action to plug this enormous escape hole in the price freeze. Yesterday he conferred with Secretary of Agriculture Brannan and discussed the subject, but in general terms.

Associates of Di Salle have represented the price chief as being loath to get bogged down in a political battle to obtain a change in the law. He was said to be virtually resigned to an attempt to hold prices at parity, when they get there, rather than tackling the farm bloc which opposes amendments that would let farm prices be frozen at lower levels.

Obviously, however, Di Salle would be delighted if Wilson wants to participate in a joint fight for a change in the law.

In his news conference, Johnston said that how long the summer level of prices can be held will depend on whether the budget is balanced, production is increased, and credit controls are tightened.

Johnston said prices can and will be rolled back on some major products, but that he doubted whether those reductions would offset increases in other parts of the economy.

The Economic Stabilizer's mention of credit controls was taken by some observers as a reference to the problem of stopping the enormous expansion of lending by commercial banks since the outbreak of the Korean

War. How this is to be done is presently the subject of vigorous dispute between the Federal Reserve Board and the Treasury.

The FRB proposes somewhat higher interest rates on Federal securities. It feels the concurrent drop in the prices of those issues would deter many banks from selling them whenever they need reserves in order to make loans.

From testimony 2 weeks ago before a congressional committee, it would appear that Johnston sides with the FRB. There are other indications that the FRB position is supported also in other high places in Wilson's Office of Defense Mobilization.

WHY RENT CONTROL SHOULD BE EXTENDED

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FINE. Mr. Speaker, during the last campaign I pointed out to the electorate that if the Republicans were continued in control of the New York State Legislature there would be no opportunity for genuine opposition to the previous rent-control law—a Republican measure sponsored and passed by a Republican controlled legislature, and signed by the Republican governor.

The worst fears of those of us in the State legislature who opposed the Republican rent-control law have now been fully realized. In a joint statement issued on February 5, 1951, Senator Elmer F. Quinn, minority leader of the New York State Senate, and Assemblyman Irwin Steingut, minority leader of the assembly, brought to light the full evils of this alleged rent-control law.

Far from giving the citizens of New York the protection that they had reasonably expected from the State legislature, they now find themselves the helpless victims of rent increases which may well spell the ruination of countless families in the middle and related groups of income.

The new regulations promulgated pursuant to the rent law contain a series of jokers which will automatically become law if not disapproved by a joint resolution of the New York State Senate and Assembly on or before February 15, 1951. On Monday night, last, a Democratic attempt to have such a resolution of disapproval adopted, failed in the assembly. The Republican Party has once again demonstrated that they only give lip service to the needs of the people.

By reason of these disclosures there is but one alternative, if we are sincere in our objectives to give the greatest amount of aid to the people in this present national emergency. Federal rent control should be extended to apply to New York as well as to the rest of the country.

Shelter constitutes one of the primary and basic necessities of life and during the period of this new emergency rents for housing accommodations should continue to be stabilized, regulated, and strictly controlled in order to prevent unreasonable and unwarranted evictions which would inevitably adversely affect the public health, safety, and general welfare of the people.

As the President declared recently, we are in a state of national emergency. The actions of Soviet Russia and its satellites throughout the world leave us no alternative but to take all necessary steps to insure our national defense. One of the vital ramparts of that defense is taking proper care of the basic needs of our citizens here at home so they can produce the needed goods and services so essential for our fighting men abroad.

One of their essential needs is shelter—decent housing at a fair price that they can afford to pay. With construction shortly limited by the large down payments required—around 50 percent if you build a good house—most of the common people have to look to their Government for protection against rent gouging. Like the rest of the Nation New York faces a similar rent crisis and the people need help.

In order that the Members of Congress have a clear picture of the rent crisis in New York, under unanimous consent, I ask that the following release be made a part of the record of my remarks at this point:

JOINT STATEMENT BY SENATOR ELMER F. QUINN, MINORITY LEADER OF THE SENATE, AND ASSEMBLYMAN IRWIN STEINGUT, MINORITY LEADER OF THE ASSEMBLY

In 1950, when Governor Dewey succeeded in having his own rent control law passed by the legislature, we announced our vigorous opposition, pointing out that its many weaknesses, its inadequately defined sections, and its obvious inequities would result in sever hardship for untold numbers of families.

We introduced a bill of our own that would have provided strong rent control. We predicted that the passage of the Republican bill would lead to the breakdown of effective rent control. Our fears were more than justified. The new set of regulations proposed by the rent control commissioner will take the lid off rent ceilings—will mean increases for almost one-half the tenants of New York State.

One of the provisions of that law to which we particularly objected was that giving the rent commissioner authority to set up his own plan of controlling rents to take effect on March 1, 1951. We denounced this grant of power to one man as a dangerous precedent and a flagrant surrender of legislative authority to a commissioner who could do anything he wanted with rent control.

The commissioner has now submitted his regulations for future rent control. As we predicted, they will open the way for many new rent increases, many new hardships for tenants.

Of the regulations laid down by the rent commissioner, the following we regard as particularly treacherous.

1. The fair-value formula: This inflationary device provides that a landlord may raise his rent on the basis of his property's assessed valuation, so that he is guaranteed an income of 4 percent of the property's worth. This means that a landlord can raise rents indefinitely—first, he can increase his rental on the basis of his assessed valuation, then he can raise the value of his property on the basis of new rent increases, thereby qualifying for still another rent increase because of the higher assessed valuation of his property.

2. Subdivisions: The 1950 law gave landlords the power to remove apartments from rent control by subdivision or conversion. Under this section of the law, a landlord can inform the tenant at any time that he plans to convert his apartment from one apartment into two or more apartments. He can evict the tenant and the tenant has no redress. And, once the apartment is converted, it is no longer under rent control.

The rent administrator's regulations provide that subdivisions can only occur when an apartment is undertenanted. A six-room dwelling inhabited by two parents to two teen-age children is defined as undertenanted—and such a family is powerless against an eviction for the purpose of subdividing. Once that subdivision occurs, of course, the landlord may charge what he pleases for the two or more new apartments he has made for himself. Meanwhile, there are thousands of such apartments of six or more rooms, lived in by typical middle-income families throughout the State.

3. The 15-percent voluntary rent increases: Under this regulation, it would be perfectly possible for landlords who have already received a 15-percent rent increase by virtue of Federal laws to obtain an additional 15-percent increase now, either by "voluntary" agreement with a tenant under the "fair net" operating formula.

That such increases would be voluntary on the tenants' part is little more than a farce. By threatening to subdivide the apartment, the landlord virtually forces the tenant to consent to an increase. Or, by asserting that he is not getting a fair return on his property's assessed valuation, the landlord can again put the tenant on the spot when he asks for a 15-percent voluntary increase.

4. Evictions permitted without proof of compelling necessity: The owner of a one- or two-family house of a cooperative apartment may have a tenant evicted if he wishes to occupy the premises himself, even though there is no evidence that he, the landlord, needs to change his accommodations.

5. Exemptions from controls: The rent administrator's regulations fail to correct the discriminatory provision in the law which exempts from control all new housing completed since February 1, 1947, and new housing created through remodeling after May 1, 1950. Again the sky is the limit for rentals charged for such accommodations.

An equitable rent-control law would provide that newly built apartments be controlled on the basis of the first rental charged—such a rental having been fixed in a free market.

In our opinion the provisions of the law passed in the 1950 session, combined with the regulations concerning the granting of rent increases laid down last month by the rent commissioner, all but destroy effective rent control in New York State. That we should be pursuing such a disastrous course at a time when total mobilization points to an even greater housing shortage, is truly unthinkable.

It is only fair to the citizens of New York State that they know how their legislators stand on the vital question of effective rent control. This week we will move to discharge from committees of the senate and assembly our resolution disapproving the rent commissioner's regulations. This will give an opportunity to every member of the legislature to state his stand on rent controls—whether he wants to hold the line and hold it firmly, or whether he wants the lid taken off so that skyrocketing rents will add to the peril of national inflation.

Within the next week, we shall submit our own rent-control bill—a bill remedying those inequities of the present regulations which we have already pointed out. Our bill will hold the line on rent control—allowing increases only in those cases where the landlord can prove undue hardship and loss. In that way, we shall provide a second opportunity for every member of the legislature to put himself on record where rent control is concerned.

A DECLARATION OF FRIENDSHIP FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE TO ALL OTHER PEOPLE OF THE WORLD

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a House concurrent resolution entitled "A Declaration of Friendship From the American People to All Other People of the World." A similar resolution is being introduced today in the other body by Senator McMAHON, under the joint sponsorship of 21 Senators.

The purpose of the McMahon-Ribicoff resolution is to reaffirm the American peoples' desire to live in peace with all peoples, including the people of the Soviet Union. The resolution will specifically request President Truman to call upon the Soviet Government to make known the contents of this resolution to the Russian people.

Spiritual power and not material power is the key to the world's ills. As a Nation, we must set peace as our goal. The heart of the world must be touched. While we rearm, we must not sidetrack other methods to avoid war. We must never fail to tell the peoples of the world that our goal is peace. This resolution will put the American people and Congress squarely on record as standing for peace instead of war, for life instead of death.

With the best moral case in the world, we are still on the defensive. We must have the vision and imagination to contribute ideas. We cannot lead if we are not guided by a moral and spiritual force of our own.

This resolution is the start of a positive program for peace. It emphasizes the desire of the American people for peace, friendship, and brotherhood with all men throughout the world.

A copy of this resolution is set out below:

A DECLARATION OF FRIENDSHIP FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE TO ALL THE PEOPLES OF THE WORLD, INCLUDING THE PEOPLES OF THE SOVIET UNION

Whereas the goal of the American people is now, and ever has been, a just and lasting peace; and

Whereas the deepest wish of our Nation is to join with all other nations in preserving the dignity of man, and in observing those moral principles which alone lend meaning to his existence; and

Whereas in proof of this, the United States has offered to share all that is good in atomic energy, asking in return only safeguards against the evil in the atom; and

Whereas this Nation has likewise given of its substance and resources to help those peoples ravaged by war and poverty; and

Whereas terrible danger to all free peoples compels the United States to undertake a vast program of armaments expenditures; and

Whereas we rearm only with reluctance and would prefer to devote our energies to peaceful pursuits: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Members of this Congress reaffirm the historic and abiding friendship of the American people for all other peoples, including the peoples of the Soviet Union, by declaring—

That the American people deeply regret the artificial barriers which separate them from the peoples of the U. S. S. R., and which keep the Soviet peoples from learning of America's desire to live in friendship with all other peoples, and to work with them in advancing the ideal of human brotherhood; and

That the American people desire neither war with the Soviet Union nor the terrible consequences of such a war; and

That although they are firmly determined to defend their freedom and security, the American people welcome all honorable efforts to compose the differences standing between them and the Soviet Government; be it further

Resolved, That the Congress request the President of the United States to call upon the Government of the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics to acquaint the peoples of the Soviet Union with the contents of this resolution.

BLACK MARKET IN MEAT

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Speaker, I regret to say that I have unquestionable evidence that the black market in meat is back again with us in New York. As of yesterday it would cost $1,800 under the table to get a chance to bid on a car of dressed beef in the New York market.

Mr. Speaker, I have before me a telegram from a gentleman in New York who knows the meat industry from hogs and beef on the hoof to the finest product as it finds its way on the tables in the best hotels and restaurants in the greatest city in the world. He says:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *February 8, 1951.*

Congressman JAMES G. DONOVAN,
Old House Office Building,
Washington, D .C.:

Meat conditions under present Government regulations are chaotic in New York area. Black market conditions rampant. A few weeks of such conditions can make a ruthless wholesaler richer by far than any violator during OPA era. Cash is being exacted and passed. Straight carcass being sold at prices ceilinged for cuts. Low-grade meats being sold for prime quality prices. Most meats lack Federal grading and practically no top quality meats available. General feeling in trade is that there is no patriotic reason for imposition of controls which stifle business when meat prices are not regulated at farm level. Trade does not feel we are at war and it is public knowledge that meat supplies are adequate if all levels of meat industry are given fair profit margins to work with. Resentment high that top qualified men in meat industry are bypassed and advice is accepted from poorer qualified consultants. Impossible to obtain cooperation to convict violators of present regulation because of fear supplies would be shut off to anyone turning in concrete evidence makes it presently impossible to expect or demand such cooperation under existing conditions the following proposed suggestions would gain widespread support for a controlled program from the meat industry at large. Freeze price of feeds and grains. This is only commodity not frozen on farmers list of requirements. On basis of frozen grain prices ratio on beef, veal, lamb, pork, and poultry can be satisfactorily ceilinged at farm level. This permits impositions of fair ceilings on milk, butter, cheese, eggs, flour, and all other byproducts this also permits proper ceilings at slaughter-house level which also readily permits proper ceiling margins to be calculated for wholesale distributor, jobber, hotel supply house, and retail levels. Belief if grain prices must advance is to move up percentagewise at all levels. Obligatory Government grading for all meat of utmost importance. Finally let meat industry do its own policing pledging Government its support in this program.

Very sincerely,

PAUL A. SPITLER.

SEVEN SILVER STARS GIVEN REAR ECHELON BIG SHOTS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am going to insert in my remarks an article about seven Silver Stars which were presented to six generals and a colonel in Korea, none of whom had been under fire, and none of whom had been up on the battlefront. Apparently that Silver Star has become quite a coveted award, and these fellows felt that they would look better with it on their chests. I hope the Members will read this newspaper story. I might say that 16 or 17 months ago, when the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments was in Greece, we were up on the Albanian frontier, and some of us heard some gun fire in the distance. I do not know whether that puts us in line for a Silver Star or not, but if it does, I would be embarrassed to accept it, and I do not think I would want to wear it under those circumstances.

The article is as follows:

[From the Washington (D. C.) Daily News of February 7, 1951]

SEVEN SILVER STARS GIVEN REAR ECHELON BIG SHOTS

(By Jim G. Lucas)

The Air Force has awarded 17 Silver Stars so far. Seven have gone to generals and a colonel based in Tokyo. They usually get to Korea about once a month.

Congress created the Silver Star in 1918 as a reward for "gallantry in action when the Medal of Honor is not warranted."

It specified, however, that such gallantry must be of "marked distinction." The Silver Star has become one of our most coveted decorations. You don't win one hanging around the rear echelon. At least, that's the way it used to be.

Nevertheless Lt. Gen. George Stratemeyer, commander of the Far East Air Force, has presented it to:

HERE'S LIST

Maj. Gen. Laurence Craigie, vice commander for administration and plans.

Maj. Gen. Otto P. Weyland, vice commander for operations.

Brig. Gen. Jarred V. Crabb, deputy commander for operations.

Brig. Gen. Oliver S. Picher, Far East inspector general.

Brig. Gen. Charles Y. Banfill, deputy for intelligence.

Brig. Gen. Derr H. Alkire, deputy for matériel.

Col. Leo J. Erler, director of installations.

NO. 1 MAN

Each man, the citations say, "distinguished himself by gallantry in action in Korea during the period July through November 1950." Each, General Stratemeyer said, acted "in keeping with the highest traditions of the military service."

General Cragie—General Stratemeyer's "No. 1 man"—"made frequent visits to combat elements in Korea to coordinate operations * * * participated in reconnaissance, tactical control, and bombing missions over enemy territory to observe and improve effectiveness of his plans * * * was subject to attack by enemy aircraft and ground fire."

General Weyland also was decorated for flying to Korea occasionally to visit Air Force elements (and) coordinate operations. He participated in bombing missions over enemy territory to obtain first-hand knowledge. Like General Craigie, he was subject to attack by enemy aircraft and ground fire.

General Crabb "at great personal risk and in constant danger * * * made frequent visits to combat Air Force elements in Korea." His participation in combat missions enabled him to improve the effectiveness of his direction of operations.

General Picher—the inspector general in charge of paper work—also is credited with making frequent trips to advanced air bases in Korea to obtain information. General Banfill—in constant danger from enemy ground and aerial attacks—flew to Korea and obtained vital information concerning the enemy.

General Alkire visited the most forward airfields and made ground and aerial surveys to insure an uninterrupted flow of matériel. Ditto Colonel Erler.

NO OPPOSITION

The citations don't say they were fired upon. They were subject to attack. So was everyone else in Korea. The chance of ground attack on even the most forward Air Force base in Korea is remote.

And you can count on one hand the number of enemy planes over Korea after the first week of July. The frequent trips from Japan to Korea simply involved getting in a C-54 transport in Tokyo and getting out in Korea. As a rule it's about as risky as flying from New York to Cleveland. And they went on combat missions merely as passengers and spectators.

CAME HARDER

Other men apparently worked harder for their Silver Stars. Take Hospital Corpsman Vernon Ault, of Greeley, Colo., for instance. His citation said he was "painfully wounded in the arm and leg while serving with a Marine infantry company. Despite pain and extreme loss of blood, he courageously continued to administer to the wounded while under intense enemy machine-gun fire. He refused to be evacuated * * * until he collapsed from his wounds and loss of blood and had to be carried."

William G. Araza, of San Antonio, fearlessly and courageously ran forward under intense machine-gun and antitank fire and, although receiving a painful wound, proceeded to pull a wounded man 30 yards to a covered position and administer aid.

Many Air Force men are bitter. They feel promiscuous awards of the Silver Star to staff officers has cheapened it. One combat pilot who won the Silver Star in World War II for torpedoing a Jap cruiser, told me he had put the medal away and would never wear it again.

DEMOCRATIC STEERING COMMITTEE

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, as acting chairman of the Democratic steering committee, I am calling a meeting in the Rules Committee room at 2 o'clock today, if the House has adjourned at that time; otherwise immediately after the adjournment of the House. The notice went out that the meeting would be held immediately after the adjournment. I am changing that now to make it 2 o'clock today.

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

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

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman makes his announcement as acting chairman. I hope that after the meeting he will again be chairman.

Mr. MURDOCK. I thank the gentleman.

OUR CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS MUST BE PROTECTED

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a statement by Judge Call of the municipal bench of Los Angeles.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the Constitution of the United States was formulated by the Constitutional Convention to retain all rights of the States and inherent rights of the people in statu quo, except such powers as were therein expressly given and delegated to the Federal Government. The rights and duties of man under the natural law were recognized, and the personal liberty of the individual was to be protected.

Since the adoption of our Constitution, a trend has developed toward liberal and enlarged construction of implied powers of Congress. A drift from the Constitution has become apparent, and its ultimate effects upon our form of government and the extent to which it may encroach upon the liberty of our citizens should receive serious consideration.

An excellent article on this subject appeared in the January issue of the Los Angeles Bar Bulletin. It was written by the Honorable Joseph L. Call, judge of the municipal court of the city of Los Angeles. This article should receive thoughtful consideration from the Members of Congress.

[From the Los Angeles Bar Bulletin of January 1951]

THE DRIFT FROM THE CONSTITUTION

(By Hon. Joseph L. Call,* judge of the municipal court of the city of Los Angeles)

"Government, through its rulers, may be the implement of tyranny."[1]

This was the political condition that confronted the colonists and precipitated the Declaration of Independence and the War of the Revolution.

The fundamental objection of the colonies was that the colonies and Great Britain were coordinate members of the great English Empire under the dominion of a common sovereign but not united by common legislative sovereignty or legislative rights. The colonists declared that their legislative power to govern themselves was as complete and distinct as that of the English Parliament to govern England. Great Britain maintained that the colonies were subject to English parliamentary laws and royal executive decrees emanating from the homeland. The assertion of the right of self-government by the colonists, a denial of this principle by England and the arbitrary assumption of the right of Great Britain to make laws for all constituents of the English Empire without their right of participation or self-government, in each and every instance, led to the discovery by England that she had no right to make laws for the colonists in any respect whatsoever.[2]

This led to the Declaration of Independence by the Thirteen Colonies in which the basic and ever-underlying premise of American Government was emphasized, and that was that "* * * all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; that, to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."[3]

These principles of (a) the inherent sovereignty of the people; and (b) the consequential creation of government to maintain these rights, deriving its powers from the consent of the governed, therefore gave rise to the Bill of Rights of the Thirteen Original States and thereafter the Bill of Rights to the United States Constitution.

It is seen that the doctrine of inherent sovereignty of the people is the major premise upon which this government was founded, and that very obviously all public officials are agents and agents only of the sovereign power, to wit, the people; and that consequently, the inherent right of self-government is always the primary right of the people:

The assertion of these rights by the American people gave rise to 7 years of merciless and bloody revolutionary war and incredible hardships, but was finally culminated by the independence of the American colonies climaxed by the surrender of General Cornwallis at Yorktown, October 19, 1781; and thereafter emerged the thirteen original colonies as free and independent states.

It is well to note that these states came into existence as separate governments and entities; and each retained all of the right of self-government, self-regulation, and all rights incident to complete sovereignty. They were independent of any other state or nation. Any problems, situations, improvements or social adjustments, all found adequate protection and comprehension within and by reason of the sovereign power of the individual state. None of these states was inadequate to determine fully on all matters of internal concern.

There were, however, certain limited problems that the people felt they were unable adequately to contend with. These inadequacies of the states acting as political units are stated by the Constitutional Convention of 1787 in its letter recommending to Congress the adoption of the new Federal Con-

*Judge Call received his bachelor of laws degree from the University of Southern California School of Law in 1925. He has served on the bench of the Los Angeles municipal court since 1931.

[1] Excessive Law Making—A Threat to Liberty, by Robert M. Jones, Tennessee Law Journal, vol. 16.

[2] Madison's Report on the Virginia Resolution (1800), Elliot's Debates on the Federal Constitution, vol. IV, p. 562.

[3] Declaration of Independence, adopted in Congress, July 4, 1776.

stitution. This letter is signed by George Washington and presents this limited state inadequacy as follows: "The friends of our country have long seen and desired, that the power of making war, peace and treaties; that of levying money and regulating commerce; and the corresponding executive and judicial authorities should be fully and effectively vested in the general government of the union."[4]

Throughout the debates in the Constitutional Convention was the constant insistence that in the dual system of Government about to be formulated, the rights and the sovereignty of the people and the States were to remain supreme in all matters of local and self government, but subject to certain powers to be expressly granted or delegated under the terms of the proposed Constitution to the proposed Federal Government.

And, the insistence of these principles in Convention debate was certainly not without precedents garnered from the rise and fall of government throughout history. Under the postulates of European monarchies and under the prerogatives of the Roman civil law, the state or government is exemplified as all-powerful, all-knowing, all-wise and even of divine origin. A corollary of this premise was it therefore became the duty of the government, that in order to achieve supreme success and happiness for the people, the state or government must obviously regulate and prescribe for all human endeavors, and that the deity of the state naturally denied the right of the individual to work out his own problems, and to prescribe his own methods of procedure. This theory of government postulated from the time of the disintegration of the Roman republic at the time of the formation of the first triumvirate, approximately 50 years before Christ, found expression and was fully bearing fruit at the time of the American Constitutional Convention. The European theory advocated that the government of monarchy and dictatorship was all-knowing and all-powerful, and was predicated on the premise that the people whom it sought to govern were utterly incapable of governing themselves and prescribing their own rules and regulations. Its purpose was that of dictating to and for the lives of its peoples.

Consequently, at the Constitutional Convention, it was the considered opinion of the members of the Convention that the state was not divine nor omnipotent nor omniscient, but that, on the contrary, sovereignty, law and regulation were rights of the people, and that the official was but an agent of the people placed in office for the purpose of administering laws enacted by the people, and that every individual had the right without the interference or intermeddling of government to formulate his own happiness and his own laws.

Accordingly, with the ever-retained sovereign rights of the people as the major premise, there was formulated the United States Constitution (September 17, 1787) retaining all rights of the States and inherent rights of the people in statu quo, except such powers as were therein expressly given and delegated to the Federal Government. Under the Federal Constitution there are created three separate and distinct departments of government. Article I creates and delegates power to the legislative or congressional department; under article II there is created and delegated power to the executive department; and under article III there is created and delegated power to the judicial department. Each department of government, under this novel system, is supreme within its own field, but, nevertheless, acts as a check-balance upon the other departments.

[4] The Growth of Federal Bureaucratic Tyranny, by Sterling E. Edmunds, The Lawyer and Banker, vol. 36 (1933).

Although the sovereignty of the people and the States, under the Constitution, as submitted and adopted in 1787, was clearly supreme, nevertheless the people were so zealous of these unalienable rights and fearful of the usurpation of power by the Federal Government and that tyranny under the pretense of constitutional authorization might become enthroned, that the Thirteen States thereafter adopted, in 1791, the ninth and tenth amendments to the Federal Constitution. These amendments again reaffirmed the limitations of the Federal Government and the sovereign rights of the States and the people as independent political units. These amendments at the time seemed to satisfy the minds of the most skeptic, and were thought to definitely and finally put to an end the respective rights and any possible contentions that might arise under the relative rights of the dual government.

Article I, section 8, of the Federal Constitution enumerates 18 specific grants of power by the people to the United States Congress. Among these grants there may be listed the following fundamental rights affecting the life and liberty of the people of the country:

1. The power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises;
2. To pay the debts of the United States;
3. To provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States;
4. To borrow money on the credit of the United States;
5. To regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States and with the Indian tribes;
6. To coin money and regulate the value thereof and fix the standards of weights and measures;
7. To declare war;
8. To raise and support armies and to provide and maintain a Navy;
9. The power to make treaties under the authority of the United States (art. VI, sec. 2).

At this time it should be noted that the American system of government was entirely the creation of the American people and American way of life, and that under the Federal Constitution one of the purposes was to eliminate the doctrine of an all-powerful legislature as well as an equally powerful administrative or executive division. Under the English law neither division of government was subject to any judicial control. Hence both operated independently, exclusively, and to a great extent, without restraint and without restraint upon each other.

To obviate any such situation in this country there was incorporated in our Constitution and created the United States Supreme Court with power to determine all cases arising under the Constitution and laws of the United States. The Supreme Court was set up as a bastion against the encroachment by the legislative or executive branches of the Government against each other or by them against the sovereign rights retained by the people, and consequently to prevent any arbitrary, unlawful, or self-assumed power by either the executive or legislative branches of the Government.

It was the intention of the framers of the Constitution that the Supreme Court be established nonpartisan, free and independent, and beyond the pressure of any whim and caprice of public factionalism, fanaticism, public clamor, or the platitudes of the masses. The Court was established to be an all-time bulwark against such pressures and against infractions of the Constitution, however minor or serious, that might occur, and for the purpose also of declaring null and void any usurpations of power or encroachments that might occur by either the legislative or administrative branches of the Federal Government. For this reason the Supreme Court was placed beyond all approach and appointed for life.

The constitutional principle of complete sovereignty of the people, and that the States operated as independent political units, and that the Federal Government existed by reason of a grant of powers by the people was thereafter respected for at least 100 years. Under the protection of these principles and the establishment of this dual system of government, the United States became the freest and the most stable Government in the world. The liberty enjoyed by the citizens of this country was unequaled and unparalleled from the earliest records of organized society, dating back at least 4,000 years B. C., up to and including the present time.

It would be well to note at this time, however, that in the year 1819, the Supreme Court of the United States, in the case of *McCulloch* v. *Maryland*, speaking through Chief Justice Marshall enunciated a principle obviously necessary to a proper construction of that case, but which later served as a yardstick for the unwarranted assumption by Congress of vast powers never intended by the framers of the Constitution nor by the States subscribing thereto. This doctrine, simple at the time of its creation, was as follows:

"There were to be implied to the Federal Government all powers necessary to the exercise of the enumerated powers to the Federal Government."[5]

However, with some deviations, this principle *McCulloch* v. *Maryland* was strictly adhered to and powers that could not be truly and honestly considered as powers necessarily implied from the specific grants of power to Congress was not enlarged (*License Cases, 5 Howard*, 46 U. S. 504 (1847), and the American Government flourished and progressed under the dual system of government, as contemplated by the Federal Constitution.

Indeed, even after the war of the rebellion in 1866, during times of the greatest internal and national stress ever faced by the United States, in affirming the elementary principles of the Federal Constitution and the sovereignty of the people of the States, the Supreme Court states in ex parte Milligan[6] as follows:

"The Constitution of the United States is a law for rulers and people, equally in war and in peace, and covers with the shield of its protection all classes of men, at all times and under all circumstances. No doctrine involving more pernicious consequences was ever invented by the wit of man than that any of its provisions can be suspended during any of the great exigencies of government. Such a doctrine leads directly to anarchy or despotism, but the theory on which it is based is false; for government, within the Constitution, has all the powers granted to it which are necessary to preserve its existence; as has been happily proved by the result of the great effort to throw off its just authority."

However, from approximately 1887, the Supreme Court, slowly at first but thereafter during the years gaining momentum, enlarged by judicial construction the authority of the Congress of the United States and decreed as valid acts of Congress on the premise and ground that such legislation was a proper and necessary implied power to an express grant of power to Congress under the Constitution. The decision of the Supreme Court in *Bowman* v. *The Chicago Railway Company* (125 U. S. 465 (1887)), indicates the beginning of this trend of construction enhancing the implied powers of Congress. In this case the legislature of the State of Iowa, acting under the police powers and the sovereign rights of the people, had decreed that common carriers bringing intoxicating liquors into the State must first obtain a certificate from State authorities.

[5] *McCulloch* v. *Maryland* (4 Wheaton, p. 316).

[6] U. S. 2 (1866).

The enactment by the legislature of this law was necessary to adequately enforce the policy of State prohibition against the manufacture or sale of intoxicating liquor.

The desires of the people of the State of Iowa in this regard were swept aside by the Supreme Court in this decision, and the State legislation nullified insofar as this case was concerned, the Supreme Court, in construing the implied powers of Congress and the powers of Congress to regulate interstate commerce, held that the Iowa Legislature violated implied powers granted to Congress under the commerce clause, and states in part as follows: "The statute of Iowa * * * (requiring a certificate) is essentially a regulation of commerce among the States within any differentiation given to that term or which can be given; and although its motive and purpose are to perfect the policy of the State of Iowa in protecting its citizens against the evils of intemperance, it is nonetheless on that act a regulation of commerce." And so this State legislation and desires of the people of the State of Iowa were nullified and terminated.

This trend, however, toward liberal and enlarged construction of (implied) powers of Congress saw through the ensuing years, however, sporadic but continuous enlargement. As vacancies occurred, obviously personnel on the Court changed. There were also, however, placed upon the Supreme Court conservative lawyers and students of the Constitution and men studied in the fundamental principles of American government.

One of the greatest exponents of American constitutional Government, as contemplated by the American Constitution and the American way of life, was Justice David J. Brewer, who was a member of this distinguished bench from 1890 to 1910. One of his decisions standing out as a milestone in United States jurisprudence and coming at a time in which the trend of the court was and had been for some time toward liberal construction of legislative powers was the decision rendered in *Kansas* v. *Colorado* (206 U. S. 46 (1906)), in which he states, on behalf of the court, that the United States Government is one of enumerated powers and has no inherent powers of sovereignty; that this enumeration is to be found only in the United States Constitution, and that if Congress seeks new powers, it should be obtained as provided in the Constitution, and that the reservation and the reaffirmance of the rights of the people and the States, as set forth in the ninth and tenth amendments to the Constitution, are to be construed in simple English and are to mean what they say, and that "the proposition that there are legislative powers affecting the Nation as a whole which belong to, although not expressed in the grant of powers, is in direct conflict with the doctrine that this is a government of enumerated powers. That this is such a government clearly appears from the Constitution independently of the amendments. * * * This natural construction of the * * * Constitution is made absolutely certain by the tenth amendment. This amendment, which was seemingly adopted with prescience of just such contention as the present, disclosed the widespread fear that the National Government might, under the pressure of a supposed general welfare, attempt to exercise powers which had not been granted." [7]

This decision again reaffirmed and reestablished principles of constitutional government, but not for long. The doctrine of implied powers was again to be reaffirmed by the Supreme Court soon thereafter and in no uncertain fashion. Numerous decisions thereafter followed over a period of years and down to the present time which have opened the gates with increasing acceleration to Federal legislation and to administrative acts of the executive department in a manner never contemplated or comprehended by the States ratifying the Constitution, by the framers of the Constitution, or by the Constitution itself.

WARTIME PROHIBITION ACT

In 1919 this drift from the Constitution again became apparent. On November 21, 1918, there was enacted the Wartime Prohibition Act (40 Stat. 1046). This was approved 10 days after the armistice with Germany was signed. It provided that until the conclusion of the present war and thereafter until the termination of demobilization it was unlawful to sell alcoholic beverages. The act stated that this was for the purpose of conserving manpower. It is to be noted that under the grants of power to Congress there is no right given to legislate on the question of prohibition, and that if this legislation is a valid exercise of legislative power it would have to be affirmed as an "implied power" incidental to a direct grant of power to Congress. It is to be noted that this legislation was enacted after the capitulation of Germany and the signing of the armistice. However, the Supreme Court affirmed this legislation of Congress and held this legislation a "war power"—a power of Congress arising under its right to declare war and "to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution" [8] the powers expressly granted. This appears to be the first time that reference is had to "war powers" of the United States, powers that arise by implication from express grants of power to the Federal Legislature.

This decision opened the door to limitless legislation by Congress on the theory that legislation was justifiable as a war power. A right or power of Congress to enact legislation derived from the direct power to declare war and to enact such legislation as may be necessary to enforce the same.

The vicious part of this unbridled power is that these war powers are not confined to a period of time at which the country is actually engaged in a state of war. Let us examine further.

HOUSING AND RENT ACT, 1947

There was passed by Congress, effective July 1, 1947, and practically 2 years after the complete capitulation of Japan, what was known as the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, effective July 1, 1947, regulating the maximum price of rents to be charged under the authority of the Housing Administrator. The constitutionality of this litigation was affirmed by the United States Supreme Court [9] as valid legislation of Congress under their "war powers." And it is to be noted that in affirming the Housing Act of 1947, the Court cites with approval and authority the decision rendered in 1919 in Hamilton against the Kentucky Distilleries Co., supra, as its precedent, and concludes that "the war power includes the power 'to remedy the evils which have arisen from its rise and progress' and continues for the duration of that emergency. Whatever may be the consequences when war is officially terminated, the war power does not necessarily end with the cessation of hostilities." And most significant is this statement of the Court: "But we canot assume that Congress is not alert to its constitutional responsibilities." [10] In connection with this statement, it is well to remember that the Supreme Court is and was to act as a bastion and bulwark against the encroachment by Congress upon any other departments of the Government or the Constitution itself. The history of congressional legislation indicates to the contrary, and that Congress has time and again directed legislative mandates contrary to its power, and that on such occasions it has not been alerted to its constitutional responsibilities, and that the Supreme Court has had to vitiate and set aside such acts of Congress.

In this holding (Woods against Miller Co., supra), there is a concurring opinion, written by Justice Jackson who, while affirming the legality of the legislation, nevertheless views the same with great concern and skepticism, declaring that "the Government asserts no constitutional basis for this legislation other than this vague, undefined and undefinable 'war power.' No one will question that this power is the most dangerous one to free government in the whole catalog of powers." At the time of the present writing, it is 5 years and 4 months since Japan completely capitulated and under the guise of war powers, the Federal Government has and is enacting legislation not authorized under the Federal Constitution nor possible of conscientious construction as a "war power" of Congress.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

One of the greatest detours from the Constitution is to be found in the construction of implied powers to Congress resulting from the grant of power to Congress to regulate commerce among the States. This big step was made in the sanctioning of Federal legislation by the Supreme Court in a divided opinion rendered in 1935 in the case of *Ashwander* v. *The Tennessee Valley Authority* (297 U. S. 288). This decision literally and actually put the Federal Government into the business of distributing and selling electric power over large districts and to expel companies which had long serviced them and the control of the markets therein. This with all the protective rights of the sovereign and subject to no limitations whatsoever. A brief résumé of the history of this litigation and the ultimate finding of the Supreme Court is illuminating and the full import of its decision startling and amazing.

The Tennessee River is approximately 900 miles in length. The drainage basin approximately 40,000 square miles; the volume of water is extremely variable; commercial navigation is of moderate importance. However, during and immediately after World War I, there was constructed at Muscle Shoals, near Florence, Ala., the Wilson Dam. With its auxiliary plants, including the hydroelectric power plant, they were intended to be adapted to the purpose of national defense. Also, the act authorizing the creation of the same, the Defense Act of June 3, 1916, had in view improvements to navigation. As a result of this, the Federal production of electricity soon commenced. Some was devoted to Government purposes; much was sold but delivery made at or near the dam.

On May 18, 1933, Congress created a corporation, known as the Tennessee Valley Authority, and operations were begun for improving the Tennessee River navigation, and especially for developing the water power along the whole river at public expense. This plan involved conversion of water power into electricity for wide distribution throughout the valley and adjacent territory.

The United States Government immediately thereafter acting through its creation, the Tennessee Valley Authority, promptly took over the Wilson Dam; construction work began on the Wheeler Dam, 20 miles up the river; and the Pickwick Dam, some 40 miles lower down. It commenced construction on the Norris Dam, across the Clinch River, a branch of the Tennessee River 200 miles above the Wilson Dam. All of these additions

[7] *Kansas* v. *Colorado* (206 U. S. 546, p. 89).

[8] *Hamilton* v. *The Kentucky Distilleries Co.* (251 U. S. 146, p. 156 (1919)).

[9] *Woods* v. *Miller Co.*, 333 U. S. 138 (1947).

[10] *Woods* v. *Miller Co.*, 333 U. S. 144 (1947).

were to be connected by transmission wires, and electric energy distributed from them to millions of people in many States.[11]

At this time it is to be noted that during the last 30 years (prior to 1935), several corporations had been engaged in the business of developing electrical energy. It finally resulted in an extensive business having been built up; all private corporations, of course, and operated under State supervision. Among them were the Alabama Power Co., Georgia Power Co., Mississippi Power Co., and the Tennessee Electric Power Co. They were ultimately banded together under the mother company of the Commonwealth and Southern Corp. During this time and during the creation of these big private enterprises, huge sums of money were invested by thousands of persons in many States of the Union, and the companies were at all times diligently developing their several systems in response to the demands of the people in the territories that they served.

The creation of the Tennessee Valley Authority was to put the United States Government into the business of distributing and selling electric power through the same districts serviced by the aforementioned private power companies, and to expel the power companies which had long serviced them and to control the market therein.[12]

The question before the Supreme Court was that the Tennessee Valley Authority was not properly created nor authorized by any express grant of power or right to Congress, nor were the rights assuming to be exercised by Congress in the creation of the Authority proper incidental powers to be derived from any express power granted Congress.

The majority opinion in affirming this Federal legislation held "the act of 1916 had in view improvements to navigation. Commerce includes navigation. The power to regulate interstate commerce embodies the power to keep the navigable rivers of the United States free from obstructions to navigation and to remove such obstructions when they exist. The Government acquired full title to the dam site, with all riparian rights. The power of falling water was an inevitable incident to the construction of the dam. That water came into exclusive control of the Federal Government. The mechanical energy was convertible into electric energy, and the electric energy thus produced constitutes property belonging to the United States."

By this construction the Government was put into active competition, with all the exemptions of sovereignty, with private enterprise, which was subject to all of the burdens of government and of sovereignty.

A very capable dissenting opinion is written by Justice McReynolds in which it is pointed out that the public service corporations which were and had been servicing the millions of people in many States were to be brought to such terms as the Valley Authority saw fit to dictate, or to be put out of business, and that an early expenditure for this purpose of public funds of at least $75,000,000 was appropriated by the directors for this purpose. The purpose of the Valley Authority was definitely to control the market of selling and distributing electric power heretofore serviced by private companies. And the dissenting opinion clearly points out that "a Government instrumentality had entered upon a pretentious scheme to provide a yardstick to the fairness of rates charged by private owners and to attain no less a goal than the electrification of America."

Under the competition of Federal enterprise tax free and subject to no limitation other than the sovereign may desire to prescribe for itself, and free from any State limitation whatsoever, it is clear that the power companies, operating under the name of the Commonwealth & Southern Corp., were either to be forced into bankruptcy, or to comply with the pleasures of the Valley Authority. They chose the latter.

The Alabama Power Co. agreed to sell for $1,000,000 all of its low-tension transmission lines, substations, and all rural lines in five Alabama counties and parts of two others.

The Mississippi Power Co., for $350,000, agreed to transfer all of its transmission and distribution lines, substations and generating plants in nine counties in the State of Mississippi to the Authority.

For $900,000, the Tennessee Power Co. agreed to convey its transmission and distribution lines, substations, and distribution system in four counties in Tennessee and all of the 66 kilovolt transmission lines from Cove Creek to Knoxville, Tenn., to the Valley Authority.

Justice McReynolds in his conclusion states that "Congress has no constitutional authority to authorize the Tennessee Valley Authority or any other Federal agency to undertake the operation essentially permanent in character of a utility system for profit, involving the generation, transmission, and commercial distribution of electricity within State domain, having no reasonable relation to a lawful Government use." He further states, "if under the thin mask of disposing of property the United States can enter the business of generating * * * and selling power * * * with the definite design to accompany industry wholly beyond the sphere marked out from time to time by the Constitution, an easy way has been found for breaking down the limitations * * * to guarantee protection against aggression."

Clearly, the holding of the majority of the Supreme Court constitutes constitutional amendment by judicial legislation. Now for a step further and as a natural consequence of the breakdown of constitutional barriers, let us analyze the holdings of the Court in its construction of the commerce clause to be found in the case of *Wickard* v. *Filburn* (317 U. S. 111) decided some 7 years later (1942).

At this time there had been adopted by Congress the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938. It was amended in 1941, and this case has to do with the amendment of 1941. In this case the defendant, Filburn, had for many years owned and operated a small farm in Ohio. From this farm he obtained his living by selling cattle, milk, and raising poultry. To keep the farm operating properly, he raised a small acreage of winter wheat, which when sown in the fall was ready for harvest in July. Of this small amount of wheat, he would sell a portion of the crop to feed part of the poultry and livestock; another portion of the crop he used for home consumption; the rest of the crop he kept for seeding for the ensuing year. Under the terms of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, an order was issued limiting Filburn to 11.1 acres for the raising of wheat and each acre not to yield more than 20.1 bushels of wheat. Apparently, finding that he could not adequately operate his small farm on this arbitrary allotment, he planted and sowed 23 acres of his land with wheat and harvested from the excess acreage sown (11.9 acres), excess bushels in the number of 239. Under the terms of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, he was now subject to a penalty of 49 cents a bushel, or $117.11, and because of his refusal or inability to pay the penalty, he was refused a marketing card. Obviously the effect of this was to put him out of business.

The question of the constitutionality of this act was presented to the Supreme Court and the Court affirmed the validity of the act on the ground that the act constituted a regulation of interstate commerce and as such was the exercise of a power authorized to Congress.

The validity of this act is justified by the Court in part in the following words: "The general scheme of the act is to control the volume moving in interstate and foreign commerce in order to avoid surpluses and shortages, and the consequent abnormal low or high wheat prices and obstructions to commerce."

The opinion also asserts the following conclusion of the Court: "The question (constitutionality of the act) would merit little consideration since our decisions in *United States* v. *Darby* (312 U. S. 100) sustaining the Federal power to regulate production of goods for commerce, except for the fact that this act extends Federal regulation to production not intended in any part for commerce but wholly for consumption on the farm."[13]

Can this be said to be anything other than judicial enlargement of constitutional powers? And what has happened to the dual system of government contemplated by the Constitution in the face of this holding and the rights of the States and the sovereign rights of the people clearly defined in the fundamental law?

Does it not bear out the admonition and the warning emanating from the dissenting opinion of Justice McKenna, in the case of *Block* v. *Hirsch* (254 U. S. 458), in which the majority opinion of the Supreme Court affirmed rent control of private property in the District of Columbia in 1921, in which Justice McKenna states "'withstand beginnings' (*Boyd* v. *United States* (116 U. S. 616)). Who can know to what end they will conduct? The facts of this litigation point the warning."

The decisions, of course, are replete with similar holdings on "implied" powers of Congress relative to the commerce clause. However, this trend of construction does not stop with the commerce clause. The same "liberal" attitude or drift is to be found in the construction by the Court of the power granted to Congress "the power to make treaties under the authority of the United States" (art. VI, sec. 2).

Under the guise of a treaty with Canada protecting migratory birds, an act of Congress which standing alone was manifestly unconstitutional[14] now became the law of the land (*Missouri* v. *Holland* (252 U. S. 416), opinion by Justice Holmes. But the consequence of this holding and subsequent holdings is so very far-reaching and so transcends constitutional grants that they can only be adequately treated in a separate discussion.

NINTH AND TENTH AMENDMENTS BEING NULLIFIED

And so it is clearly apparent that the inherent and sovereign rights of the people and the States, recognized and guaranteed in the ninth and tenth amendments of the Constitution have been inched away by congressional usurpation of power and authority, and that legislative exercise of power in this respect has been affirmed by the supreme tribunal.

The great danger to be found in the wake of such expansion and centralization of power is totalitarianism and dictatorship. History is replete with the rise of false prophets motivated only by political success and desire for personal grandeur and personal enthronement, who through the usurpation of powers, will play to the platitudes of the masses and under the postulates of

[11] Dissenting opinion of Justice McReynolds, *Ashwander* v. *The Tennessee Valley Authority* (297 U. S. 288).

[12] See, Report of the Tennessee Valley Authority for 1934-35.

[13] *Wickard* v. *Filburn* (317 U. S. 111, p. 123).

[14] *United States* v. *Shauver* (214 Fed. 154 (1914)); *United States* v. *McCullagh* (221 Fed. 288 (1915)); *State* v. *Sawyer* (113 Maine 458 (1915)); *State* v. *McCullagh* (96 Kans. 786 1915)).

democracy will not hesitate to seize power and ultimately annihilate the sovereign rights of the people. A most casual analysis of the Hitler regime, the Mussolini dictatorship, the present Stalin bureaucracy advocating the alleged supremacy of the proletariat, illustrates nicely and comprehensively the complete assassination of sovereign rights and free enterprise, and the consequential results of the doctrine of unlimited powers of Federal Government.

Such a situation and such contingencies and uncertainties were most comprehendingly discussed by President William Harrison in 1841, in succeeding to the Presidency and after the expiration of the office of Andrew Jackson. In his only message to Congress, after pointed comments in regard to the powers assumed by Andrew Jackson, he follows with this observation:

"This is the old trick of those who usurp the government of their country. In the name of democracy they speak, warning the people against the influence of wealth and the danger of aristocracy. History, ancient and modern, is full of such examples. Caesar became the master of the Roman people and the senate under the pretense of supporting the democratic claims of the former against the aristocracy of the latter; Cromwell, in the character of the protector of the liberties of the people, became the dictator of England, and Bolivar possessed himself of unlimited power with the title of his country's liberator. * * * The tendencies of all such governments in their decline is to monarchy, and the antagonistic principle to liberty there is spirit of faction—a spirit which assumes the character and in times of great excitement imposes itself upon the people as the genuine spirit of freedom, and, like the false christs whose coming was foretold by the Saviour, seeks to, and were it possible, would impose upon the true and most faithful disciples of liberty. It is in periods like this that it behooves the people to be most watchful of those to whom they have entrusted power."

POLAND SOLD OUT AT YALTA

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRIEST). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, the month of February brings to mind many dates of which the American people are justly proud, such as Washington's and Lincoln's birthdays.

However, this week marks the anniversary of a date on which America can lower her head in shame. We are not proud to remember that 6 years ago the now infamous Yalta agreement was drawn up by the architects of our present foreign policy, one of the chief advisers being Alger Hiss.

Yesterday marked the day that the Democratic Party, the Hisses, the New Deal, the Fair Deal—yes, even the "queer deal"—sold Poland into slavery and paved the way for the enslavement of eight more European nations and permitted the Soviet Empire to become a great world force. They turned the Polish people over to communism; they covered up the facts of the Katyn massacre for many years where many thousands of Polish officers were wantonly massacred: they put religion on the chopping block to such an extent that the feature news story in last Sunday's Catholic News reported:

"The curtailments suffered by the church in Poland during 1950 were among the worst in its 1,000-year history."

In my own city of Chicago the great majority of Polish people in the past have supported the Democratic Party. Why does not the Democratic Party demand just treatment and renounce the sell-out of Poland? Why does not this Democratic Party right the wrongs of Yalta? Why? Because they will not admit their own blunders, and it will have to remain for the Republican Party to restore decency and confidence in our foreign relations, and to restore Poland to its rightful place among the great nations of the world.

THE BOXCAR SITUATION IN THE MIDWEST

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, the boxcar situation throughout the Midwest is again becoming very bad and especially has it been aggravated by the switchmen's strike. I have today introduced H. R. 2517, which would give to the Interstate Commerce Commission the power to regulate the rental charges on boxcars which, for example, leave our area in the Midwest with a load of grain or lumber for an eastern destination. Eastern lines then used these cars day after day instead of returning them immediately to their home railroads in the West and Midwest. Consequently, at times, some of our railroads in the Midwest have 30 percent of their boxcars doing shuttle service at $1.75 a day on the eastern lines, instead of being returned for another long haul. By raising the rental to a reasonable figure, the Interstate Commerce Commission can regulate the use of these cars and prevent chaotic conditions occurring periodically in the great grain-producing areas of our Nation. I hope the membership will help in getting this legislation adopted. It will save from spoilage and wastage millions of bushels of high-moisture-content grain annually.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

TWO RELATED INCIDENTS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, two events took place yesterday which should have a definite relation with each other in the minds of the American public.

One was the successful effort of the Republican minority to achieve a greater degreee of realism in the reciprocal trade agreements program; and the other, the conviction in New York City of William W. Remington for perjury involving denial of his Communist affiliations.

While I do not charge that the negotiation of trade agreements with other countries, handled or at least dominated by the State Department, has been dictated by unpatriotic motives, the evidence is conclusive that disloyal elements have wormed their way into this crucial governmental activity. Certainly, case after case can be cited where the United States negotiators displayed far deeper concern over the welfare of foreign industries and those employed in them than they did over American businesses and American working men and women.

International trade is vitally important to the prosperity and well being of the people of this country. If trade agreements are conscientiously arrived at and scrupulously administered in accordance with the protective provisions now incorporated in the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act and all parties concerned sincerely bend their efforts toward making it work, many of the evils and injustices which have resulted from the present program can be eliminated without impairment, indeed with an increase in the volume of international trade flowing in both directions.

It is regrettable that the attitude of the administration leaders who sponsored the bill before us yesterday made it necessary to water down the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] to withdraw the application of reduced tariffs and other concessions which have been granted to imports from Russia, Red China and other Communist dominated countries. At least the minority members of the Committee on Ways and Means did succeed in convincing the Majority that they should not throw a road block in the way of the effort to stop the State Department from championing the grant of such concessions to Communist countries in the future.

Probably no one in Congress knows what goes on behind the scenes in preparation for these international trade conferences or what takes place at the conferences themselves. Contrary to the practice of other countries, Members of the United States Congress are excluded from participation in these conclaves.

We do know that in many instances damaging, sometimes fatal, concessions have been made by our representatives. We also know that the personnel of some of our negotiators was, in many instances, not such as to commend them to the confidence of the American people.

The insidious influence of Alger Hiss in international conferences has been repeatedly emphasized. Now we have the case of William W. Remington, who stands convicted of having lied when he said he was not a member of the Communist Party.

It is important for us to remember, and for the American public constantly to bear in mind, the high official positions which Remington held and the influence upon international trade matters which

he necessarily exerted. Let me refresh your recollection as to the high posts in Government which he held.

When he testified in July of 1948 before the Senate Committee on Expenditures, he had previously been a staff member of the President's Council of Economic Advisers with offices in the White House and the assistant executive secretary of a committee headed by Mr. Harriman, with offices in the White House, and was at that time the director of the export program staff of the Office of International Trade, Department of Commerce. In this last capacity he was directly under Mr. Thomas C. Blaisdell, the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for foreign and domestic commerce.

It should not be necessary for the Congress of the United States to be required by legislation to direct, as they did yesterday, that the executive agencies shall endeavor to protect American interests when they negotiate trade treaties and that they shall not grant reduced tariffs and other concessions to Communist-controlled countries. But unfortunately, bitter experience has dictated the necessity for such protective amendments.

On the very day Congress steps in to protect American interests, a dramatic illustration of one of the reasons for this action is furnished by this conviction in a court of law of one of our highest placed experts in international trade.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman stated something about an amendment being adopted yesterday by the Republican minority. Did not that amendment receive support from the majority side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman does not state a parliamentary inquiry. The RECORD speaks for itself, as to what took place on the floor of the House.

THE TREASURY AND THE FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, in the current controversy between the Treasury and the Federal Reserve Board it is the people who are getting burned. One of the things we said about this emergency was that there was not to be business as usual or politics as usual. I think it is time to end politics in this situation and have the Treasury and Federal Reserve Board get together to answer these questions: Shall the interest on the national debt be a billion or so dollars less, which makes the budget look better; or shall inflation be dealt a real blow by dealing with the inflationary expansion of bank credit at its source? Let us remember that such inflation can cost our people many times in billions of dollars of purchasing power what additional expenditure would be involved in somewhat higher interest rates on some Government bond issues.

Normally the people are entitled to low-interest rates and that is in the long-range interest of the United States. We are in grave danger from inflation now and reasonable people will not object to measures to halt it so that we may indeed again be able to take up the forward march to normal economic conditions and low interest rates. But if one of these parties wins an absolute victory—and that is the Treasury—they are going to go off in one direction without the Federal Reserve Board with what may well prove a disservice to the people. The time has come for compromise, we need the Treasury and Federal Reserve Board unified on policy. It would be a service to the people if the President "called off the dogs" and both parties got together and inflation attributable to vast additions to the money supply and public credit was dealt a body blow now. The people will understand that saving somewhat on interest payments on national debt in such circumstances would be penny wise and pound foolish.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRIEST). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Speaker, for several decades it has been evident that the St. Lawrence seaway and power project will make a substantial addition to the economic strength of Canada and the United States. By removing the narrow bottleneck—created by rapids in the St. Lawrence River—between Ogdensburg, N. Y., and Montreal—a distance of 114 miles—a 2,347-mile deepwater channel between the Great Lakes and the Atlantic Ocean will be opened. Chicago, Detroit, Milwaukee, Toledo, Duluth, and other Great Lakes cities will become ocean ports. Great transportation savings will result throughout the area when the midwest finally receives its Panama Canal.

As part of the dual-purpose development of the St. Lawrence River, a power project, the equivalent of a Grand Coulee, will be made available. The site of this power development is at Massena, N. Y. Shared equally by Canada and the United States, the 13,000,000,000-kilowatt-hours of electric energy generated annually will go far to alleviate the critical power situation facing Eastern Canada and the New York-New England region.

The present legislation calls for the project to be self-liquidating. Tolls are to be charged on the waterway. The State of New York is to pay for the power facilities, which will be turned over to that State. Thus, the taxpayers do not bear the ultimate burden of the costs of the St. Lawrence development.

The present world crisis serves to emphasize the urgency of getting started on the St. Lawrence project. The Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Joint Board for Defense, Canada and the United States, and the Defense Department, have all taken the view that the St. Lawrence development is needed for the security of Canada and the United States.

But most important of all to our national security is the need for the St. Lawrence seaway to provide a protected waterway to transport Labrador iron ore to Great Lakes steel mills.

Over a 50-year period, and through two world wars, the mines around Lake Superior have supplied most of the Nation's iron ore. But now, the huge reserves of high-grade ore in the area are seriously depleted. The demands of the present mobilization period will make new inroads on our declining domestic reserves of ore. By 1960 we shall be forced to import a very substantial portion of the iron ore required by our steel mills. Labrador ore provides the only major continental source of high-grade ore to supplement our dwindling domestic supplies.

The St. Lawrence seaway is urgently needed to make it possible to bring Labrador iron ore in over a protected inland route rather than over exposed ocean routes, subject to enemy submarine attack.

Moreover, the inexpensive waterway transportation will have a stabilizing effect on industry in the Middle West. If the seaway is not constructed, the steel industry and associated industries will tend to migrate to coastal areas to take advantage of cheap tidewater transportation of foreign iron ores. The resulting economic decline of the Midwest, and the further concentration of industry on our exposed East and Gulf coasts, will adversely affect the security of the Nation.

Both the power and navigation facilities of the St. Lawrence project are urgently needed for the national security of Canada and the United States. Further delay in undertaking the St. Lawrence project must not be tolerated.

CONVICTION OF WILLIAM W. REMINGTON

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, another red herring has finally been laid to rest. This time it is the case of William W. Remington, the $10,000-a-year Commerce Department economist who was found guilty last night of perjury. What the verdict amounts to, of course, is a finding that Remington has been a member of the gang of Communist spies, saboteurs, and traitors in high Government positions

who have been serving the cause of Russia for many years.

We should draw two lessons from the Remington verdict. First, it is a sad commentary on the President's so-called loyalty program. In February 1949, many months after espionage charges had been made against Remington, the President's Loyalty Review Board cleared him and awarded him $5,000 in back pay to cover the period of his suspension. One of the many astounding aspects of the Board's action was the later admission by its chairman, Seth Richardson, that it had never bothered to study the testimony about Remington that had been developed by a Senate investigating committee during the Eightieth Congress, even after that testimony had been transmitted to the Board for its especial consideration. This Mr. Richardson is, of course, the same man whom Mr. Truman has recently nominated to be chairman of the new Subversive Activities Control Board. By this action in the Remington case alone, Mr. Richardson has disqualified himself for any such important position.

The second lesson from the Remington verdict is that it proves the importance of the work of congressional investigating committees in ferreting out disloyalty. The Remington case was developed in its early stages by the House Un-American Activities Committee, as was the Alger Hiss case. Luckily, these committees did not believe that the stench from the Remington and other cases were just the odor of "red herring," as President Truman wise-cracked repeatedly.

EFFICIENT USE OF MILITARY PERSONNEL

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, General Marshall and his advisers are advocating that Congress approve legislation for the drafting of 18-year-olds. This legislation might not be necessary and veterans of World War II would not be recalled to active duty if the Department of Defense would only use the available manpower efficiently and economically.

A recent communication from a GI on duty clearly indicates the Army is not doing the job effectively. A corporal was recalled to active duty in November. He spent 2 weeks at Fort Sheridan in Illinois. From there he was shipped to Tacoma, Wash., where he remained 2 weeks. Then a shift back east to Percy Jones Hospital in Battle Creek, Mich., for duty. Approximately a month later he received orders to report to his new duty, back again at Tacoma, Wash.

This GI will have traveled approximately 10,000 miles in 3 months. From Fort Sheridan, Ill., to Battle Creek, Mich., is about 140 miles but under Army orders he traveled to the west coast and back again.

The American people need to have confidence in the Department of Defense, but they are properly disturbed by such unsound personnel policies.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to address the House for 90 minutes on Wednesday next, following the disposition of the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

NEWS REPORTS AND COMMENTARIES FREE OF LABOR INFLUENCE

Mr. VAIL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a copy of a bill I am today introducing.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. VAIL. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill that has for its purpose the preservation to the American public of its right to news reports and commentaries, free from the influence that can be exerted by national labor organizations upon their membership.

Under this measure I propose to exclude from the provisions of section 9 of the National Labor Relations Act of 1947, as amended, all employees of newspapers or periodicals, and all others, directly involved in gathering and presentation of marketed public information.

Freedom of the press is one of our constitutional guaranties, recognized as vital to our national security. However, it cannot be contradicted that no real freedom of the press can exist, no complete honesty of presentation can be assured, and no genuine, well-founded public confidence can be reposed in reportorial accuracy if individuals who develop and phrase news that shapes public opinion are subject to economic pressure from sources having vital and widely varied interest in news content.

It would seem obvious that the news reporter under the impression his working conditions have been or could be improved by membership in a union through its affiliation with a national labor organization or who can, under certain circumstances, be deprived of his means of livelihood under the rules of such organization cannot fail to be influenced in some degree by reason of the relationship.

Sound public policy demands forthright presentation of news. The American press must function freely, safe from even the suspicion of undercover utilization of power over reportorial staffs by labor organizations for the purpose of directing public thought through news coloration nor should even the suspicion exist that such organizations could, through friendly relations established by mutual interests restrict or prevent publication of unfavorable information.

Public policy has decreed that Federal, State and municipal employees be excluded from the provisions of the act. Surely to no less a degree can exclusion be justified of that group that is charged with the great responsibility of reporting the news for public consumption on which the opinions formed by our American citizenry are predicated.

The fourth estate has its proud traditions. It constitutes a field of service that affords great opportunity and attracts men and women of exceptional talent. Its very nature and its exacting requirements insures for them adequate compensation and fair working conditions. Clearly, an alliance of newsmen with any organization having a vital selfish interest in news content is contrary to public interest and a departure from traditional reportorial independence.

It should be made clear that this bill is not to be interpreted as accusatory in the sense that it is prompted by the back record. The intent is purely to safeguard to the greatest possible degree vital public interest in open-minded news presented.

My bill reads as follows:

H. R. 2516

A bill to deny the benefits of the National Labor Relations Act to any labor organization whose membership includes certain employees of newspapers and periodicals

Be it enacted, etc., That section 9 of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(i) No investigation shall be made by the Board of any question affecting commerce concerning the representation of employees, raised by a labor organization under subsection (c) of this section, no petition filed by a labor organization under section 9 (e) (1) shall be entertained, and no complaint shall be issued pursuant to a charge made by a labor organization under subsection (b) of section 10, if such labor organization is an affiliate or constituent unit of any national or international labor organization and includes among its officers or members any individual employed by a newspaper or other periodical as a writer, reporter, correspondent, or commentator, or in any other capacity which is directly involved in the gathering or presentation of news."

PACKED APPROPRIATION SUBCOMMITTEES

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, the Appropriations Committee met yesterday and organized 1 month after the organization of the House. I want to call the attention of the House to one of the most shocking examples of packing committees that I have ever witnessed in my 28 years in Congress.

Although the historic ratio between majority and minority members has been 3 to 2, the Democrats yesterday packed two subcommittees of the Appropriations Committee at a 5-to-2 ratio, and three other subcommittees at 4-to-2 ratio.

I want to call attention to the fact that the five committees which have been stacked are committees where any substantial savings in the budget this year must be made. With Republicans hav-

ing 46 percent of the membership of the House, it is impossible for me to reconcile the fact that we received only 29 percent representation on two committees and only 33⅓ percent representation on three others.

I can only conclude that it is the intention of the committee chairman, Mr. CANNON, and the Democratic leadership of this House to ignore public demand for economy and to protect the bureaucrats in their spend-as-usual programs. If Mr. CANNON wants to be the pallbearer for the Democratic Party, who am I to stop him? I can only tell this House that the Republican members will work with all the energy they possess to hold every non-defense-appropriation item to only essentials. But I must tell the House that Republicans cannot be held responsible for appropriations voted by stacked committees.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, as members of the Subcommittee on State, Justice, Commerce, and Judiciary Appropriations, my colleague from Ohio [Mr. CLEVENGER] and myself find that subcommittee has been stacked against us 5 to 2. For the life of me, I cannot understand what the chairman and the Democratic members of the committee hope to gain by such tactics. I know that the people of my district, and I am confident that the entire population of this country, want a maximum of economy, particularly in nondefense items, during this crisis when they are asked to submit to taxes until it hurts.

There is simply no justification for this arbitrary action unless it be that the Democratic Party wants to commit suicide. If the Democratic Party wishes to extinguish itself, it has picked a certain way to do it because the responsibility for any extravagance during this critical year will lie squarely on that party.

As a member of the committee, I will, of course, spend every hour that I can in efforts to effect the economies that we must have if this Nation is to remain secure, and I know that I express the sentiment of all 20 Republican members of the Appropriations Committee. But I cannot accept responsibility when I am not permitted to share in it.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, as a member of one of the committees that has in effect been stacked 5 to 2 in favor of reckless spending, I rise to join the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] in this protest. We on the subcommittee for the Interior have worked long hours in the past to do the best job possible. What justification there can be for this procedure, short of protecting the bureaucrats and spenders, I do not know. I will promise the House this much: My colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON] and myself will do the best we can, even though we may be outvoted 5 to 2, and I further promise that if substantial reductions are not made—and I have very little hope that they will be made—we will bring amendments to the floor that will give this House—with its 54–46-percent ratio representation—a chance to do the job.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I think the comments made by the distinguished ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations [Mr. TABER] and other Republican members of that committee today are of interest to everybody in the entire United States. They show an organization plan in the committee which can be directed to only one thing; that is, to the protection of spending as against saving.

I am also interested in the fact that the Subcommittee on Agriculture, a basic commodity of the United States, a great industry of the United States, is to be placed by the committee chairman and the majority members of the Committee on Appropriations in the same category as the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I protested to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] against treating the Subcommittee on Agriculture in that fashion yesterday.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

SUBVERSIVES

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, a few minutes ago reference was made to the Remington and Hiss cases. Both Remington and Hiss were cleared by loyalty boards. These cases bring to my mind another case.

I refer to the case of George Shaw Wheeler, a man whose record I exposed on this floor several years ago. I was severely criticized and smeared at the time because it was stated that the man had been cleared by three loyalty boards. A little over a year ago this same man repudiated the United States and sought asylum behind the iron curtain under Russian protection. A man who was educated in this country and given every opportunity the same as any other citizen repudiated the country of his birth and the land that gave him opportunity and education.

This brings me to another point. This Nation does not yet know the debt of gratitude we owe the able and distinguished gentleman from Mississippi, Hon. JOHN RANKIN, for the part he played in establishing the Committee on Un-American Activities. That committee examined the records of Alger Hiss and Remington and their questionable connections. The function of this committee is to examine the records of people of this type for security reasons, and it has done excellent and valuable work.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, the conviction of William Remington for perjury in connection with his membership in the Communist Party has another lesson which I think ought to be pointed out. It has to do with the reliability of Miss Elizabeth Bentley, Whittaker Chambers, and Louis Budenz. These three individuals, against whom every possible smear has been directed in an effort to discredit them and destroy confidence in them, have been demonstrated to be accurate in every case that could be confirmed or disproved by additional evidence. In every case thus far where it has been possible to establish the truth about persons whom any one of the three has said he knew as a member of the Communist apparatus, their testimony has been proved true. I think the country owes a debt of gratitude to them for their willingness, when subpenaed, to go back into their own past and bring out some thing which they naturally would rather have kept secret in order to do their duty to their country now and try to atone for the harm they did their country in the past.

What about the other persons—besides Hiss, Remington, Wadleigh, Pressman, and so forth—whom Bentley, Budenz, and Chambers have said they knew as members of the Communist Party, and whom loyalty boards or Senate committees have cleared? It seems to me that all of us who are sworn to defend our country against all enemies, foreign and domestic, must assume that such accused persons are suspect until proved otherwise and must govern ourselves accordingly. When deciding whom we are to believe, the record clearly indicates we can and should believe the three abovenamed witnesses who have consistently been proved right rather than the loyalty boards who have so often been wrong, to the detriment of our national interests.

FREEDOM FOR POLAND

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I think it is quite appropriate that we should today recall the unconscionable agreements made at Yalta, from which emanated such unspeakable grief, injustice, turmoil, and current threats of war. Much of the strife and discord that exist in the world today can be traced to Yalta. Certainly the predominance, which the Soviets have achieved in world polity, is lastingly attributable to Yalta and similar concessions and appeasements.

One of the most shameful of all chapters in the Yalta handbook was the betrayal of Poland. Many times I have characterized that action as one of the great crimes of history and that is just what it is.

The idea of casually consigning into slavery the great and noble Polish people, with centuries of historic love for liberty and sacrifice from freedom, is monstrous. For my part, I have never acknowledged the validity of the agreements reached at Yalta, affecting the Polish and other free nations with similarly fine traditions, who were entitled to the same benefit of the principles enunciated in the Atlantic Charter, as other nations in the world.

I again make another emphatic and vigorous protest against the enslavement of the Polish people and ask this Government and this Congress to take a stand in favor of their deliverance from the tyranny of the Soviets. I ask that relief in the name, not only of Poland alone, but of Lithuania and other nations suffering under serfdom, and in the name of the millions who sacrificed so bitterly in order that freedom might be made a reality but whose sacrifices have been nullified up to this point by diplomatic blunders.

SUBVERSIVES

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, when, in 1946 as chairman of the Republican National Committee, I made speeches on the platform and on the radio pointing out that Communists, fellow travelers, and subversives had insinuated themselves into positions of importance in the Government service and I named Alger Hiss and William Remington as examples, I was castigated, cartooned, and reviled extensively in the press. While no one takes satisfaction in seeing harm come to any individual, there is consolation that the records of some of these subversives are finally being established in the courts of our land. I am satisfied there are many others still in positions of influence.

UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, apropos of what some of the honorable gentlemen have said regarding the Remington conviction, particularly the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] regarding the attack made on people like Whittaker Chambers and Louis Budenz, I recall about 7 or 8 months ago when Louis Budenz appeared before a Senate committee and gave very strong testimony against one of the State Department policy advisers, Owen Lattimore. And, I recall that within a very few days thereafter a vicious attack was made against Louis Budenz on the Senate floor in an administration effort to protect Mr. Lattimore. It was a disgraceful thing. It was the type of thing that has brought us to the bad situation we are in today, not listening to the truth, trying to cover up some of the mistakes and some of the traitorous acts of people like Alger Hiss in the Government service and the pro-Communist advice of professors like Owen Lattimore called in to shape the thinking of Secretary Acheson in the disastrous far eastern policy that led to Korea.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, my real purpose in remaining here is to listen later on to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN]. But, while waiting for that, permit me to suggest to the members of the Committee on Appropriations, the Republicans, that you should not be too greatly grieved about the fact that they have stacked those subcommittees against you. In the last session the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments had 18 New Dealers—no, I guess it was 5 Democrats, 13 New Dealers, and but 7 Republicans. Being on that committee I considered that ratio something of a compliment. Seven Republicans equal to 5 Democrats plus 15 Truman Democrats, made me feel fairly good. So, my Republican colleagues on the Appropriations Committee do not grieve too much about it. Moreover, the Democrats were only trying to establish unity, and to do it by excluding the greatest possible number of Republicans from the committee and the subcommittees.

There is however a matter of principle involved in this situation and unless we are willing to ignore our duty to the Republican Party, abandon our faith in the two-party system we should take immediate aggressive action to right the wrong, to protect our colleagues on the Appropriations Committee.

In my judgment a resolution should be offered to the House instructing the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations or the committee itself to appoint new subcommittees, the membership of which should be divided between Democrats and Republicans in as near as possible to the same ratio that exists in the House.

That has been the custom in the years gone by, it is fair and just. There is no reason why the chairman of that committee should be permitted to punish members who voted against his pet idea of the way appropriation bills should be handled.

If the Republican leadership does not offer such a bill I shall do so.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to talk about another subject.

Today, the Army, which has been in nominal charge of certain railroads since last August, issued an order which calls upon the striking employees to go back to work when called, unless they can show that they are really ill. If the strikers do not comply with this order, which was signed by Assistant Army Secretary Karl R. Bendetsen, they will be discharged—lose their jobs as railway employees.

The order states that, twice since last August, "a relatively small group of over one million employees have violated the law of the land."

I do not know whether this relatively small group of railway employees has violated the law of the land, but I do know that some of them have disobeyed court orders and that the effect of the transportation tie-up which they have brought about has prevented the shipment of needed munitions of war to the men who are fighting abroad; it has interfered with the movement of conscripted men to their training camps. It has prevented some men, who have served abroad, making visits to their families.

Twice, impartial mediation boards, appointed by the President under the law, have found that the demands of the railroad men were not justified, should not be granted.

On the last occasion, a mediation board, if my understanding is correct, recommended a raise of 18 cents an hour for the yardman, and 5 cents an hour for the roadmen. This recommendation was accepted by the railroads and by the officers of the union. Notwithstanding this agreement, some of the crews went on strikes and transportation was, for the second time, tied up.

The Army order anounces an interim wage increase of 12½ cents an hour for the yardmen, or 5½ cents less than was recommended by the Mediation Board; and 5 cents an hour, or the same increase that was recommended, for the roadmen.

One thing is certain—all too long, small groups in various unions which to a large extent are employed in activities supplying transportation, light, fuel and water to the public have been permitted to enforce their demands through strikes.

It has long been my contention that no group, either of workers or industrialists, should be permitted to follow a course which interfered with the health, welfare or safety of the public.

The soundness of this contention is apparent when we remember that the rates charged by public utilities, by companies furnishing the services above referred to, are often fixed by either State or Federal authorities.

It may be, as has sometimes been charged, that in the past these strikes have been brought about by Communists working from within the unions. We do know that the CIO, in recent months, has, as a matter of self-protection, been forced to expel a number of its affiliates because Communists had acquired control of those unions.

It would be absurd, it would be foolish, to charge that strikes as a whole are instigated or carried on by Communists, for there are few—but the few very powerful—Communists in unions.

There is strong reason to suspect that some, desiring the socialism of public utilities, have instigated, do lend support to, these strikes, in the hope that the Government will be forced to take over the companies operating these public utilities.

No doubt, some who wish the Government to take over are of the opinion that, when the Government secures control, then the unions, through political pressure and political alliance with those in authority, will find it easy to make good their demands for either shorter hours or increased compensation.

Few there are who believe that any man should be forced to work at a job other than one of his own choosing. It is equally true that no man should be permitted to be a dog in the manger, that is, to refuse to work at a job which did not suit him, where the compensation was not to his liking, and, in addition, prevent anyone else from working at that job. That sort of a position cannot be maintained in a free America.

A remedy? The remedy is simple if the facts are given consideration.

Unions have obtained a position of power because, and only because, the Congress has given unions and union members certain special privileges and benefits denied to nonunion members.

When the unions or the members of such unions refuse to exercise those powers wisely and judiciously, when they use those powers oppressively and, through the exercise of those powers, endanger the public health, safety or welfare, then the obvious remedy is not to throw the union men in jail, not to attempt to force them to work, but to deny them the special benefits and privileges which have been granted them by so-called labor legislation.

A bill has been introduced which would apply that remedy; which would take from union men the special benefits and privileges which they enjoy as union men, when they refuse to work at their jobs and when such refusal is injurious to the public as a whole.

There is evidence that the few who, in unions, attempt to use the special privileges granted them, capriciously, arbitrarily, injuriously, to the detriment of the public, have come to the end of the road; that the people, and the Congress, although lagging behind the people, will ultimately enact and insist upon the enforcement of legislation which will protect the public against the demands of the few.

THE REMINGTON CASE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the conviction of William Remington, I think it only fair to point out, in view of the severe criticism of the House Committee on Un-American Activities that has been appearing recently in Westbrook Pegler's newspaper column, that whatever sins of omission or commission the committee has been guilty of, it was responsible, nevertheless, for the reopening of the Remington case. Through the efforts of the committee, additional evidence was certified. This evidence led to Remington's conviction yesterday in Federal court on a charge of perjury.

I had the honor to serve on the Committee on Un-American Activities during the Eighty-first Congress. I found, very quickly, that the work of that committee is extremely difficult. It is under constant attack, both from the right and from the left. The extreme right complains because it does not hang somebody before sunrise every morning. The extreme left denies that the committee has any business investigating anybody or anything.

It is my sincere belief, however, that the committee conducted its proceedings in the Eighty-first Congress with dignity, with fairness, and in keeping with its assigned mission. A careful reading of the published reports and transcripts of hearings bears this out, and my regret is that these publications have not received more general attention. It heard more witnesses, took more pages of testimony, and published more reports than at any time in the history of the committee.

The committee has uncovered a startling series of subversive Communist operations in the United States—operations undertaken methodically and accomplished with chilling success. The investigations of the committee gave clear proof of the extent to which the Communists have attempted a systematic undermining of our atomic research projects, establishment of sabotage cells in communications and in other key industries and infiltration of the Federal Government and such important defense bastions as the Territory of Hawaii.

The committee certainly is not immune to criticism. I believe Mr. Pegler should consider the whole record of the committee, however, in the interest of fair reporting.

PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute for the purpose of finding out the program to be announced by the majority leader for next week.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, Monday is Lincoln's birthday and there will be no legislative business on that day. On Tuesday there will be no legislative business. There is no business scheduled for next week at all, as a matter of fact. The House has been acting so efficiently that we have disposed very promptly of the matters that have come before us.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. May I say that the gentleman from Massachusetts is being very courteous to the Republicans who will be speaking next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. I appreciate the observation of my friend, and I want him to know that it brings pleasure to me to arrange the program with that in mind. It is what I want to do and what any decent-minded person in my position should do.

There will be no legislation on Wednesday. If there is any legislation to be considered next week it will not be before Thursday, and I know of none at the present time. If any legislation does come out of committee to come up next week, and that is to be considered under the regular rules of the House, that is, with general debate and consideration under the 5-minute rule, I shall give the House as much advance notice as possible so that Members will not be left in an unguarded position. However, I know of nothing important for next week, and insofar as I am able I shall try to have nothing important come up if it should be reported out of committee. I do not want to bind myself to that, but even if anything is reported out it will not come up before Thursday of next week.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I assume, then, that the majority leader has not in mind any anticipated emergencies that might call for action on a resolution or anything of that nature, and that those who stay here will have opportunity to express their views from the well of the House?

Mr. McCORMACK. As the gentleman knows, I am a great believer in the principle of freedom of speech. As far as I am concerned, I enjoy every speech I hear, whether or not I agree with it in whole or in part. If the gentleman has any desire to make speeches on any day next week, or every day, it is perfectly all right with me. We will meet every day except, of course, that I would not want to have the House meet on Friday of next week if we had no business.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I do not have any in mind now, but occasionally impulses to speak cause me to do so.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is quite a natural impulse, that we all thoroughly appreciate, and respect, I might say.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the

House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

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

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to object to this request or to a similar request next week, but, having a great desire to finish our work and get home sometime early next fall, after next week I intend to do what I can to see if we can expedite business so that when the 1st of September comes along the House may adjourn.

Mr. McCORMACK. May I say to the gentleman in all seriousness——

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I am serious about it.

Mr. McCORMACK. I know the gentleman is very serious about it, and not facetious. May I say that when the committees get rolling out legislation, if I set a week's program and the House disposes of it by Thursday, a good week's program, I am sure the gentleman from Michigan, like the gentleman from Massachusetts, would feel completely satisfied and glad to adjourn over from Thursday to Monday, even in the weeks after next week. Is that correct?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I have seen so much in the papers about the T. T., but I am not a member of the T. T. Club.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman is not much of a paper man, is he?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I do not know what you mean by that. I read the paper occasionally, the Washington Post, which advises me what I should do to serve the Fourth Congressional District of Michigan.

Mr. McCORMACK. But do you do it?

Mr. HOFFMAN. No; no; I do not. I find in my experience that I can best serve my district if I just go the opposite, usually, to what they say. Of course, once in a while the Post does have a sound, constructive idea, but usually I can serve my people pretty well by going along the opposite way from what the Post suggests. The Post is just a little too internationalist for me. What I was thinking about was, not belonging to this—what do you call it?—T. to T. Club, that is, to come Tuesday and adjourn Thursday Club, I do not know any reason why some of us who come from so far away should be required to be here all the time and the others just go home for a large part of each week. I do not know what they do—maybe play golf or ride on their yachts when the sea permits; but anyway they just are not here. I am not finding fault with them nor with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]. I know he works hard. He is always working. He tries—but are we to loaf along and then stay here until September or October or November?

Mr. McCORMACK. All of which comes under the principle of freedom of speech.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. No; no freedom to get away and earn a dollar on another job when it might be well to give first attention to this job to which we are elected.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of next week may be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

THANKS FOR THE COMPLIMENT

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, being one of the members of one of those subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations which have been packed 5 to 2, my reaction is just a little different from some of the other members. I am a little bit like old Uncle Mose, when the stranger at the gas station asked if he had the change of a $20 bill. Uncle Mose said, "No, sir; but thanks for the compliment."

If they have that much regard for the strength of my ranking member, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN], my reaction is, "Thanks for the compliment."

THE PRICE OF MILK

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, thus far through this session, in spite of all the talk and promises to do something about prices and rollbacks, we are still just where we started, with nothing as yet done.

The consumers of this country are paying too high a retail price for milk. The farmer is never guaranteed enough to cover his cost of producing this vital commodity.

People cannot continue paying 22 cents and up for a quart of milk. Even if they buy some at that figure, their children will not be privileged to get enough milk.

A family consisting of five children should be able to consume more than five and even seven quarts of milk per day. That means a regular charge on the family budget for milk alone of over $1.50 daily and well over $10 a week.

Those amounts will not include other dairy products such as butter, cream, or cheese which children need in addition to milk.

Therefore, 22 cents for a quart of milk makes this necessary food prohibitive for the American family table.

For several years, I have been pleading in vain for some action to remedy all these high food prices. Certainly milk is an outstanding example of how inflation has run wild with the average family food budget.

I am not among those, Mr. Speaker, who wants to blame this bad state of affairs on the dairy farmer. I own and operate a farm myself, not a large dairy, but a family size one. Therefore, I am able to testify that the average dairyman is in serious straits financially and that unless he is assured a fair and stable price for his milk, he is lost.

The dairymen in upstate New York cannot make his cost of production with an income of less than $5 per hundred pounds of milk. He cannot make a reasonable profit on an income of less than $6 for the same amount.

The farmer who receives an income of $5 per hundredweight actually realizes about 10 cents a quart for his milk. That looks big, but it is not, at least for the man who milks a herd of from 10 to 20 cows.

In order to give such a herd the proper care to obtain a decent yield, he must employ another man besides himself, especially if his son has been drafted. That requires an outlay of well over $100 a month to pay this hand and oftentimes $150.

This, added to the dairyman's taxes, his terrific feed bills, his supplies and machinery, makes it well-nigh impossible for him to stay in business.

Last spring, I was roundly criticized by selfish interests because I came out for a $6 minimum price per hundred pounds for the dairymen of the Northeast. Big city operators sent stooges to every creamery to smear me with the average farmer several months prior to my primary election.

A lot of money was spent to send thugs from farm to farm to try to force the farmers who had always supported me to vote for some other candidate.

Speakers were induced to go into the granges unbeknown to the rank and file members to do a job on me. They were vicious and loud in their denunciations of my record because I tried to get the dairy people of my section more money for their milk.

I do not expect to let these birds get started again because I am wise to what went on last time. I will have a few friends of my own planted in these meetings to stop these agitators in their tracks.

But let us return to the price the dairy farmer now receives for his product. It is unstable and inadequate. He lacks the guaranty he should have to produce enough of this vital food.

My bill proposes to give him a floor price of 10 cents a quart for milk, below which the market cannot go. Then he will be sure of some protection against a sheriff's sale of his property.

In the same bill, I provide for a ceiling price over the counter of 18 cents a quart.

This means the consumer gets fair treatment, the dairy farmer gets fair treatment. There is still a wide margin of profit between the 10 cents surety the farmer receives and the 18-cent quart of milk the consumer pays for

Unless something similar to these proposals is put into effect, the American public will soon be unable to buy any milk, the Armed Forces will be lacking sufficient diet, dairy producers all over the United States will have to give up.

Therefore, I urge this Congress to get busy, take the bull by the horns, and see that our price stabilizers put such a plan into immediate effect for the very survival of our Nation.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

SKILLED MANPOWER IS VITAL TO FOOD PRODUCTION

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, policies of the Truman administration have set in motion a vicious inflationary price spiral that has increased the cost of living for every American. Persons living on fixed incomes, who do not profit from war expenditures, are hard hit as a result of the present inflationary trend. Food is the vital item for every consumer. I have taken this time to discuss food production in all of its phases.

According to the 1950 census about 18 percent of the population of the United States resides on the 6,000,000 farms of this country. More than two-thirds of these farms are known as the family-size farms that produce up to 85 percent of the average consumer diet. The family-size farms are generally operated by members of the farm family and on these are produced the dairy products, poultry, eggs, meat, fruits and vegetables so necessary for a healthy diet. It is not possible for the average farmer to employ competent labor, in competition with the short hours and high pay in industry, and therefore, the farmer and his family must do the work. Today, I am dealing in particular with the manpower problem confronting the farmers who operate family-size farms.

There is only one sound method to retard or stop the present inflationary spiral of food prices, and that is to secure more production of food by American farmers. Abundant production of food can only be assured for 1951 and the war years to come if Government manpower policies provide for the retention of essential farm workers on the farms and an adequate supply of farm machinery and equipment. Prompt action must be taken to initiate such policies or we will experience serious food shortages, black markets, higher food prices, and stricter Government control.

Because of the confusion and buck-passing that is found in top levels today over the need for skilled essential manpower in food production, I will discuss some of the common practices generally found throughout the Selective Service System in dealing with agricultural manpower problems.

It has been my observation, Mr. Speaker, that many consumers in this country and those who make the policies for the Government take it for granted that we will have ample food supplies to take care of the people without providing necessary manpower. Most of the consumers of the country do not realize that you must have skilled men to produce food in this country if it is to be produced and in abundance.

It also appears that the Defense Establishment does not appreciate the vital part that food production and supplies play in a wartime economy. This is evidenced by the following correspondence that I have recently had with the Secretary of Defense:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
December 18, 1950.

Gen. GEORGE MARSHALL,
Secretary of Defense,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR GENERAL: Since I represent a district in the Midwest where a large portion of the Nation's food is produced, I am writing you to get your opinion on the need for abundant food production in connection with the present war effort.

During the last two wars the following slogan was publicized: "It will take food to win the war and write the peace." If this slogan deals with realities in connection with winning the war, I would very much like to have an expression from you which I can publicize to encourage additional production of vital food for the men in the Armed Forces, our allies, and for the domestic economy.

With kindest personal regards, I remain,
Sincerely yours,
AUGUST H. ANDRESEN,
Member of Congress.

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, December 26, 1950.

The Honorable AUGUST H. ANDRESEN,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. ANDRESEN: In answer to your letter of December 18 asking for my opinion on the need for abundant food production in connection with the present war effort, I can state that the ability of a country to supply its armed forces with adequate food is one of the most important considerations in the conduct of war.

I believe, however, that any specific recommendations with reference to the production of food should properly come from the Department of Agriculture. I would, therefore, suggest that you address your inquiry with reference to your district to Secretary Brannan.

Faithfully yours,
ROBERT LOVETT,
Acting Secretary.

It will be noted that Acting Secretary Lovett does not concern himself with food production for the civilian economy or the inflationary price spiral when food shortages occur. He simply refers me to Secretary of Agriculture Brannan for information on food production. Secretary Brannan is urging all-out food and cotton production, but has done nothing to secure the retention of essential and skilled manpower on the food producing farms of this country. I want to be fair with the Secretary of Agriculture, because his Department is working with the Departments of State and Labor to have 500,000 Mexicans brought to this country to do seasonal work on cotton, sugar beet, vegetable, and fruit farms. But this type of labor can under no circumstances replace the skilled domestic workers vital to food production on dairy, livestock, poultry, and grain producing farms of this country.

It is estimated that more than 750,000 skilled farm workers will leave the farms in 1951. Of this number 500,000 will be drafted into the Army and 250,000 will go into more highly paid defense work. This exodus of skilled manpower away from our food-producing farms, with no replacement available, is bound to curtail food production and add more fire to the inflationary spiral of food prices.

THERE SHOULD BE NO GENERAL DEFERMENT FOR ANY TYPE OF LABOR

Food is the vital item for every civilian and soldier. Without food the people cannot live, work, or fight. The high price of food is the main complaint from consumers. To produce necessary food, we must have adequate manpower, machinery, and equipment.

I do not recommend that all farm workers be deferred from the draft, but I do insist that the Selective Service System adopt a uniform Nation-wide manpower policy that will properly classify essential, and I emphasize, essential farm workers, so that such essential workers may continue in food production. Such a policy should be mandatory and a requirement for every local draft board is considering the merits of each request for deferment. At least one able-bodied man should be allowed to remain on each farm.

I am not criticizing local draft boards. These boards are made up of patriotic Americans who are giving much of their time, without compensation, in the present war emergency. They are assigned a quota on every call for men and they do their best to fill it. They work under terrific local pressure and are subject to much abuse. However, this pressure and abuse would not occur if local boards would evaluate each draft case under specific instructions from General Hershey, the Director of Selective Service.

The Selective Service System should be Nation-wide in its scope, operating under specific regulations applicable to all parts of the country. The following letter from General Hershey would indicate that the governor of each State heads the Selective Service System for his State. If such be the case, does the governor have the power to issue specific regulations for the guidance of local draft boards?

NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS,
SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM,
Washington, D. C., January 4, 1951.

The Honorable AUGUST H. ANDRESEN,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. ANDRESEN: As requested by you, I am confirming the information which Colonel Franck, of my staff, furnished you when he was recently in your office concerning the status of a State director of selective service for a State.

The Selective Service Act of 1948, as amended, provides in section 10 (b) (2) authority for the President "to appoint, upon recommendation of the respective governor or comparable executive official, a State Director of the Selective Service System for each headquarters in each State, Territory, and possession of the United States and for

the District of Columbia, who shall represent the governor and be in immediate charge of the State headquarters of the Selective Service System: * * *".

Sincerely yours,

LEWIS B. HERSHEY,
Director.

General Hershey indicates that he has no control over the State selective service system. He states that the State selective service organization is appointed upon the recommendation of the Governor. In view of this fact, it seems to me that one way to handle the agricultural manpower problem would be for the Governor of each respective State to formulate mandatory regulations to govern local draft boards in the consideration of agricultural and other essential manpower problems.

In my own State of Minnesota at least 50 percent of the food which is produced is used throughout the entire Nation and much of it finds its way into the Military Establishment. Therefore, a loss of a substantial number of essential farm workers now engaged in food production in our State, will be a loss to the Nation. The end result will be drastic cut-backs in production to the detriment of the Nation and our war effort. I feel that the Governors of our respective States should exercise their authority with reference to the manpower problem.

It is obvious that we must have men for the military forces. It should be equally obvious that we must also have skilled men to produce the food for the country and men to produce war materials. The President possesses sufficient authority under the Selective Service Act of 1948 to issue specific regulations to deal with essential agricultural manpower. He has not used this authority, which is found in paragraphs 622.13 and 622.14 of the draft law and quoted as follows:

622.13. Class II-C.—Registrant deferred because of agricultural occupation: (a) In class II-C shall be placed any registrant who is employed in the production for market of a substantial quantity of those agricultural commodities which are necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest, but only when all of the conditions described in section 622.10 are found to exist.

(b) The production for market of a substantial quantity of agricultural commodities should be measured in terms of the average annual production per farm worker which is marketed from a local average farm of the type under consideration. The production of agricultural commodities for consumption by the worker and his family, or traded for subsistence purposes, should not be considered as production for market. Production which is in excess of that required for the subsistence of the farm families on the farm under consideration should be considered as production for market.

622.14. Length of deferments in class II-C: (a) Class II-C deferments shall be for a period of 1 year or less. If there is a change in the registrant's status during the period of deferment in class II-C, his classification shall be reopened and considered anew.

(b) At the expiration of the period of a registrant's deferment in class II-C, his classification shall be reopened and he shall be classified anew in the manner provided in part 625 of this chapter. The registrant may be continued in class II-C for a further period of 1 year or less if such classification is warranted. The same rule shall apply when classifying a registrant at the end of each successive period for which he has been classified in class II-C.

(c) Nothing in this section shall be construed to require the local board to retain in class II-C any registrant when the reason for his occupational classification has ceased to exist.

During the past 3 months I have had many conferences with policy-making members of the National Selective Service Office on the subject of proper classification of essential farm workers. I regret to state that up to the present time there has been no change in the policy of that office with reference to the proper classification of essential farm workers.

GENERAL HERSHEY STATES LOCAL BOARDS HAVE FULL RESPONSIBILITY TO PROPERLY CLASSIFY ESSENTIAL WORKERS

In a recent letter to local draft boards discussing the responsibility of local boards in properly classifying registrants in essential occupations, Gen. Lewis B. Hershey has set forth the following facts:

First. The local draft board has the responsibility for determining, initially, every classification of a registrant.

Second. A registrant seeking a deferred classification for occupational hardship or other reasons should furnish the local board with a complete written statement, supplemented by substantiating evidence, giving all facts for the local boards to consider in properly classifying the registrant.

Third. A registrant has the right to appeal his classification to the State appeal board if he is dissatisfied with the decision of the local board. The attorney for the local board will assist the registrant in perfecting the appeal.

If the decision of the State appeal board is not unanimous, a further appeal may be taken to the President's appeal board in Washington.

Fourth. Under Selective Service Regulation 1625, a registrant may have his classification reconsidered by the local board upon the presentation of new evidence at any time before the induction notice is issued to the registrant by the board. Such request for reconsideration should be made in writing to the local board.

If the local board does not change the classification of the registrant after considering the new evidence, the registrant is entitled to again appeal his classification to the State appeal board.

Fifth. A registrant is entitled to a hearing before the entire local board, as a matter of right.

General Hershey also states in the letter to the local draft boards:

It has been unfortunate that this strict application has found utterance attributed to local board members by registrants that local boards could defer no one in the absence of specific instructions to do so or that they would defer no one of certain occupational classifications, such as farmers or members of the maritime service. In the first instance, the power to defer does rest with the local board. In the second instance, it is unwise for an administrative agency responsible for individual decisions, such as the classification of a registrant, to indicate that decisions are made to defer or not to defer in any other manner than after a careful consideration of the particular merits of the individual case.

The danger inherent in this situation is that the pressure for legislation or for regulations, or for both, increase. There is a demand that local boards be authorized to do that which they already can do, but with the authorization will inevitably come directives as to what they can and what they must do. The autonomy of local self-government disappears more often by abdication from within than usurpation from above.

The selective service operation is a decentralized one. All of the actions which lead to the induction of men into the Armed Forces are performed in the community. This fact requires that the power to act be delegated to the local board. This has been done in large measure by the Congress by giving to the local board the responsibility for determining, initially, every classification of a registrant. This classification is final unless there is an appeal exercised under regulations provided by the President.

The question to be decided is whether the task being performed by the registrant is essential to the national interest; and finally, can he be replaced. These are judgments that in the last analysis local board members have rendered in the past and must render in the future. The making of these judgments is their responsibility. It is the local board's job.

Since many of the local boards have taken the position that they do not have the authority to properly classify essential farm workers, General Hershey's instructions definitely give the local boards full authority and responsibility to pass upon the qualifications and occupation of each registrant. This may be buck passing but, nevertheless, it is now definite that the local boards have full responsibility to pass upon the essentiality of each registrant in food production or any other line of occupation. Each case must be decided upon its merits by the local board.

A few days ago Mrs. Anna Rosenberg, Assistant Defense Secretary for Manpower, appeared before a committee and stated it was necessary to have 4,000,000 workers in industry, engaged in the manufacture of implements of war. But she said nothing about the need for manpower in food production.

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

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I am very glad to have the gentleman from Minnesota, who is a congressional authority on agriculture, bring this thing up, because it looks to me as if this is where we come in, as they say in the motion-picture industry; as if we are going through the same things which we went through during World War II. The gentleman will remember that we did not have any allocations of steel or essential materials especially for agriculture, and if it was necessary to get repairs or baling wire, or whatever it might be, he would have to get permission to purchase it, and it was a sort of hunting license, to see if he could go out and see if he could find it.

I am particularly glad to have him bring up the matter of labor because there has been a movement—I have seen it in a labor journal laid on my desk in the last few days; I have seen it in a magazine which I have read called

The New Leader, a complete misrepresentation, a complete misstatement of the facts; and I am very glad the gentleman is bringing up the question so we may have a thorough airing of it and a determination of whether or not we shall be able to retain the labor on our farms that we need, that is, retain the essential trained labor, and whether we shall be able to get the vegetables and the foodstuffs out of the fields.

The gentleman will remember that in World War II, even though we had an amendment known by the name of a former Member of the other body, the Tydings amendment, which had for its purpose the protecting of skilled labor, the protecting of experienced labor on the farms for producing the foodstuffs that were needed, yet Selective Service paid no attention to it. The gentleman will remember that.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I remember that very well, and I may say that in the Draft Act that was passed last year the President of the United States was given the same authority virtually that was contained in the Tydings amendment; he now possesses the power to issue regulations to permit local draft boards to defer essential farm workers that they may continue in the production of food.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Does not the gentleman feel that the Congress should pass some sort of legislation prescribing that Selective Service must leave at least one able-bodied man on each family-sized farm during the emergency? In my district I have cases today where the only able-bodied man working on a particular farm, the man who has been actually operating that farm has been given instructions that he has got to have a sale and get ready to go into the service—an established farm family that has been in existence for several years. I do not think that is good business for the Nation as a whole.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. There are thousands of similar cases throughout the United States, because it is quite apparent it is now the policy of Selective Service down to the local draft boards to draft men who are essential to produce the food the Nation needs.

I do not urge that farm workers be deferred as a class; I think that the case of every selectee who comes up and presents his facts should be determined on the merits, whether or not he is essential. It would be a big mistake were we to ask for the deferment of all farm boys as a class, and I do not want to do that; I would be against that. But out home, out in the areas where we really produce the bulk of the Nation's food and in parts of the country where they have small production the local boards are so close to the production that they sometimes do not comprehend the important part that people in the producing areas play toward furnishing the over-all supply of food for the Nation. So, I hope that when we have our hearings before the Committee on Agriculture we can prevail upon General Hershey and upon the President—he will not be there, but through General Hershey—so that we can have a definite policy whereby each case may be determined upon its own merits by the local boards instead of just drafting them into the service wholesale.

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

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. BECKWORTH. I was very much interested in the description of the type of farm mentioned by Mr. ANDERSEN, where the only able-bodied man of a farm family was about to be taken; for instance, it may be a farm where the father is an elderly man and has an only son who really operates the farm, yet he is being considered for the draft. I think that practically destroys that farm unit and it is an important unit yet in this country. To what extent can the gentleman state whether or not this foreign labor we are bringing into the country will help that kind of farm?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I will say to the gentleman from Texas, that I have scores of cases in my congressional district where the only son has been classified in I-A for induction into the Army. That is one reason I am calling this vital matter to the attention of the House and the country, with the hope that corrective measures will be promptly taken by General Hershey. The foreign labor to which I referred cannot do the work on our dairy, poultry, livestock, and grain farms. They are not suited for this type of farming, and they can in no manner replace the young men from our farms, who have been trained through life to do the work.

While I have many draft cases in my district, I know that a similar situation prevails throughout the entire country—particularly in food-producing areas. Food production and the essential manpower to produce it, must be dealt with on a Nation-wide scale if farmers are to produce food in abundance as demanded by the Secretary of Agriculture. To close down or curtail farming operation because of a shortage of essential farm workers in the present inflationary war emergency, does not make sense, even in the United States and the President and his administrative officials should do something about it. We can pass more legislation on the subject, but that will not afford relief unless the executive branch of the Government administers the law in accordance to the intent of Congress. I say again, that the President possesses ample authority under existing law to issue regulations that will correct the mistake now being made in agricultural manpower policies.

Mr. BECKWORTH. The gentleman means foreign labor from any area from which we obtain it could not be utilized?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. No. It is not there. The labor that can be used in vegetable, sugar beet areas, and the cotton areas, a good deal of it at least, is stoop labor. The Mexicans and other foreign labor that come in here can do that kind of work. But we who represent diversified areas, producing at least 85 percent of the perishable crops of the country, must have skilled, competent labor to produce it. The farmers who operate these family sized farms are not able to go into the labor market and employ experienced farm labor to replace their own boys who are taken into the Army because they cannot compete with the short hours and high wages of the industrial centers of the country.

Mr. BECKWORTH. As a member of the Committee on Agriculture, is the gentleman in position to state whether or not a small, family sized cotton farm, we will say, would likely qualify for that labor that is brought in?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Well, I know what kind of labor you need. You need a certain amount of skilled labor, of course, and you can probably get along, at least for a time, with some of the imported labor, much more so than we can up in our section of the country.

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

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Foreign labor should be divided into two classes, the class which is brought in specifically to pick a crop in a large area, to which the gentleman from Minnesota refers, and those that come in little by little under the immigration laws and have stayed here and acquired the facility to operate. Those can be used on the small farms. The imported labor can be used on cotton ranches.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Is the machinery to be so worked out that we will say the average small farmer in a given area can participate in the program?

Mr. PHILLIPS. This morning I read a release of the Department of State and I am very doubtful that we will be able to participate in the program satisfactorily unless some material changes are made in it. That is why the gentleman's committee is doing a great service in holding public hearings on this matter. I know what the gentleman has in mind and it is a very important point.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I do not want to go into that picture at this time because we have had extensive hearings on it. I know what the gentleman from Texas is referring to. However, our committee will hold a hearing on February 26, according to what the chairman of that committee told me this morning, so that we can go into the whole manpower situation. What I want to direct attention to at this time is the policy of the drafting of essential farm labor from the family-sized farms where experienced men are required to produce food.

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

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I want to compliment the gentleman from Minnesota on his analysis of this problem and to refer to what the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] said with respect to leaving one able-bodied man on each family-sized farm. Actually that system was tried during World War II in Iowa through a directive, I believe

from State headquarters of the Iowa Selective Service System. I served as chairman of one Selective Service Board during the early part of that war. I know the problem to which the gentleman has alluded was very acute at that time. My observation has been that the plan of leaving one able-bodied man at least on every family-sized farm under this directive to which I have referred worked quite well, and, as a rule of thumb, I am not so sure but what it might not be applicable to every part of the United States and might well be written into law.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. CLEVENGER. As the gentleman knows, my district is largely agricultural, with the exception of perhaps two or three industrial centers. We have this problem facing us right now. But, is not this labor that the gentleman proposes to bring in coming from a United Nations neighbor?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Well, I think that is correct.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Can the gentleman see any good reason why we should furnish an asylum for another nation to send their sons to America while we send ours to fight and die in a war over on the other side of the Pacific?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Well, that is one reason for this discussion.

Mr. CLEVENGER. We have to have the right kind of labor to get the job done.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. We have to get it done if we are to provide food. As far as our committee is concerned and I am personally concerned, I am only interested in getting food produced in abundance for the American people in order to stop inflation, in order to stop black markets, in order to have less Government control. You know, one of the principal demands for price control is on account of high food prices at the consumer level. Let us try to solve the proposition by securing abundant production. But to do so we must have the manpower and the machinery and the farm equipment to do it.

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

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SADLAK. Does the gentleman contend that there is necessity for some action that will tell the immediate draft boards not to take farmers?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Yes; immediate action is vital and urgent for essential farm workers.

Mr. SADLAK. May I clear up that point?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Yes.

Mr. SADLAK. It is my understanding that from areas which include agricultural districts the members of those immediate draft boards are constituted, or have membership on them, of farmers who know the problem.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That is not entirely correct.

Mr. SADLAK. If I understand what the gentleman desires to bring about, it is that they have no alternative other than to take a person, whether he be a farmer or not, in answer to the demands of the quota needed, but that action is necessary on top of that to restrain the taking of a farmer from that area, even though there was a call for men from that area who are farmers.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Let me make it clear, because I do not want to be misunderstood. In the first place, I do not favor a general exemption for farm workers; but I insist that if it comes down to the production of food we must have experienced and essential manpower to produce it. Now, the only way we can get the manpower on most of the farms in our country is from the farmer's own family, and in each case where a boy or young man is being called for induction his case should be considered by the local draft board as to whether or not he is essential to the production of food. Now, to give that consideration they must, of course, have the facts before the board. Heretofore in many sections of the country facts have been ignored. But what I think we should have emanating from Washington is a definite policy that every board should consider a man's essentiality in the line that he is in, especially if it is in food production, so that the board can determine whether he is essential or he is not essential, without just automatically putting him into the service without considering the merits of each case.

Mr. SADLAK. If the gentleman will yield further, over the past week I had a like case in Connecticut, and I am sure the gentleman from Minnesota will concede that among the many industries we have in the great State of Connecticut we also have a great deal of farming. We had the case of two boys of farm families. One had been on the farm throughout his 23 years; the other, a lad of 25, brought up on the farm, but who left the farm and had gone out into another industry, another business. As of the first week of January they have taken the lad who had been on the farm all of his life. Now they are preparing to take the other lad, who had left the farm. The father says that he is ill and should have one of the boys back on the farm, the one who had left the farm. What does the gentleman say about that?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Of course, I am not a draft board and cannot pass on that question, but if the gentleman has had one case like that, I know of hundreds of them that are somewhat similar, where the boys have left the farm and gone into business or are farming for themselves. In fact, I have one case that I got yesterday where there are three boys in the family. They have a 340-acre farm. Two boys have already enlisted in the Air Corps and the third is now in class I-A, ready for induction next week. This leaves a father, who is 63 years old, to operate that 340-acre farm, with a lot of livestock. He just cannot do it. He is 63.

Down here in Washington they retire admirals and generals at 62 because they say they are no longer any good, yet expect men who are that age or older, with disabilities, heart trouble, arthritis, rheumatism, and a good many other things to go ahead and operate large farms.

Mr. SADLAK. I desire, of course, to cooperate with the gentleman wholeheartedly in this tremendous and vital problem, but they have told me, as no doubt they have told the gentleman, that on the draft board as constituted covering that area, agriculture has a member.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. As a rule there is no farm member on a local board.

Mr. SADLAK. They have told me that. If the gentleman has found that they have not, then I am ready to cooperate with him in order that they may have a properly constituted, fully informed draft board, so they would know all the problems, particularly those concerning agriculture.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. According to the present set-up, the draft boards are appointed by the governor through the State selective-service director, who is appointed by the governor. What I am trying to get at is that we should have a coordinated policy in the country, from the President down through the Selective Service, that will issue specific instruction to the local draft boards and the State selective-service director that each case in agriculture or some other line shall be considered on its merits as to the essentiality of the man who is being drafted.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. First I want to compliment the gentleman on the statement he is making. It is the first attempt to probe into this subject that I have heard on the floor in recent weeks. May I say that I am of the same opinion as the gentleman, that I think there should be some kind of policy stated, and stated soon, otherwise farm labor is going to be drafted off every dairy farm in up-State New York and in Minnesota and other dairy States.

I do not know whether I want to go any further than the gentleman does in saying that we should defer or give special attention to the deferment of farmers, but I do know that the dairy farmer has a particular problem. He has a specialized work which the migrant labor cannot attend to. Such a worker cannot help on a dairy farm. It would take at least a year to get accustomed to running a dairy. Therefore, at least in my section, every single farm off which these boys are being drafted is going to be forced to close up its dairy. The farmer will just have to sell off his stock and go out of business. The flow of milk will become considerably lighter if that keeps on. That is not in the interest of producing food for our Armed Forces.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I thank the gentleman. That is the point I have

tried to make, that food production is vital to the economy of the country and to the war effort in which we are engaged in the present emergency.

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

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I was not here when the gentleman began his speech, so I do not know whether he has covered this point or not, but I understand however you are arguing we must have some migrant labor at least?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. No, I am not talking about migrant labor, I am talking about the family labor on a family sized farm, such as you have in your area and we have all through the Middle West where we cannot employ good outside labor to come in and do the work on the farm because of the competition with the cities with the short hours and the high wages that is offered, which the farmer cannot pay. I am talking about that kind of labor which is necessary to produce the food and if essential farm workers are taken into the service we will not be able to produce the food for the country.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Some of the work on our farms is not done by local people, that is, what you call the stoop labor and some of the fruit picking, but this other situation which I think you have in mind, from what I heard, existed in the last war. The gentleman recalls, I know, that then we had the Tydings amendment.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That is right. That has been discussed.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Then we had the proposed Lemke amendment. I am sure you recall that the gentlemen from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] put the facts in the RECORD here one time as did some others from Michigan, but General Hershey, notwithstanding the Tydings amendment, insisted that the local boards, acting through the State board, were instructed to draft the farm labor which was in violation of the Tydings amendment. Have you any remedy which will prevent that situation from happening again?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. What I am trying to do it to get a coordinated policy, starting from the President down, who has the authority under the Selective Service Act, which was passed in 1948, to issue orders so that local boards and the Selective Service organization will consider each case for each industry on its own merits and write regulations that the local boards should follow in considering a man's occupation.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. They did that before and then along came General Hershey who said, "No, never mind all that stuff. You take the men." In fact he came to my office with some more brass and he said, "It does not make any difference what the Tydings amendment says, we need the men and we are going to take them." That is the situation that worries me.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. What I am worried about is that we will not have the essential manpower to produce the food and farm prices will pierce the ceilings and then we will have strict Government control—rationing and black markets in vital items, like beef, veal, pork, poultry, and eggs—throughout the country on a Nation-wide scale and people who want to live according to the law of the land and regulations, will not be able to get meat through legitimate channels.

From a political angle that might be a good thing, but here we are dealing with realities and that is the production of food for the people. Those of us who are working to bring about a situation where the consumer will have plenty of food at reasonable prices should be given assistance by the administration to solve this critical manpower problem before it is too late.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DOLLINGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. DELANEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address by the Honorable JOHN SPARKMAN, of Alabama, on the occasion of the annual Democratic dinner in New York.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a statement by Dr. Hugh Bennett.

Mr. O'NEILL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article.

Mr. HAMILTON C. JONES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a radio broadcast over Station WBT, Charlotte, N. C., also questions and answers in which the public is interested.

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

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

Mr. SUTTON (at the request of Mr. HAYS of Ohio) was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. FERNANDEZ (at the request of Mr. MURDOCK) was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. LECOMPTE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a report of the Wayne County Soil Conservation District.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include extraneous matter; and further to extend his remarks and include the bylaws of the Italian-American World War Veterans, notwithstanding the fact that it will exceed two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $492.

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

Mr. GWINN and Mr. SHORT asked and were given permission to extend their remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include two addresses.

Mr. DOLLIVER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a portion of an article in the VFW magazine by Homer B. Ketcham, the national legislative director.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mr. WOOD of Idaho asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address by the attorney general of Idaho.

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

Mr. D'EWART asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include certain quotations.

Mr. JACKSON of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in five instances and include newspaper articles and letters.

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

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, February 12, 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:

185. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to require the recordation of scrip, lieu selection, and similar rights"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

186. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of a law enacted by the Tenth Guam Congress, Public Law 36; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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. STANLEY: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 37. Resolution authorizing additional clerical assistants; with amendment (Rept. No. 96). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. STANLEY: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 42. Resolution to authorize the expenditure of certain funds for the expenses of the Committee on Un-American Activities; without amendment (Rept. No. 97). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. STANLEY: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 114. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of

the investigations and studies authorized by House Resolution 38; without amendment (Rept. No. 98). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

H. R. 2515. A bill to roll prices and wages back to the June 25, 1950, level and to impose a 100-percent tax on excess profits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VAIL:

H. R. 2516. A bill to deny the benefits of the National Labor Relations Act to any labor organization whose membership includes certain employees of newspapers and periodicals; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN:

H. R. 2517. A bill to amend section 1 (15) of the Interstate Commerce Act, with respect to the emergency powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission relating to car service, with particular reference to charges as between carriers or between carriers and other owners; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H. R. 2518. A bill to provide that, in the determination of the amount which certain local educational agencies are entitled to receive for school-construction purposes, no reduction in such amount shall be made for prior construction under the WPA, PWA, and NYA programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CHUDOFF:

H. R. 2519. A bill to designate the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier of the American Revolution; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H. R. 2520. A bill to extend the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL:

H. R. 2521. A bill to place a ceiling price on milk of 18 cents per quart to the consumer and a floor price of 10 cents a quart to the dairy farmer; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HESS:

H. R. 2522. A bill to provide military status for women who served overseas with the Army of the United States during World War I; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. R. 2523. A bill to provide for the exemption from taxation of certain tangible personal property; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. R. 2524. A bill to exempt amounts paid for admissions to concerts and operas from the Federal tax on admissions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HORAN:

H. R. 2525. A bill to establish a Columbia Interstate Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan:

H. R. 2526. A bill to require United States Civil Service Commission to establish regional office for State of Michigan at Detroit, Mich.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RANKIN (by request):

H. R. 2527. A bill to provide for the construction of certain Veterans' Administration hospitals; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 2528. A bill to amend title 39, chapter 8, the franking privilege, section 321, to include the National Guard of the United States and the Air National Guard of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2529. A bill to provide for the transfer or quitclaim of title to certain lands in Florida; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia (by request):

H. R. 2530. A bill to amend certain tax laws applicable to the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BUFFETT:

H. R. 2531. A bill to protect persons who retain their investment in series E United States savings bonds for 10 years after original maturity, or purchase such bonds after December 31, 1950, and hold them until maturity, against decline in purchasing power of the dollars so invested; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHATHAM:

H. R. 2532. A bill reaffirming the friendship of the American people for all the peoples of the world, including the peoples of the Soviet Union; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GOLDEN:

H. R. 2533. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to increase annuities and pensions under such act, to permit retirement regardless of age, and to permit payment of widow's insurance annuities regardless of age; to amend the Railroad Retirement Tax Act; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 2534. A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 2535. A bill to provide hospitalization and flag burial for merchant marine veterans of World Wars I and II; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 2536. A bill approving the agreement between the United States and Canada relating to the development of the resources of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin for national security and continental defense of the United States and Canada; providing for making the St. Lawrence seaway self-liquidating; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HAYS of Arkansas:

H. J. Res. 157. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution relating to the qualifications of electors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. J. Res. 158. Joint resolution requiring congressional authorization for sending military forces abroad; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. POTTER:

H. J. Res. 159. Joint resolution approving the agreement between the United States and Canada relating to the development of the resources of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin for national security and continental defense of the United States and Canada; providing for making the St. Lawrence seaway self-liquidating, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. Con. Res. 56. Concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Committee on National and International Movements, and regulations for the conduct of hearings and activities of congressional committees; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RIBICOFF:

H. Con. Res. 57. Concurrent resolution reaffirming the friendship of the American people for all the peoples of the world, including the peoples of the Soviet Union; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H. Res. 123. Resolution to provide funds for the investigation and study continued by House Resolution 74; 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. BATES of Massachusetts (by request):

H. R. 2537. A bill for the relief of Manuel Rocha Batiste and Frederick P. Rocha; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHENOWETH:

H. R. 2538. A bill for the relief of Joe Bargas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHUDOFF:

H. R. 2539. A bill for the relief of Staff Sgt. Irvin M. Cohen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GORE:

H. R. 2540. A bill for the relief of the Farmers Mutual Fire Insurance Co., of Sumner County, Tenn.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2541. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Yoshiko Kambe Salts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2542. A bill for the relief of Tennessee Fresh Frozen Foods, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H. R. 2543. A bill for the relief of Roy Mirt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEAN:

H. R. 2544. A bill for the relief of the estate of Grant Frederick Duerr; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts:

H. R. 2545. A bill for the relief of Wong Thew Hor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NICHOLSON:

H. R. 2546. A bill for the relief of Charles W. Vanderhoop; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHORT:

H. R. 2547. A bill for the relief of Yoshiko Ito; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 2548. A bill to provide for the issuance of commissions in the United States Coast Guard Reserve as temporary members to members of the St. Andrews Bay Pilots Association and the Port St. Joe Pilot's Association; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 2549. A bill for the relief of Talmage Wilcher, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2550. A bill for the relief of Thomas G. Digges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2551. A bill for the relief of the Mount Vernon Chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. R. 2552. A bill for the relief of Eleanor Mansour; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 2553. A bill for the relief of Leon Gregory Britanisky, his wife and minor children; 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:

42. By Mr. BUSH: Petition of citizens of Bradford, Pa., urging the Congress to roll back prices where they were before the freeze and to plan for the workers to draw an in-

come sufficient to raise their families; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

43. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Mrs. Edward B. Morris, secretary, Federation of Citizens Associations of the District of Columbia, Washington, D. C., requesting that legislation be enacted which would create a transportation commission for the metropolitan area of Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

SENATE

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 12, 1951

(Legislative day of Monday, January 29, 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, Father of our spirits, whose power is unsearchable and whose judgments are a great deep, at the beginning of the day we would quiet our hearts in Thy presence. We would be still and know that Thou art God. As amid the earthquake, wind, and fire of this violent world we wait for Thy still small voice, give us sensitive hearts to listen, teachable minds to learn, humble wills to obey. Let some revelation of Thy light fall on our darkness, some guidance from Thy wisdom save us from our bewilderment, some power from Thine infinite resource strengthen us in our need.

We acknowledge our oneness with all humanity. Humbling ourselves in penitence for our boasted pride, confessing our share in the evil that has brought confusion and ruin on the earth and praying for an ordered society of nations that shall give substance and hope to man's dream of brotherhood, we ask 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 Thursday, February 8, 1951, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

ABRAHAM LINCOLN

(At the request of Mr. HENDRICKSON, and by unanimous consent, the following remarks by Mr. HENDRICKSON and editorials submitted by him in connection therewith were ordered to be printed at this point in today's RECORD:)

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that we are met here today on the anniversary of the birth of the sixteenth President of the United States, Abraham Lincoln. There may be some who will disagree when I say that Abraham Lincoln was the greatest of all our Presidents, but I make that statement, believing firmly that it is so. Some historians, some students, and some political writers may disagree, but I say that it is so because Mr. Lincoln lived in the most crucial hour of the Nation's history, an hour even as crucial as that in which we are living today, and he led us to safety and security once more. As we of the Senate, when we pay tribute to the first President of the United States, George Washington, on his birthday, recognize that none of us possess sufficient eloquence to pay just and fitting tribute to him, and therefore substitute for our lack of eloquence the reading of his own eloquent Farewell Address, therefore, Mr. President, in recognizing the greatness of Abraham Lincoln, I think we must also recognize that in his case, as in the case of Washington, we who serve in this body lack the eloquence to pay to the martyred President the full tribute which is properly due him. Perhaps the greatest epitaph ever written of Mr. Lincoln was written by his great Secretary of War, Mr. Stanton, when at the time of Mr. Lincoln's death, Mr. Stanton said—despite the many bitter differences of opinion which existed between Mr. Lincoln and Mr. Stanton—"Now he belongs to the ages."

Mr. President, as we pay Washington a tribute by reading the words of his Farewell Address, so now I endeavor to pay appropriate tribute to Mr. Lincoln by reading a few words from his second inaugural address, delivered on March 4, 1865, which are as appropriate today as they were when they were uttered at the end of the War Between the States. In that address Abraham Lincoln said:

> Fondly do we hope, fervently do we pray, that this mighty scourge of war may speedily pass away. Yet, if God wills that it continue until all the wealth piled by the bondsman's 250 years of unrequited toil shall be sunk, and until every drop of blood drawn with the lash shall be paid by another drawn with the sword, as was said 3,000 years ago, so still it must be said "the judgments of the Lord are true and righteous altogether."

And then he said, as we remember his famous words:

> With malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in, to bind up the Nation's wounds, to care for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow and his orphan, to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations.

Mr. President, I think those words in themselves pay Mr. Lincoln all the tribute which any mortal could hope to pay to him. They are his own immortal words—almost as eloquent, indeed, as the words of his Gettysburg address.

Mr. President, some of the great newspapers today have paid tribute to Mr. Lincoln more eloquently than I could ever hope to do. Therefore I shall ask unanimous consent to speak through them and to have printed at this point in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, three stirring, thought-provoking editorials in honor of Lincoln. They should be read by every Member of the Senate. One is from the Philadelphia Inquirer, and is entitled "Lincoln's Way Can Still Save America and Freedom."

Another, entitled "The 'Lincoln Idea'," is published in the New York Times for today. I hope every Member of the Senate will take the time to read this editorial in the light of the situation existing in the world today.

The third editorial, entitled "The Universal Lincoln," appears in today's issue of the New York Herald Tribune. It constitutes another thought-provoking discussion of a great man.

Mr. President, I cannot say any more that would raise the name of Lincoln higher than he himself raised it throughout his entire life, and up to the time of his death. We should be grateful that our people show an ever-growing recognition of his greatness, and are reflecting that recognition in their everyday lives.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that these remarks and these editorials may appear in the RECORD at the beginning of the proceedings for today, rather than at the end of them, as a further tribute to Mr. Lincoln.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The editorials are as follows:

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer of February 12, 1951]

LINCOLN'S WAY CAN STILL SAVE AMERICA AND FREEDOM

On this birthday of Abraham Lincoln the great question is whether this is the glorious Nation he fought so hard and so well to save.

Are its people as determined in 1951, as they were in 1861, to preserve its freedom? Are they as eager to struggle against terrible odds to continue America on the path to still greater destinies?

We believe that to all such questions an affirmative answer can instantly be given and that Lincoln himself, who once fervently spoke of the promise of "man's vast future" in our country, would without hesitation render the same verdict.

The Rail Splitter, as he was about to become President, saw the enormous perils that were rushing upon the Nation and remarked: "The man does not live who is more devoted to peace than I am, none who would do more to preserve it, but it may be necessary to put the foot down firmly."

Look at his subsequent course: he sought peace, but with never a thought of appeasement. Up till the first shot at Sumter and throughout the war which followed he repelled every attempt to bring about its end on terms that would weaken the Union.

Lincoln, who knew how to deal with Copperheads and traitors, faintheart's and appeasers, has virtually given us a chart for national conduct in dealing with the Reds and fellow travelers of 1951 and the dangers they represent now.

There were timorous Americans in 1861 who wanted to "let the erring sisters go." They wanted to give up the Union—they wanted peace at any price. Throughout the war there were disloyal people who secretly or openly tried to aid the enemy.

Abraham Lincoln's steadfast wisdom overcame them all. With similar but greater perils from the Red menace confronting us today we need to cling to the Great Emancipator's way as the only way to discharge our duty of world leadership; to save America and with it human liberty on this earth.

[From the New York Times of February 12, 1951]

THE "LINCOLN IDEA"

It might even be true, as some scoffers say, that Lincoln has become "the great American myth." It could be true that the cult of "Lincolnolatry" has obscured the man and most of the facts about him. Nevertheless, the man and his meaning have an indisputable and an unshakable place in