Woman's Society of Christian Service of the Methodist Church, to protect our rights by passing legislation to prohibit advertising of alcoholic beverages in interstate commerce through such mediums as radio, television, newspapers, and magazines; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 18, 1951

(Legislative day of Monday, October 1, 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 God who art the hope of all the ends of the earth, as in former times Thy spirit didst breathe over the chaos, confusions, and divisions of struggling States and weld them into one Nation, and didst lead forth our fathers unto a wealthy place; so, we beseech Thee, in these latter days having girded us to conquer tyranny without, wilt Thou heal the tensions which threaten to tear the fair robe of our democracy. Save us from violence and discord, from all pride and arrogance. Endue with the spirit of wisdom those who in Thy name are here trusted with the authority of governance, to the end that there may be peace and prosperity within our borders. Forbid that the precious oil of our unity be spilled upon the ground to ignite selfish fires. May it still feed the flame of liberty's torch as it enlightens the whole darkened earth. We ask it in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, October 17, 1951, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on October 16, 1951, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 1718) for the relief of Elizabeth Bozsik.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 921) to amend section 304 of the Federal Property and Administrative Act of 1949 and section 4 of the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 51) establishing a Joint Committee on Railroad Retirement Legislation, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

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

H. R. 4467. An act to incorporate the Conference of State Societies, Washington, D. C.; and

H. R. 5511. An act to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to permit certain improvements to two business properties situated in the District of Columbia.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 3298. An act to amend sections 303 (c) and 503 (b) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended;

H. R. 3376. An act for the relief of Margaret K. N. Miller;

H. R. 4386. An act making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5131. An act granting the consent of Congress to a compact or agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey concerning a bridge across the Delaware River to provide a connection between the Pennsylvania Turnpike system and the New Jersey Turnpike, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 341. Joint resolution making appropriations for rehabilitation of flood-stricken areas for the fiscal year 1952, and for other purposes.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. SALTONSTALL, and by unanimous consent, Mr. CAIN was granted leave from attendance on the sessions of the Senate today and tomorrow.

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. MARTIN was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate for the remainder of the week, after today.

ONE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DEATH OF JOHN HOWARD PAYNE, AUTHOR OF HOME SWEET HOME

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask that House Joint Resolution 284, which has just come over from the House of Representatives be laid before the Senate and acted upon at this time. Before the joint resolution is read, I might say that it concerns the one hundredth anniversary of the death of John Howard Payne, author of the family hymn of America, Home Sweet Home.

The joint resolution calls for the appropriation of no money, but provides for a commission which is to act within a year. I have discussed the matter with the majority leader, I have conferred with the program committee of the minority, and with the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, and no one has any objection. The joint resolution should be passed promptly if the commission is to do any work. I have been asked to make this request, and I hope there will be no objection.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I certainly shall not object, and I hope that the Senate will be able to sing Home Sweet Home by Saturday night. [Laughter.]

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair joins the majority leader in that hope.

The Chair lays before the Senate a joint resolution coming over from the House of Representatives, which the clerk will state by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 284) authorizing the participation of the United States in the preparation and completion of plans for the observance and memorialization on April 9, 1952, of the one hundredth anniversary of the death of John Howard Payne, author of that family hymn of America, Home Sweet Home.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE ACT OF 1950

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

PROHIBITION OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE ADVERTISING IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE—LETTERS, RESOLUTIONS, AND PETITIONS

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I have a letter from Mrs. John D. Peck, of Herndon, Va., transmitting a resolution and a petition of the mothers of Virginia and members of the Woman's Society of Christian Service of the Methodist Church, praying that their rights and those of their families might be protected by passing legislation to prohibit advertising of alcoholic beverages in interstate commerce through such mediums as radio, television, newspapers, and magazines, and I ask unanimous consent that the letter, resolution, and petition, without the signatures attached, be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter, resolution, and petition, without the signatures attached, were referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HERNDON, VA.,
October 15, 1951.

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Will you please have this petition mentioned in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD? Thank you.

Yours truly,

LOUISE C. PECK
Mrs. John D. Peck.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

To the Virginia Congressional Delegation:

Whereas our children are being led to believe that alcoholic beverages are harmless and their use desirable particularly through association with sports and other programs of interest to young people, on radio and television:

Therefore we, the undersigned mothers of Virginia and members of the Woman's Society of Christian Service of the Methodist Church, respectfully petition you to protect our rights and those of our families by passing legislation to prohibit advertising of alcoholic beverages in interstate commerce through such mediums as radio, television, newspapers, and magazines.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I have two letters from Miss Elizabeth Laynor, chairwoman, Christian Social Relations and Local Church Activities of the Washington Street Methodist Church of Alexandria, Va., transmitting a resolution and a petition of the mothers of Virginia and members of the Woman's Society of Christian Service of the Methodist Church, praying that their rights and those of their families might be protected by passing legislation to prohibit advertising of alcoholic beverages in interstate commerce through such mediums as radio, television, newspapers, and magazines, and I ask unanimous consent that the letters, resolution, and petition, without the signatures attached, be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters, resolution, and petition, without the signatures attached, were referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALEXANDRIA, VA.,
October 15, 1951.

Hon. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR ROBERTSON: Enclosed please find petition signed by the members of the Woman's Society of Christian Service of the Washington Street Methodist Church, Alexandria, Va., which clearly states our wishes with respect to the advertising of alcoholic beverages.

We trust that you will give it your kind consideration on our behalf and, if possible, have it read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Put yourself in our places as mothers and members.

Sincerely yours,
ELIZABETH LAYNOR,
Chairwoman, Christian Social Relations and Local Church Activities.

To the Virginia Congressional Delegation:

Whereas our children are being led to believe that alcoholic beverages are harmless and their use desirable particularly through association with sports and other programs of interest to young people, on radio and television:

Therefore we, the mothers of Virginia and members of the Woman's Society of Christian Service of the Methodist Church respectfully petition you to protect our rights and those of our families by passing legislation to prohibit advertising of alcoholic beverages in interstate commerce through such mediums as radio, television, newspapers, and magazines.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. HOEY, from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments:

H. R. 5230. A bill providing for the conveyance to the State of North Carolina of the Currituck Beach Lighthouse Reservation, Corolla, N. C.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1023).

By Mr. LEHMAN, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

S. 1320. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act, as amended, so as to provide for equality of grade, pay, and allowance between certain officers of the Public Health Service and comparable officers of the Army, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1024).

By Mr. PASTORE, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

S. 337. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act and the Vocational Education Act of 1946 to provide an emergency 5-year program of grants and scholarships for education in the fields of medicine, osteopathy, dentistry, dental hygiene, public health, and nursing professions, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1025).

By Mr. NEELY, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

H. R. 5329. A bill to increase the salaries of the Metropolitan Police, the United States Park Police, the White House Police, members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, and employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1026).

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

H. J. Res. 330. Joint resolution to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the Chicago International Trade Fair, Inc., Chicago, Ill., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1028).

By Mr. RUSSELL, from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 1650. A bill to provide for the release of the right, title, and interest of the United States in a certain tract or parcel of land conditionally granted by it to the city of Savannah, Chatham County, Ga.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1032).

By Mr. SALTONSTALL, from the Committee on Armed Services:

H. R. 4049. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to transfer to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts certain lands and improvements comprising the Castle Island Terminal Facility at South Boston in exchange for certain other lands; without amendment (Rept. No. 1027).

By Mr. HUNT, from the Committee on Armed Services:

H. R. 3548. A bill to provide that payments to States and Territories for care given to certain disabled soldiers and sailors of the United States shall be effective from the date such care commenced; without amendment (Rept. No. 1029).

By Mr. STENNIS (for Mr. CAIN), from the Committee on Armed Services:

H. R. 3003. A bill to authorize Rear Adm. Emory D. Stanley, United States Navy, retired, to accept employment with the Government of Peru; without amendment (Rept. No. 1030).

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, from the Committee on Armed Services:

H. R. 5425. A bill to authorize construction at Air Force installations, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1033).

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

H. R. 1628. A bill to provide for the acquisition of land and the construction thereon of buildings and appurtenances essential for forest fire control operations of the Forest Service, United States Department of Agriculture, at or near Missoula, Mont., and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1034); and

H. R. 4027. A bill to provide for an agricultural program in the Virgin Islands; without amendment (Rept. No. 1035).

WAGE STABILIZATION BOARD—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (REPT. NO. 1037)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I submit a report on the functions of the Wage Stabilization Board, together with the individual views of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed. This report was unanimously accepted by the committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and, without objection, printed, as requested by the Senator from Minnesota.

LABOR PARTICIPATION IN DEFENSE MOBILIZATION—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (REPT. NO. 1038)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I submit a report on labor participation in defense mobilization, together with the supplemental views of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed. This report was unanimously accepted by the committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and, without objection, printed, as requested by the Senator from Minnesota.

SUPPLY AND DEMAND FOR FERTILIZERS, FARM MACHINERY AND PESTICIDES (REPT. NO. 1031)

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I submit a report on the supply and demand for fertilizers, farm machinery and pesticides, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and, without objection, will be printed, as requested by the Senator from Louisiana.

AUTHORIZATION TO SENATE INVESTIGATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE OF COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS TO SUBMIT INTERIM REPORTS DURING ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate Investigations Subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, or the full committee, be authorized to file interim reports during the adjourned period of the Eighty-second Congress and that they be printed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from North Carolina? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, October 18, 1951, he pre-

sented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 11. An act to provide for the appointment of conservators to conserve the assets and provide for the personal welfare of persons of advanced age, mental weakness, not amounting to unsoundness of mind, or physical incapacity;

S. 466. An act to authorize and direct the Administrator of General Services to transfer to the Department of the Army certain property in St. Louis, Mo.;

S. 752. An act authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain lands to the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission;

S. 945. An act to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1947;

S. 1482. An act for the relief of the town of Mount Desert, Maine;

S. 2233. An act to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as amended; and

S. 2244. An act to amend certain housing legislation to grant preferences to veterans of the Korean conflict.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 2295. A bill to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. LANGER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BRICKER:

S. 2296. A bill for the relief of Josephine Maria Riss Fang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S. 2297. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act, as amended, so as to provide for equality of grade, pay, and allowances among certain officers of the United States Health Service occupying positions of comparable responsibility, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. LEHMAN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LEHMAN (for himself, Mr. MURRAY, and Mr. HUMPHREY):

S. 2298. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, with respect to the meaning of "outside salesman"; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. WILLIAMS (for himself, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. BUTLER of Maryland, Mr. NIXON, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. CASE, Mr. IVES, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. JENNER, Mr. ECTON, Mr. HENDRICKSON, Mr. FLANDERS, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, and Mr. THYE):

S. 2299. A bill to prohibit members and employees of any national political committee from practicing before or attempting to influence the decision of any department or agency of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURRAY (for himself, Mr. LANGER, Mr. MORSE, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. GILLETTE, Mr. NEELY, and Mr. LEHMAN):

S. 2300. A bill to authorize the Commissioner of Education to encourage the further development and growth of the educational drama and music programs in the State and land-grant and other accredited nonprofit colleges and universities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. IVES (for himself, Mr. HILL, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. PASTORE, and Mr. AIKEN):

S. 2301. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide a program of grants and scholarships for education in the field of nursing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. MARTIN:

S. 2302. A bill to authorize the reinstatement or issuance of national service life insurance policies covering the lives of certain persons notwithstanding the provisions of the Insurance Act of 1951; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 2303. A bill for the relief of Miki Takano; and

S. 2304. A bill for the relief of Moshe Gips; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 2305. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, regarding published articles and broadcasts by foreign agents; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHOEPPEL:

S. 2306. A bill to assist in the rehabilitation of disaster-stricken areas by assuring adequate relief under the housing laws; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

AMENDMENT OF TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, as a separate bill, which is in substance the same as an amendment to House Joint Resolution 289, ending the state of war with Germany, which was discussed on the floor of the Senate by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] yesterday.

This amendment was reported by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee as a committee amendment with the concurrence of the majority of the committee. Inasmuch as it has been indicated by Senator MCFARLAND that debate on this measure might delay the adjournment of the Congress without action on the ending of the state of war with Germany, I am, in accordance with suggestions made by Senator MCFARLAND yesterday, introducing this as a separate bill. I hope that this action will make possible without discussion and acrimony the dropping from the joint resolution ending the war with Germany all matters relating to the Alien Property Custodian and the passage of the joint resolution, so reduced to a simple joint resolution ending the state of war, by unanimous consent.

The bill (S. 2295) to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT RELATING TO PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF CERTAIN OFFICERS

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act, as amended, so as to provide for equality of grade, pay, and allowances among certain officers of the United States Public Health Service occupying positions of comparable responsibility, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that a statement by me be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2297) to amend the Public Health Service Act, as amended, so as to provide for equality of grade, pay, and allowances among certain officers of the United States Public Health Service occupying positions of comparable responsibility, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. LEHMAN, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The statement is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LEHMAN

In connection with the report on S. 1320, which I have submitted today on behalf of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I would like to read a brief quotation from it. The report points out:

"At the hearing on S. 1320 the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, while indicating his endorsement of the principle of according proper recognition and prestige to the dental profession, pointed out that enactment of the bill would create certain administrative problems for the Public Health Service and would disturb the parity established under existing law among top positions in the Public Health Service. Also, the National Society of Professional Engineers filed a statement at the hearing in which, while they agreed to the principle of according recognition to the dental profession, they expressed the view that similar recognition should be accorded the engineering profession through action to give equivalent rank and status to the chief sanitary engineer in the Public Health Service.

"CONCLUSION

"The committee is convinced, on the basis of information developed at the hearing, that action may have to be taken to provide for changes in grade, pay, and allowance with respect to other positions of comparable responsibility in the Public Health Service. Action should be taken now, however, with respect to the chief dental officer."

In order that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare may give further consideration to this problem of assuring parity among positions of comparable responsibility in the Public Health Service, I have introduced a bill which would—

1. Provide that the six statutory assistant surgeons general shall have rank, pay, and allowance equivalent to those of a major general;

2. Provide that additional positions, as necessary, could also be classified as temporary Assistant Surgeons General with rank, pay, and allowance equivalent to those of major general or brigadier general. Only one-third of such temporary assistant surgeons general, however, could hold the rank of major general.

This bill will, I hope, furnish a framework for consideration of the classification of other positions in the top administrative structure of the Public Health Service—as well as the chief dental officer—in a manner commensurate with the importance of the responsibilities of these positions.

SCHOOLS IN CRITICAL DEFENSE HOUSING AREAS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. MURRAY submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 5411) to amend Public Laws

Nos. 815 and 874 of the Eighty-first Congress with respect to schools in critical defense housing areas, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

H. R. 4467. An act to incorporate the Conference of State Societies, Washington, District of Columbia; and

H. R. 5511. An act to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to permit certain improvements to two business properties situated in the District of Columbia.

INTERNATIONAL DISARMAMENT—ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] has expressed a desire to be a cosponsor of Senate Concurrent Resolution 42, favoring international disarmament. I ask unanimous consent that he may be listed as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FLANDERS subsequently said: Mr. President, a few moments ago I asked to have the name of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] added to the list of sponsors for Senate Concurrent Resolution 42, relating to disarmament. The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] has just asked that his name be also added, so I ask unanimous consent that that may be done.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FLANDERS. I invite any other Senators who are so minded to notify me, as I shall be glad to add their names to the list of sponsors.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

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

(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:

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

Fifty-seven postmasters.

By Mr. STENNIS, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Roswell L. Gilpatric of New York to be Under Secretary of the Department of the Air Force, vice John A. McCone, resigned; and

Lt. Col. Gerald Joseph Greeve, and sundry other officers for appointment, by transfer, in the Regular Army of the United States.

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

Charles Morris Irelan, of Maryland, to be United States attorney for the District of Columbia, vice George Morris Fay, resigned.

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

Richard Hartshorne, of New Jersey, to be United States district judge for the district of New Jersey, vice Guy L. Fake, retired.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

Statement prepared by him entitled "The Inflation Engine."

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

Statement prepared by him, together with a letter from John B. Dunlap, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, relative to the unpaid tax account of A. H. Myers, Kansas City, Mo.

By Mr. MARTIN:

An address delivered by him before the Ohio Federation of Republican Women's Organizations at Columbus, Ohio, on October 8, 1951.

By Mr. BUTLER of Maryland (for Mr. HENDRICKSON):

Statement released by Mr. HENDRICKSON today urging immediate consideration of the remainder of the Hoover Reorganization Commission recommendations when Congress reconvenes next January.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

Excerpts from address entitled "Operation Home Front," delivered by Brig. Gen. C. W. Christenberry, Chief of the Special Services Division of the Army, on a program conducted by the American Newspaperwomen's Club for the entertainment of servicemen and servicewomen stationed in or near the Capital.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

Editorial entitled "Inspiring Example," from the Memphis Commercial Appeal, October 9, 1951, commenting on address delivered by him at the dedication of the Crittenden Memorial Hospital, West Memphis, Ark.

Article entitled "40 et 8 Establishes Scholarship Enabling French Student To Attend the University," published in the Northwest Arkansas Times of October 13, 1951.

An article entitled "The Fulbright Ideal—A Great International Experiment," printed in the magazine Pacific Neighbors, published by the Australian-American Association of Australia.

By Mr. BRICKER:

Analysis of Senate bill 1889, the Transportation Act of 1952-53, by Hugh McCarthy, former counsel to Subcommittee on Domestic Land and Water of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

By Mr. THYE:

Editorial entitled "Before You Beef About Beef Prices, Know the Story," published in the Minneapolis Star of October 12, 1951.

By Mr. BENTON:

Statement entitled "Private Investment in Underdeveloped Countries," issued on October 16, 1951, by the steering committee of the National Planning Association.

STATEMENT BY SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR AND LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS RELATING TO COMMUNIST DOMINATION OF CERTAIN UNIONS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, 2 days ago the Senate Subcommittee on Labor and Labor-Management Relations voted to have published as a Senate document nine significant reports. These are the reports of the trial committees designated by the CIO which held hearings and decided on the expulsion of nine CIO affiliated national unions because they are Communist-led.

The Senate subcommittee agreed on a statement explaining its reasons for taking this action. I feel sure I reflect the attitudes of members of the subcommittee when I say that the critical problem of security against sabotage in plants producing classified matériel for defense was a prime consideration in the members' minds. We agreed to investigate the problem and will use the CIO trial committee reports as a point of reference for the investigation and possible hearings in the months ahead.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to insert in the RECORD the subcommittee's statement setting forth the objectives of its action and the reasoning behind it.

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

INTRODUCTION TO SENATE DOCUMENT—COMMUNIST DOMINATION OF CERTAIN UNIONS

Whatever effect the non-Communist affidavit provision of the Taft-Hartley law may have had, there can be no question that there remain labor organizations now controlled by leaders whose loyalties are not to democratic government and democratic unionism but to the policies and programs of the Communist Party. The contents of this document should therefore be of consuming interest to the United States Senate and to the American people at large because it demonstrates in detail how one of our two great labor federations, the Congress of Industrial Organizations, proceeded to uproot Communist-dominated unions from its ranks.

The subject matter of this Senate document is the reports of the trial committees designated by the CIO to hear and decide the charges of Communist domination against nine of its affiliates. These reports, in my judgment, are of considerable historical significance for two main reasons: First, they demonstrate how an alert and democratically governed organization destroyed Communist infiltration by due process. Second, the reports illuminate the nature of Communist strategy as a conspiracy to subvert the unions as democratic institutions and to convert them into bases for the extension of Communist power. We have here spelled out how Communist unionism functions as a system of power.

The committee proposes, therefore, to investigate and to hold hearings on the extent to which Communist-controlled unions are in a position to endanger the defense effort. The committee proposes further to propose appropriate legislation to meet this problem, a problem which still remains very much to be solved.

REPEAL OF CERTAIN GOVERNMENT PROPERTY LAWS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1952) to amend or repeal certain Government property laws, and for other purposes, which were, on page 15, to strike out lines 7 and 8; on page 15, line 9, to strike out "(116)" and insert "(115)"; on page 15, line 12, to strike out "(117)" and insert "(116)"; on page 15, line 14, to strike out "(118)" and insert "(117)"; on page 15, line 16, to strike out "(119)" and insert "(118)"; on page 15, line 20, to strike out "(120)" and insert "(119)"; on page 15, line 23, to strike out "(121)" and insert "(120)"; on page 16, line 1, to strike out "(122)" and insert "(121)"; on page 16, line 4, to strike out "(123)" and insert "(122)"; on page 16, line 7, to strike out "(124)" and insert "(123)"; on page 16, line 10, to strike out "(125)" and insert "(124)"; on page 16, line 13, to strike out "(126)" and

insert "(125)"; on page 16, line 15, to strike out "(127)" and insert "(126)"; on page 16, line 17, to strike out "(128)" and insert "(127)"; on page 16, line 19, to strike out "(129)" and insert "(128)"; on page 16, line 21, to strike out "(130)" and insert "(129)"; on page 16, line 23, to strike out "(131)" and insert "(130)"; on page 17, line 1, to strike out "(132)" and insert "(131)"; on page 22, line 19, to strike out "136" and insert "163"; on page 23, line 13, to strike out "220" and insert "1834"; on page 25, to strike out lines 15 to 19, inclusive; and on page 25, line 20, to strike out "(10)" and insert "(9)."

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL PROPERTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES AND ARMED SERVICES PROCUREMENT ACTS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 921) to amend section 304 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 and section 4 of the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947, which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That section 304 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 and section 4 of the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947 are hereby amended by inserting at the end of the above-named sections the following new subsection:

"(c) All contracts negotiated without advertising pursuant to authority contained in this act shall include a clause to the effect that the Comptroller General of the United States or any of his duly authorized representatives shall until the expiration of 3 years after final payment have access to and the right to examine any directly pertinent books, documents, papers, and records of the contractor or any of his subcontractors engaged in the performance of and involving transactions related to such contracts or subcontracts."

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

INVESTIGATION OF ORGANIZED CRIME

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of the Senate to a meeting held last Monday which was of particular importance, and is one of the most encouraging events that has taken place in recent months in connection with the efforts of citizens to investigate organized and local crime, to deal with the problem, and to put a stop to crime.

In Chicago on last Monday a meeting was held of representatives of the various private crime commissions throughout the country. At that meeting a committee was appointed to examine into the possibility of forming an association or federation of citizens' crime committees the purposes of which would be to exchange information among the various private crime commissions to act as liaison with the investigative agencies of the Government and with the Congress and to keep the spotlight on crime and corruption at local levels. It is anticipated that if this national association or liaison group is formed, it will be financed by local means.

The committee which has been named to look into this matter and to report back consists of Virgil Peterson, the operating director of the Chicago Crime Commission, as chairman; James Walsh, of the Anticrime Committee of New York; Arlon Wilson, the operating director of the Crime Committee of Kansas City; and Daniel Sullivan, the operating director of the Greater Miami Crime Committee.

Mr. President, in the Third Interim Report of the former Special Committee of the Senate To Investigate Organized Crime, the third recommendation looked to the creation of a Federal Crime Commission which would have subpena power and would act as a liaison group with local commissions and local prosecuting attorneys throughout the Nation. I ask permission to have printed in the RECORD at this point this proposal in the Third Interim Report.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

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

III. APPROPRIATE LEGISLATION SHOULD BE ENACTED TO SET UP AN INDEPENDENT FEDERAL CRIME COMMISSION IN THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF THE GOVERNMENT

This Commission should be appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. It should be composed of three members, all of whom are prominent citizens and not otherwise members or employees of the Federal Government. It should be organized promptly and be ready to function on September 1, 1951, the date set for the expiration of authority of this committee.

The Commission should hear witnesses and hold hearings from time to time, but should not have the power of subpena. In such cases as the Commission may find it necessary to subpena witnesses, or to hear them under oath, it should apply either to the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which by virtue of Senate Resolution 129 succeeds to the functions of this committee, or in the alternative, it may apply to any other appropriate committee of the Congress which has jurisdiction over the subject matter when it deems it desirable to have hearings. The hearings, in such instances, will be held by the appropriate committees.

The functions of the Federal Crime Commission should be—

1. The continuing study and surveillance of operations of interstate criminal organizations throughout the country.

2. Reports on such criminal activities at periodic intervals to the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the United States Senate.

3. To make recommendations for hearings to the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the United States Senate or any other appropriate committee in cases in which the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee may not be the most appropriate, for more intensive investigation requiring the testimony of witnesses under oath.

4. The maintenance of liaison between Federal investigative and law-enforcement agencies and crime commissions at the State and local levels with the dissemination to the latter of information respecting criminal operations as may be required in the public interest.

5. Suggestion and encouragement of legislation designed to expedite, facilitate, and encourage better and more intensive law enforcement at all levels of Government.

6. The initiation and development of appropriate social study relating to crime, its punishment, and law enforcement.

7. The maintenance of files and records as a national clearing house of information respecting criminal activities in interstate commerce to be made available, to properly authorized individuals and groups, subject to suitable security measures, but not to conflict with the interests of any presently established Federal, State, or local law enforcement agency.

Recommendation III is concurred in by all members of the committee except Senator ALEXANDER WILEY who, while appreciating some of the advantages which might be achieved under a Federal Crime Commission, believes that the possible abuses of such a new agency require his opposition to the proposal.

It is Senator WILEY's contention that the Commission could conceivably result in (a) the basis for a national-type police force which is contrary to America's tradition, and which has been vigorously opposed by all outstanding Federal law-enforcement agencies; (b) unnecessary harassment and interference with Federal investigative agencies; (c) an unnecessary and costly superstructure imposed upon the present operating agencies; (d) dissipation of the function on the part of the legislative branch.

Senator WILEY believes that voluntary cooperation among Federal investigation agencies can achieve most of the objectives which the committee majority believes can only be obtained by a Federal Crime Commission.

This is the only point on which Senator WILEY dissents from his agreement with this unanimous report. The committee notes at this point that there has been no previous dissent by any member on any major point of policy.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, there was some objection to the above proposal, so in the final report of the committee a proposal for a National Crime Coordinating Council was recommended, and it is described briefly in the final report. I ask permission that the proposal be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

III. RECOMMENDATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

A. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ACTION AT THE FEDERAL LEVEL

1. Establishment of National Crime Coordinating Council

In order to keep the searchlight of public vigilance turned upon crime and corruption in a manner that leaves at the local level the basic responsibility for law enforcement and at the same time affords centralized guidance and coordination, the committee proposes the establishment of a privately constituted National Crime Coordinating Council.

The Council would be a body composed of representatives of privately established local crime commissions. Its first chairman would be designated on an interim basis by the President of the United States to serve until appointment of his successor. As soon as the organization was established it would nominate five persons from whom the President

would select a chairman to succeed the interim chairman. The chairman so designated would serve for a term of not more than 2 years at which time the same procedure would be followed for selection of his successor.

Congress would appropriate the sum of $100,000 to be applied as a grant in aid to the Council for the purpose of permitting it to organize and begin its activities. It is not contemplated that the Congress would be called upon for any additional funds. Thereafter, the Council would be expected to obtain its funds from charitable foundations or other private sources.

Solely to provide the mechanics for establishing the Council at the initial stages, the Attorney General of the United States would have the responsibility of drafting its charter and bylaws, arranging for its organizational meetings, and otherwise sponsoring its creation. Local crime commissions now in existence would be invited to serve as its charter members and thereafter it would sponsor throughout the country other local crime commissions which would also become members or chapters of the national organization.

The functions of the Council would be as follows:

(a) To foster the establishment of privately constituted local crime commissions wherever needed throughout the country.

(b) To serve as a clearinghouse for information of interest to local crime commissions.

(c) To inquire into and study such new patterns or innovations in organized crime as may develop and to make the results of its studies available to appropriate agencies and to legislative bodies so that immediate deterrents may be devised.

(d) To sponsor meetings for the purpose of exchanging ideas and information regarding local crime conditions to which would be invited representatives of local social and civic organizations, religious groups, educational bodies, women's clubs, law enforcement agencies, and all other groups having an interest in crime conditions.

The committee believes that establishment of the proposed National Crime Coordinating Council would constitute a great contribution toward the cause of law enforcement because it would provide at the local level the civic vigilance without which the evil of complacency and indifference may soon return.

As previously pointed out, this plan differs substantially from the proposal for a Federal Crime Commission as described in the third interim report. The Federal Crime Commission would be an official agency in the executive branch of the Government; whereas the National Crime Coordinating Council would be a private agency serving the local, privately established crime commissions constituting its membership. If the bill now pending in the Senate for establishment of the Federal Crime Commission should be enacted, the official functions of the Commission would not be in conflict with the private activities of the Council, although a demarcation of responsibilities between them might be advisable to avoid duplication of effort.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the association or federation of citizens' crime committees which has now been recommended by the local crime commissions themselves, to be privately financed, and without any Government connection, if it can be established and sufficiently supported, would take the place of the two recommendations just printed in the RECORD, and I think it is one of the most noteworthy steps by local citizens in the battle against the cartel of crime in the country that is going on today.

THE CAPEHART AMENDMENT TO THE DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency spent several weeks in public hearings and considerable time in executive session in preparing for the Senate a revision of the so-called Capehart amendment to the Defense Production Act, with a view to making it more workable, but at the same time preserving the intent of the conferees last summer, that manufacturing, processing, and industrial services should be allowed a fair and reasonable profit. It is with a sense of keen disappointment that I note that apparently the House does not intend, at this sesson, to act on that bill which was passed by the Senate.

In the opinion of the junior Senator from Virginia action on that bill in the second session of the Eighty-second Congress will be too late to prevent a considerable price increase, which will be forced by the Capehart amendment. That, in turn, will be calculated to set off new demands for wage increases which, when granted, will again put pressure on price ceilings.

ALLOCATION OF STEEL FOR SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for not to exceed 4 minutes on the subject of the allocation of steel for school construction purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator from Massachusetts may proceed.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Last night Senate Joint Resolution 225 was introduced, and it now lies on the table. That joint resolution concerns the use of steel for school construction purposes. I should like to speak briefly from the Massachusetts point of view.

Mr. President, there stands on the lawn of the State House in Boston a statue of Horace Mann, perhaps the greatest figure in public education in the history of our country and without question one of the greatest fighters for freedom the world has ever known. I have thought often of Horace Mann's remarkable career and accomplishments and ideals, but never with greater seriousness than in recent weeks as the Nation has faced a growing crisis in the construction of its schools.

Figures have been quoted in some detail, Mr. President, to illustrate the meager allotment of steel and other metals that has been given school officials throughout the country for the construction of badly needed school buildings. There is no need for me to repeat those figures at length. The school construction crisis is a vivid, a real and a dangerous one, and I submit that a policy that provides millions of tons of metal per quarter for the building of automobiles, electrical appliances and commercial containers and less than 200,000 tons per quarter for the building of schools is a policy that demands immediate reexamination in the clear light of common sense and national self-interest.

During the past weeks, Mr. President, I have been receiving, in person, by mail and telegram and by telephone the almost frantic appeals of devoted and hard working school officials and public leaders throughout Massachusetts for a reconsideration of their communities' school construction and equipment needs. In Williamstown, Mass., in Pittsfield, in Worcester, in Quincy and in New Bedford the needs of a rapidly expanding school population require urgent attention. In Lunenberg and in Leominster, in Lincoln, in Stoughton and in Orleans, indeed, in almost every one of our thriving communities, no matter what their size or location, this need for attention to our schools is acute. And it is a need not only for attention but for action. I urge that action now, Mr. President, with all the sincerity and vigor I possess, both in the interests of our boys and girls themselves and in the interest of the Nation's adequate defense, now and in the years ahead.

There seem to be some persons these days who do not relate this school-construction need to the defense of our Nation. I cannot share that point of view. I do not recall just where it originated but it was certainly a wise man who said that "Education makes a people easy to lead, but difficult to drive; easy to govern but impossible to enslave." Surely those words have special significance today as the free world stands challenged as never before. If we are to defend this Nation successfully in the months and years ahead, from the attacks of aggressors from without and from subversive operations within, if our boys and girls are to be able to know the truth and to live and act in accordance with that knowledge, then we are obliged to see that their educational needs are met. We are duty bound to provide them with adequate school buildings and proper equipment. We have no choice whatever, moral or otherwise, but to put America's accent on youth and upon youth's future ability to remain strong and to remain free. The defense of freedom and of this great Nation is not to be achieved overnight. It is not to be achieved by partial means. If we are to achieve that "enduring posture of strength" of which General Marshall spoke so truly we must make certain that schools as well as ships, that books as well as bazookas, that desks as well as destroyers receive the priorities they deserve. Then, in a new and true sense of the word, we will achieve a real and a lasting "defense in depth" as we fight this battle for freedom.

I urge, therefore, Mr. President, that Senate Joint Resolution 225, which is before the Senate, be approved and implemented at once and that those in administrative authority be requested immediately to revise their allocations and systems of allotments of metals to meet the needs of our schools in Massachusetts and throughout the Nation. We will never be forgiven nor will we forgive ourselves if we do not act wisely in this matter now.

Mr. FLANDERS subsequently said: Mr. President, I wish to say very briefly that I heartily support the joint resolution to provide steel for the construction of school buildings, to which the senior

Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] has addressed himself. Situations exist in my State which are very similar to those described as existing in the State of Massachusetts.

CALL OF THE ROLL

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

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

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

Benton	Hickenlooper	McMahon
Bricker	Hill	Millikin
Bridges	Hoey	Monroney
Butler, Md.	Holland	Moody
Butler, Nebr.	Humphrey	Murray
Byrd	Hunt	Neely
Carlson	Ives	O'Conor
Case	Jenner	O'Mahoney
Connally	Johnson, Tex.	Pastore
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Dirksen	Kefauver	Russell
Duff	Kerr	Saltonstall
Dworshak	Kilgore	Schoeppel
Eastland	Knowland	Smathers
Ecton	Langer	Smith, Maine
Ellender	Lehman	Smith, N. J.
Ferguson	Magnuson	Smith, N. C.
Flanders	Malone	Sparkman
Frear	Martin	Stennis
Fulbright	Maybank	Thye
George	McCarran	Underwood
Green	McCarthy	Watkins
Hayden	McClellan	Williams
Hendrickson	McFarland	Young
Hennings	McKellar	

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] are absent on official business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from California [Mr. NIXON], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

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

MUTUAL SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5684) making appropriations for mutual security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question before the Senate is on agreeing to the first committee amendment, which already has been stated.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I am sure I am correct when I say that many Senators were very much disappointed that the Appropriations Committee saw fit to report the bill with an amendment calling for a 5-percent cut in the appropriations contained in the pending bill.

The Foreign Relations Committee and the Armed Services Committee spent many weeks considering the mutual security program for Europe, the Middle East, and the Far East. A subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee, headed by the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], traveled through Europe and the Balkans, went to Spain, London, and Paris, talked with all our officials in the various places they visited, held hearings in the cities, conferred at great length with General Eisenhower and his staffs, and then returned home and made a report. Following the report, we heard from the executive branches of the Government which were concerned with the problem, and we took hundreds of pages of testimony. I think all this testimony, combined with the observations of the members of the committee, point up the fact that this program was a most carefully considered one and that it was designed not by men who were careless of the budgetary situation in this country, but by men who had the security of the United States close to their hearts. The program which was designed and presented to us was not based upon what these men believed was needed in Europe, but unfortunately it had to be based upon their best estimates of what our economy could produce while still taking care of our own defense requirements.

General Eisenhower impressed this upon us, as did the Secretary of State, the ECA officials, and the Secretary of Defense. Our observations in Europe convinced us of the desirability and necessity of proceeding with the business of building our defenses in combination with our allies as rapidly and as efficiently as we could.

The committee then considered the authorization bill. We deliberated on it, we argued about it, and reported it to the Senate. In committee it was cut about $1,000,000,000. It was debated in the Senate in as vigorous a debate as the Senate has heard at this session, and I thought we had arrived at an amount to which we would adhere and upon which we would agree. The authorization bill was signed, and then the appropriation bill went to the House of Representatives. The House Appropriations Committee did what I anticipated it would do—it, too, approved the amount of the authorization, and the bill was passed by the House. It then came to the Senate Appropriations Committee. There, by a vote of 10 to 9, the committee cut it by a flat 5 percent. The committee proposes to save—and I use the word "save" advisedly—approximately $200,000,000.

Mr. President, in view of the action of the Senate on the authorization bill I think there is something arrogant about the attitude of the Appropriations Committee, not only arrogant, but foolhardy, considering the situation which confronts the world today. A very great man once said, and very recently, that the world will go to those who are not tired. I fear that we in this body are a little tired. We want to go home, and understandably so. The Senator from Connecticut himself wants to go home. I have had practically 2 years, including a campaign of unremitting work, without respite, and I am ready for a rest. But I want to say that there are those who are not resting; there are those—and every Member of this body knows it—who are designing to take over the world. Mr. President, they are not resting. They are not resting in Korea. They are not resting in Egypt. They are not resting in Iran. They are not resting in Pakistan. They are not resting in eastern Germany. Every day they are giving fresh evidences of their determination to create all of the unrest and trouble in the world they can, looking toward the dissolution of the free world and the accomplishment of their aggressive designs.

Mr. President, I picked off the ticker in my office today, a dispatch which has just come from the Mediterranean, quoting General Eisenhower as follows:

> There is no use shutting your eyes to crises. We have a weakening of the franc and the pound. They are disturbing problems. You cannot have strength without economic strength. * * * I think personally—

Eisenhower added—

> the greatest change we see every month is the constant rise in what I call the morale of free peoples, the free nations. They are gaining confidence, looking problems squarely in the face, setting about finding ways to do things, and gaining every day in the belief that they can solve them.

Mr. President, about 6 weeks ago the leader of the Republican Party in this body stated that he was in favor of giving General Eisenhower all the arms the general stated that he needed. I regret to say that when the roll was called on the Dirksen amendment he was found voting in favor of it; and I have heard no word raised by him or anyone else in behalf of keeping the pledge which was made to General Eisenhower by the leader of the opposition and by the minority, that they would support him and get for him the aid which was promised.

Mr. President, I should like to quote from remarks which were made by the Secretary of Defense, who has many warm admirers in this body, and rightfully so. Speaking to the Appropriations Committee, Mr. Robert Lovett said:

> For more than 7 months General Eisenhower has been working on plans for organizing, equipping, and training a balanced force to resist attack. For more than 18 months we have had American military advisory groups living in each of these countries, in daily contact with their respective military establishments.
>
> It is from the combined work of these groups that there have been developed the detailed lists of equipment which can be

obtained only through our provision of military assistance. As General Eisenhower has reported, any substantial reduction in this program will directly and correspondingly reduce the supply of weapons and other necessary matériel which European soldiers, sailors, and airmen will stand ready to man. "I cannot," said he, "put it more forcibly than that."

Mr. President, he put it as forcibly as he could. The Senate put it as forcibly as it could by its vote on the authorization bill. But the Appropriations Committee, in its brief consideration, saw fit by a 10-to-9 vote to cut, not any specific item, but merely to cut the authorization 5 percent; and there were those who advocated a cut of 10 percent. That is their right, that is their privilege, that is their power in the Appropriations Committee; but, Mr. President, it seems to me they have not truly evaluated what we are trying to do by means of this program. We are partners in the business of survival. Aid to one is aid to all. This money represents the best military buy, dollar for dollar, that we can possibly make.

Mr. President, I should like to quote again from General Eisenhower. He said:

Remember that this conflict, spiritually, industrially, economically, and militarily is all tied together. Let us not try to separate the parts, because they relate to one another.

A basic aim is to give assurance to Western Europe, and that assurance we have given, in an amount a little less than that which the Senator from Connecticut would give, but we did give it. Now, as events move ever closer and become ever more alarming, as in the Middle East today, we are proposing to take another tack. News of what we propose to do will certainly be received with apprehension by the man we have delegated to pull the loose ends together, to lift up the morale and to unite the free world—General Eisenhower. He certainly cannot greet the news of what we propose to do with anything but apprehension.

Mr. President, I hope the House conferees will stand by the appropriations made by the House. I hope the Senate conferees will listen to the arguments that I am assured will be made by the House conferees, and if the committee amendment is adopted I am hopeful that the conference report will show that the amount provided by the House has been restored. I assure the Members of this body that if the report comes back to the Senate in any other form the Senator from Connecticut will have some more remarks to make.

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

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I desire to state that I agree with what the distinguished Senator from Connecticut has said. I was one of those who fought the reduction in the authorization bill. I did so because I felt we were cutting down on the defense of the United States of America. It was developed in the hearings that a dollar spent in Europe for European defense meant a great deal more than a dollar spent in this country, because it bought more. We know that our first line of defense is in Europe.

There is no need of my repeating the argument which I made at that time, and which has been made by other Senators on the floor of the Senate. I certainly hope that the amount appropriated by the House will be restored by the conferees, because I know that those who will be the conferees on the part of the House, or some of them at least, and some of the members of the Appropriations Committee, feel very strongly in regard to the cut. They feel that it is going to hamper our defense effort.

Mr. McMAHON. I thank the Senator from Arizona.

I conclude, Mr. President, by saying that among the ominous events which have taken place since the authorization bill was passed was the announcement by our own Government of the explosion of a second atomic weapon by the Soviets. Stalin finally decided that he would confirm the report of the Russian possession of the bomb. He could not do anything else, of course.

I realize that it is becoming sort of "old hat" to talk about the atomic bomb question. A famous man made a speech yesterday in which he said that anyone who talks about any American cities being laid waste—I am paraphrasing his statement; I heard only a snatch of it over the radio—is talking nonsense. I hope that is so; but I know, Mr. President, that when we exploded an atomic bomb on Frenchman's Flat, people in Los Angeles, 400 miles away, could read a newspaper by the light of the explosion. I do not care to go into the speech that was made yesterday. I reserve that for another occasion. But, Mr. President, coming events not only cast their shadows before, but, as in the case of Frenchman's Flat, cast their light before, a horrible, terrifying light.

We are in a struggle for civilization; we are in a struggle for existence, and it is not going to be saved by the "five percenters." I do not know what a cut of 5 percent would figure out for each taxpayer in this country in connection with this bill, but I would guarantee it would be a very small amount indeed.

So far as I am concerned, I shall do everything I can to support the pledged word of the United States which we gave when we signed the North Atlantic Treaty, that we are going to do our best to defend the free world. If it means higher taxes, so be it. If it means greater sacrifices, so be it. If it means telling unpalatable truths to the people of our country, so be it.

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

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I wish to commend strongly the distinguished Senator from Connecticut because of the able speech which he is making and because of the position which he has taken. I did not entirely agree with the distinguished Senator when the authorization measure was pending, as he will probably recall. I did feel that some reductions from the amounts recommended should be made. But I wholly agree with his position now that the authorization made only a few weeks ago should be brought to fruition and completely realized by the appropriation action which we are now taking. It seems to me he is completely correct in his position that nothing whatever has happened since the date of that authorization to make the picture less compelling.

It likewise seems to me that he is completely correct in his position that there should be stability in the commitments of this Nation, and that when we have passed, after long debate, an authorization bill in such a vital matter as this, we should stick by it, and when we fail to do so we show lack of stability which I think will shake to some degree the confidence of others in us.

The next point, if I may be permitted to make it, is that we are now embarked on a completely different kind of program from the one under ECA which we have been considering yearly, having to do purely with the giving of economic aid. There we could make a departure from a unilateral authorization made prior to the appropriation without being left in the position in which we shall be left if we make a reduction now, because we are now in a mutual program of defense and of common preparedness for war, and it seems to me that we would be in the position of having broken faith with our friend and allies who, like ourselves, are in that mutual program, if we depart from the solemn authorization made but a few weeks ago.

I strongly commend the Senator from Connecticut for the position which he has taken.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senator from Florida very much. I particularly appreciated how pungently he expressed the thought that nothing has happened since the authorization was adopted in the Senate to change the picture of the necessities for which we authorized the appropriation. In fact, if anything, the situation has become worse, and General Eisenhower indicated that today when he talked about the weakening of the pound and the franc. The second atomic explosion in Russia indicated it.

We must be strong, we must be determined, and we must be on our guard. I feel that the action which was taken by the Committee on Appropriations was taken without proper consideration, on the spur of the moment, forgetting the underlying problems we are trying to meet, and forgetting, please God, that we are trying to defend civilization itself.

Mr. LEHMAN and Mr. GREEN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Connecticut yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself wholeheartedly with the remarks of the Senator from Connecticut and those of the Senator from Florida. It seems to me that the full appropriation is the best and greatest investment we possibly could make in the defense of our own country and in the security of the free world. There has been no new development of a nature to justify at this time a reduction in the appropriation. Quite to the contrary,

as General Eisenhower has pointed out, it is a fair assumption that the situation has deteriorated. Since the Senate first made the authorization, the situation in the Middle East, in Iran and in Egypt, has become extremely critical, and there are threats in other areas of the world. To me it would seem most unfortunate and most unwise for the Senate in any way to assume the responsibility of reducing the appropriation. I very much wish we could possibly increase the appropriations, but in my opinion it would certainly be folly at this time to reduce them in the slightest degree.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I should like to add a few words supplementary to what the Senator from Connecticut has said, and perhaps bring into sharper perspective one or two points which he has raised, but which I think could be emphasized.

In the first place, the Senator from Connecticut made allusion to a committee of the Senate which was sent abroad to investigate the justification of all the appropriations which were authorized in the first instance for what is properly called foreign aid, but which should be called, and which is technically, according to the language of the bill itself, mutual security. It is unfortunate to have the popular name "foreign aid" applied, because many people say, "We have done enough for these foreign nations, let us consider the people at home," whereas we are really aiding those foreign countries to aid us.

For illustration, when on our trip, we had our conferences with General Eisenhower, we went in the first instance to see him in Paris, and there we were briefed for over a day so that we might ask intelligent questions at the other places where we visited, so that we might know about the problems he had to meet in the great undertaking which he is striving so strongly to bring to a successful conclusion.

On visiting various capitals in Europe and meeting our representatives there and representatives of the governments to which they were accredited, we heard all their reports about conditions with what General Eisenhower had told us in mind. Then we went back to Paris for a couple of days to report to the General what he had found, and compare our observations with his own.

We were tremendously encouraged by what we learned both from him and from the others, the heads of states, prime ministers, foreign ministers of the different countries. We found that the morale of the countries had been greatly raised by what had happened in the past 6 months, and by what the attitude of this country had been shown to be.

One of the great elements in increasing morale in the foreign countries and giving confidence in our aid, this mutual aid which we had promised, was our action in Korea. We can hardly blame millions of people in Europe, when they thought of our promise to come to their aid under the North Atlantic Pact or otherwise, from wondering whether we really would, when the time came to do so. But they looked across the land and water to Korea, and they saw that in that country, where our interest is far less than in their countries, we had, as a matter of principle, gone to the aid of the people there, and assumed the chief responsibility for putting the aiding principle into effect. That had a marvelous effect on the peoples of Europe, and they started in to do all they could.

One of the many illustrations which I might cite, which General Eisenhower gave us, was this: There are great armies ready to be called, under training to the extent they can be trained without arms and equipment. But they lack arms and equipment. The funds which we provide under the so-called economic aid, which is really military aid, enable them to provide their armies with equipment, with uniforms and other accessories, and with the munitions of war themselves. Otherwise, we would have to provide them.

In the first place, we are not in a position to provide them, and, as the majority leader stated a few minutes ago, it would cost much less to have the European countries provide them, and they must be provided in order when the first attack may come, that those people can join in the mutual defense which includes, of course, our own defense. It is mutual defense which we have to consider as a fundamental principle.

Mr. President, the committee of nine which was sent abroad by the Senate was a very good illustration of bipartisanship in foreign policy. They went abroad with many different ideas, as individuals, as to what they would find to justify the appropriations which had been asked. It was an extraordinary illustration of bipartisanship in view of the fact that the majority party was not represented by a majority on the committee. There were nine members of the committee, five Republicans and four Democrats, and we worked together without regard to any party division, and came back and submitted a unanimous report to the Senate. That report called for the aid for which General Eisenhower had asked for.

We should remember that the authorization asked for by the President was cut $1,000,000,000 when the authorization bill itself was enacted. If the appropriation is now to be cut another 5 percent, after having discussed the authorization bill at length on the floor of the Senate and in the committee, as well as in conference, we shall be going back on General Eisenhower. We shall be going back on the countries of Europe, which are themselves doing all they can. They are doing a great deal more than we had hoped they would do. Such a reduction as is now proposed will have a bad effect on the world at large, and on the great struggle which is behind everything we do these days—the struggle between the communistic countries and the free countries of the world.

I am very glad indeed that my colleague the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] has brought up this question today.

Mr. KNOWLAND obtained the floor.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from California yield for that purpose?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be vacated, and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

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

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, may I ask how long the Senator from California expects to speak?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Not more than 10 minutes. In view of the comments which have been made on the other side of the aisle regarding the action of the Committee on Appropriations on the pending bill, I wanted to make a brief statement relative to the bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. Of course that would be entirely satisfactory. I am not complaining about that. I merely wish to state to the Senator from California that if we are to get away this week we have very little time left in which to pass upon these bills. I hope that the bills may go to conference at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations that I serve with him on the committee and I am as eager as he is to get the bills out of the way. Certainly there will be no attempt on my part to delay their disposition.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator from California with all my heart.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I had not intended to speak today. However, in the interest of clarity I feel that a few words should be spoken relative to the bill as it came from the Committee on Appropriations. As a matter of fact, I believe that the reduction made by the committee represents a very modest reduction in the program.

I do not subscribe to the theory that the Appropriations Committee is bound by the terms of an authorization bill. That has never been the policy of Congress, nor do I believe it should be the policy of Congress. The fact of the matter is that there have been literally hundreds of millions of dollars authorized for public works in this country, with no appropriations being made for them. Therefore it does not follow, because an authorization bill has been passed, that the exact amount of money authorized shall be provided by the Appropriations Committee. To the contrary, I believe that the Appropriations Committee would be derelict in its duty if it gave a blank check and did not discharge its obligation to scrutinize closely every appropriation bill that came to it from the House, whether it be for foreign aid, for our own military program, or for the various branches of the Government.

I do not believe that it is correct to say that there has been no change since the authorization legislation was passed. The fact is that the fiscal program of the

Federal Government is in a worse condition today, if that be possible, than it was at that time. When in the early part of the year the President of the United States presented his budget estimates calling for approximately $71,000,000,000, he proposed that there be raised some $10,000,000,000 in new taxes. Since that time the House of Representatives has acted on a revenue bill and has provided for roughly $7,000,000,000. The Senate has acted on a revenue bill providing for roughly $5,700,000,000. The difference was later adjusted in conference. A few days ago the House of Representatives rejected the conference report. I understand that we are about to have a new conference report acted upon this afternoon. At any rate, the new revenues which will come into the Federal Treasury will be considerably less than the amount estimated by the President of the United States in his budget message in January of this year.

The American people are bearing a very heavy burden. It is interesting to note that during the fiscal year which ended on June 30 last the revenues received by the Federal Treasury totaled $50,300,000,000. It is the highest tax take from the American people in the entire history of our Nation, either in war or in peace. In fact it is $4,500,000,000 greater than the high-water mark in Federal taxes during World War II. That high point came in fiscal year 1945. Therefore, actually for the fiscal year which ended on June 30 last, the Government received from the American taxpayers $4,500,000,000 more than it received during the high point of World War II.

I believe that the American people and the Congress, which is the responsible representative of the people, must take into consideration the fact that for 152 years, from the time George Washington first took the oath of office as President of the United States down through the second administration of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, the total cost of the Federal Government for all of its activities, in wartime and peacetime alike, amounted to just a little under $180,000,000,000, and that for the 7 years of the Truman administration, the total cost of the Federal Government has amounted to $320,000,000,000.

I believe that the Committee on Appropriations would be derelict if it did not examine very carefully every one of the appropriation bills which comes before the Senate.

The statement has been made that we would be defaulting on our agreements with foreign nations if we did not appropriate the authorized amount. Such is not the case. The people of this Nation have been very generous over the past period of wartime and in the postwar period in the aid and assistance which they have given to foreign nations. We did it not merely to help them, but because we recognized that it was in our national interest, and in the interest of the entire free world to rehabilitate war-torn Europe.

No one should rise on the floor of the Senate and suggest that we are not doing our full share. I believe the RECORD will clearly contradict any such statement or inference.

I believe we have a right to examine our contributions to the mutual defense system. If we are to have a mutual system of defense, I believe we should underscore the words "mutual" and "collective." Let us examine the facts.

The United States is contributing 68.1 percent of its total budget to national defense. Let us see what the other countries are contributing.

I may say that I do not want to list the countries by name, because the information came to us under a security classification. Personally, I believe that that is a very silly policy to pursue. When money is taken out of the pockets of the American people and contributed by the Government of the United States to mutual security, the people of the United States are entitled to know country by country what the other nations are contributing. However, under the general rule, which makes it possible to stamp a security classification on information, I do not feel at liberty as a member of the Committee on Appropriations to identify the countries by name. I do take the responsibility as a Senator of the United States to list a number of countries by alphabetical designation. What are the facts?

Country A is putting up 45 percent of its total budget for its defense, as compared with 68.1 percent which is being put up by the Government and the people of the United States. Country B is putting up 32.2 percent, or just one-half of what the people of the United States are being called on to put up. Country C is putting up 27.4 percent. Country D is putting up 26.2 percent, country E is putting up 22.7 percent, country F is putting up 22.4 percent, and country G is putting up 17.1 percent. I think the American people are entitled to that information.

There are some who say that is not a fair criterion, because our country is much richer than are the others, and that therefore we should consider the total national product, and on that basis should see how much the other countries are providing for defense purposes. Mr. President, let us examine the matter on that basis: The United States of America put up for defense during the prior fiscal year approximately 14.1 percent. Actually, for the current fiscal year the amount will be considerably more than that.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair). Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. THYE. In the past fiscal year the amount was in excess of $19,000,000,000. This year the total will run closer to $45,000,000,000 than any other figure which could be used. That will be $45,000,000,000 of the money of the American taxpayers that will go into the defense program of the United States, plus what we are today discussing as an appropriation to be sent to the foreign countries.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is correct. As a matter of fact, our defense estimates for future years indicate that the amount will rise considerably above that figure.

Mr. THYE. The figures which are constantly discussed as the possible appropriations in fiscal year 1952 range between sixty billion and sixty-five billion dollars. Those are the figures which are given to us by the various defense and administrative agencies.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is correct.

Mr. THYE. That is a tremendous sum of money—far more than the Senator or I can comprehend in any sense.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think the amount will be even larger than that mentioned by the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. President, compared with the prior year, in terms of the percentage of the gross national product devoted to defense, let me say that in the prior fiscal year, as I have said, the United States put up 14.1 percent. For the current fiscal year the amount will be considerably larger, perhaps reaching 20 percent. Country A is putting up, of its gross national income or product, 8.3 percent; country B is putting up 9.3 percent; country C is putting up 8.8 percent; country D is putting up 2.3 percent; country E is putting up 6.4 percent; country F is putting up 4.7 percent; country G is putting up 4.1 percent; country H is putting up 2.7 percent; and country I is putting up 5.7 percent.

On the total dollars provided, on the basis of our total budget and the proportionate amount we are contributing to the national defense, and on the basis of our gross national income, I say that the people and the Government of the United States not only are doing their share, but are doing far more than their share. I say this as one who has supported the North Atlantic Pact, the arms implementation legislation, and the appropriations under them. Based on these figures, I become a little tired when I hear, from time to time, suggestions that we are not doing our full share or that we are running out on anyone, either under this program or under any other program.

I have suggested that this program should be looked upon as one of collective security. Certainly it does no good to close the door to aggressive communism in Europe if the door to aggressive communism is to be left open in Asia. That has been one of the fallacies of the foreign policy we have followed heretofore. It was not until aggressive communism struck in Korea that some in the administration of this Government recognized that our back door had been left wide open by the policies they had followed. However, we did meet the challenge in Korea; the United States promptly moved into the situation, both under its own obligations, having set up the Republic of Korea, and as a member of the United Nations. Yet some who hold positions of high responsibility in this country would have the American people believe that the free world sprang to arms to aid us in meeting this challenge which took place in Asia.

Mr. President, what are the facts of that matter? The facts are that today,

16 or 17 months after aggression took place in Korea, the people of the United States have approximately 350,000 of their Armed Forces meeting the aggression in Korea; and all the other members of the United Nations combined that are furnishing aid in that area have contributed somewhat less than 35,000 of their armed forces in meeting the aggression in Korea. I have said before, and I say it again, that I do not believe those nations are carrying their fair share of the load. As a matter of fact, the situation is even more difficult than that, because of the 60 members of the United Nations, aside from the United States of America, only 16 of them have contributed any troops or any air force or any navy in the collective defense of the Republic of Korea; and to the nations which have contributed approximately 35,000 troops or armed forces, or 10 percent of what we have contributed, the United States and its taxpayers are supplying the logistical support of a vast majority of even that infinitesimally small number.

So let no one say that the American people are not carrying their full share of the responsibilities in trying to build a system of international law and order, so that the peace of the world can be preserved for ourselves and our children.

I do say, as a member of this body and as a member of the Appropriations Committee of the Senate of the United States, that we have a broader responsibility, because although I think all of us have recognized the grave danger of the threat of international communism, which might strike us in a Pearl Harbor type of attack, yet we are also conscious of the fact that we can spend this Government into bankruptcy, and we can create vast inflationary factors which will wipe out the savings of the American people and will bring hardship to those on pensions and on fixed incomes; and one of the great inflationary factors in our economy today is Government spending. We have an obligation not only to look over our own military expenditures and our own domestic expenditures but also to weigh them and the cuts we are having to make in them with the aid we are giving to the foreign countries under the circumstances I have outlined here today.

Mr. President, that is why I say—and I say it advisedly—that, in my opinion, the Appropriations Committee has been most generous, and that the cut proposed by the committee is a very minor one under all the circumstances, because those of us who sit day after day in the Appropriations Committee know that in this country there are areas which are desperately in need of additional facilities of one kind or another. We know that today there are countless school districts in the United States that cannot get steel with which to build schoolhouses for the education of the children of the Nation. We have an over-all responsibility.

I believe that those on the other side of the aisle—and, Mr. President, this is not a partisan question—will recognize the fact that the reduction recommended by the committee is a most modest one; and I believe they should accept it and should permit the bill to go to conference in the form in which it has come from the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I desire to associate myself with the comments just made by the senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND]. It is rather disconcerting for a Member of this body to stand here and listen to comments made by other Members to the effect that unless we go all out and give every dollar to the President which he requests for military and foreign aid, we are in fact turning our backs on General Eisenhower and the mutual-assistance pact in Europe. Mr. President, I do not think any charge can be successfully made that the American people or the Congress are not discharging their obligations to cooperate with the countries of Western Europe in efforts to resist communism. The record is clear that, since the end of hostilities in 1945 the United States Government has spent more than $37,000,000,000 for gifts, grants, loans, the Marshall plan, UNRRA, and every other conceivable program designed to assist those countries to rehabilitate themselves and to become better fortified to resist Communist aggression. I believe it is time for the Congress to determine how far we can go in dissipating the economic and manpower resources of our country in meeting these obligations. When it is said that we are turning our backs upon General Eisenhower, I say that is a false charge, and that the record shows actually that the only charge of that kind which can be made, is that Congress has in fact turned its back upon the American people and the American taxpayers.

Of course, we have entered into a mutual-assistance pact, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. I think we do owe something to the countries of Western Europe which are willing to cooperate with us in the defense of the European Continent; but I again point to the record, which shows that while the United States has funneled out these billions of dollars, while it has been sending thousands and thousands of young men in uniform to serve in Western Europe, never is there any criticism, or infrequently at least, in this body, that possibly we are rendering a disservice to the defense of free nations when we do not insist upon full participation and cooperation on the part of our allies in Western Europe. They want to do something to help. I think they would be in a stronger position, financially, economically, and from a military standpoint, today, had we not had an inept maladministration of these various aid programs during the past several years.

Mr. President, late yesterday the majority leader, referring to this appropriation bill, said:

> Some of us felt that when the authorization was cut that that should have ended the matter.

Mr. President, apparently the majority leader is not acquainted with the facts, and I should like to refresh the memory of Senators on that point. It will be recalled that when the authorization bill was before this body, approximately $250,000,000 was cut from the authorization. The bill was sent to a conference with the House. What happened there? Most of the $250,000,000 was restored, thus defying the mandate of the Senate insofar as authorization is concerned for military and economic spending. When any Senator stands in this Chamber to say that when a cut was made in the authorization bill we had done our full part and that no further reduction should be made by the Appropriations Committee, I call attention to these figures, namely, that the authorization bill as passed by the House provided $7,498,750,000; the Senate bill had authorized an appropriation of $7,286,250,000; but when the conference report came back it provided $7,483,400,000—not a cut of $250,000,000, but a reduction of only $15,000,000. So that is a very sizable cut. In fact, they probably did more than should have been done—that is, more than should have been done from the viewpoint of certain of the Members of this body who think we ought to pour out these dollars without any restraint or restriction.

Mr. President, this gigantic cut of $15,000,000 which was made in the authorization bill is a cut of precisely one-fifth of 1 percent. Why, Mr. President, that is a magnificent reduction—one-fifth of 1 percent. That is what the conference committee did in handling the foreign aid authorization bill. And so when the Appropriations Committee reports this appropriation bill and recommends a five-percent cut, I think it is entitled to the support of this body, because it is in keeping with the spirit of the authorization bill which was passed by the Congress.

Mr. President, my mind goes back momentarily to an incident which occurred in June 1948, when the Marshall plan had been approved, that is, the authorizaton for it. It authorized $5,300,000,000 for the first year. I was then a member of the Appropriations Committee of the Senate, and I recall the discussions we had at that time. Those discussions took about the same turn as the debate we have today to the effect, "You cannot cut a single dollar without breaking faith with our allies," breaking faith with our allies, who were to be the recipients of those billions of dollars.

Mr. President, at that time the Senate Appropriations Committee made a reduction of about $250,000,000 in that appropriation bill. Some of the members said, "Oh, they will be coming back for a deficiency or a supplemental appropriation." But I think the record will show that $250,000,000 was saved at that time because the Senate Appropriations Committee of that "terrible" Republican Eightieth Congress had the courage to save $250,000,000. I pay tribute to the present courageous Appropriations Committee, of which I do not happen to be a member, which reported this bill, keeping in mind that while we are committed to certain obligations and do not intend in any way to have this action construed as turning our backs upon General Eisenhower or our allies, we are yet trying so to regulate these spending programs in consonance with our revenue

collections that we shall not incur a deficit of $10,000,000,000 or $15,000,000,000 during this fiscal year.

I have just consulted the ticker tape outside, and for the first 3½ months of this fiscal year, from July 1 to October 16, we have a deficit of $4,123,000,000.

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

Mr. DWORSHAK. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. Can the Senator from Idaho inform us whether, during each of the years since the Marshall plan went into effect, there has been at the end of the year a deficit after the appropriations were made?

Mr. DWORSHAK. The Senator means a deficit in the amount which had been appropriated for that program, does he not?

Mr. WATKINS. I mean in the expenditures. Did the ECA ever run short, notwithstanding some of the cuts we made in the carrying out of that program?

Mr. DWORSHAK. No; I am sure the record will show that there has invariably been a sizable surplus carried over from year to year, and that even with the liberal, almost unrestrained spending policies of ECA, it has been impossible for that administration to expend all the dollars which have been appropriated annually under the Marshall plan.

Mr. WATKINS. I have not seen the figures, but I have been told, and I thought I was reliably informed, that during all that period of time there had been a rather large surplus at the end of each year, even though it was said at the time that we were cutting them short and were not giving them sufficient money.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The Senator from Utah is correct.

Mr. President, almost daily the newspapers carry dispatches showing how the expenditures of American taxpayers are being used in Europe. As the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] has pointed out, there has been no deficiency in the funds which have been appropriated year after year. Congress and the American people, in fact, have done more than they should be expected to do.

In this connection, Mr. President, I should like to invite the attention of the Senate to a clipping from a local newspaper, dated Dublin, October 15, just a couple of days ago. I have no criticism of the Irish people in any way. I merely cite it as being typical of the situation which we will probably find in every one of the countries in Western Europe. I should like to read this dispatch at this time:

IRISH GETTING SHOCK AS UNITED STATES CUTS OFF GIFTS

DUBLIN, October 15.—The Irish Government has been living high at the expense of American taxpayers and is certain to get a severe jolt when the last of the American hand-out funds are used by the end of the year, Sean Leamass, Minister for Industry and Commerce, said here today.

The minister, who has a reputation for facing nasty facts, said that the Irish Nation has since the war been spending far more than it earned. This was only possible, Leamass said, because the former government of John Costello, ousted in the June elections, had made up the deficit by drawing on a $120,000,000 loan made to Ireland under the Marshall aid program.

Funds realized by the Irish Government through the American loan were supposed to be spent over a period of many years to develop farmland, coal fields, electrical power, and other natural wealth, Leamass said. Instead, he said, the money has been used for day-to-day living.

"The spending spree is now over and by the end of the year, when the last loan dollar will be spent, the Government will find it cannot raise enough money from taxes or public loans to make ends meet," Leamass said.

As a result, he said, the Irish must now work much harder and export far more or prepare to face a considerable drop in the standard of living. Alternatively, he said, the nation must slash its imports and learn to become more self-supporting.

Mr. President, that article is typical of some of the developments in the nations of Western Europe. I pointed out a few minutes ago that I think we have rendered a distinct disservice to our allies when we have not insisted more vigorously in the past that they should assume greater responsibility and display greater resourcefulness and industry in keeping their part of the agreement, first, to effect rehabilitation and recovery in those countries, and then, subsequently, to make a worth-while contribution to NATO in Western Europe.

Mr. President, I do not desire to detain the Senate much longer, but I should like to refer to a few statements which were made in February of 1948 when the Marshall plan program was before this body. In the closing days of this session I do not desire to take much time, but I want to quote two or three brief statements from the report on the so-called recovery program, the Marshall plan, which was submitted to the Senate in February 1948.

On page 1, under the heading "Main purpose of the bill," I read as follows from the report:

The program—

That is, the Marshall plan—

is designed to help European nations to help themselves to recovery in such a way as to become independent of outside assistance.

We are near the end of the 4 years of the Marshall plan. If that plan had achieved the objectives outlined in this report and which were sold to the Senate 4 years ago, it would not be necessary to continue foreign aid nor to appropriate additional billions of dollars for military security in Western Europe. That is very evident from the situation which obtains in Europe today. If the program had been successful, there would be a greater degree of self-reliance and resourcefulness on the part of those nations.

On page 46 of the same Senate report I should like to read the following under the heading "The purpose is recovery; not relief":

This bill provides for United States assistance in a recovery program geared to the individual and collective needs of the participating countries. It is, therefore, a recovery bill and differs from the interim aid and earlier relief measures in that its primary concern is the re-creation of a strong, productive, self-supporting Western European economy. Obviously, some relief-type goods must be provided within the framework of the program, but all assistance, no matter what its form may be, will be devoted solely to European recovery.

One more quotation from that same report, Mr. President, reads as follows:

This assistance is not, and cannot be, a permanent feature of American foreign policy.

During the debate 4 years ago the distinguished Senator who now serves as the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations [Mr. CONNALLY] made the following statement, which will be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 94, part 2, page 2694:

I wish to say as a member of the committee, that one of the purposes of the bill is to render temporary aid, to relieve suffering, to banish fear, to relieve them of anxiety about communistic infiltration and encroachment. The other purpose is to make it possible for the nations to regain their independence, economic as well as political, to recapture their fortunes, and to stand upon their own feet.

Mr. President, during the past few days I have read much of the debate which occurred when the Marshall plan authorization was before this body 4 years ago. We were told then that if we would provide a few billion dollars, the countries in Europe which were dedicated to the preservation of peace, liberty, and freedom in this world would be able to stand upon their own feet. That is the objective we then sought. It is the objective we all want to attain at this time. But there have been many tragic errors committeed in the administration of these various programs, all of which have rolled out American dollars without achieving commensurate cooperation on the part of the nations of Western Europe.

I stress the fact that I disagree vigorously with anyone who says that unless we continue to provide every dollar for economic and military purposes that the President demands, we shall be turning our backs upon General Eisenhower or the nations in Western Europe. I think this body should support the Appropriations Committee in the very small reduction of 5 percent which has been made in the appropriation which was authorized for this particular program. The Congress will be back in session in January. It seems utterly untenable for anyone to contend that unless we appropriate without restraint $7,500,000,000 we shall foreclose the right of Congress to come back within 3 or 4 months and reexamine the entire program, and in the light of existing circumstances the American people and our Government can go on shouldering most of the responsibility in building up resistance to Communist aggression.

Mr. President, I have mentioned these facts briefly because I think we have heard far too much upon the floor of this body to the effect that the American people have not measured up to expectations and have not kept faith with our allies in Europe and elsewhere throughout the globe. The record is clear, Mr. President, and I think it is time for Congress to consider the interests of the American taxpayers, and the

interests of the young Americans who will be called upon to serve in uniform not only in Korea but elsewhere throughout the globe. Yes, Mr. President, while we are committed to the preservation of liberty and peace, likewise we have a justifiable right to insist that our allies measure up to their full responsibility in this mutual effort against Communist aggression.

NOMINATION OF DR. PHILIP C. JESSUP TO BE A REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES IN THE SIXTH SESSION OF THE ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I have just come from a meeting of the subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations at which we discussed the nominations of the American delegates to the Assembly of the United Nations. I desire to speak very briefly on the subject, and to read into the RECORD the statement I made to the subcommittee with regard to the nomination of Dr. Philip C. Jessup. I stated to the subcomittee:

This is the most difficult vote for me during my 7 years in the Senate. The nomination of Philip Jessup to be a delegate to the sixth regular session of the General Assembly of the United Nations has been confused by the charges of communism and disloyalty. I have known Philip Jessup for many years and I have absolute confidence in his integrity, ability, and loyalty to his country. I am convinced that he has not and never had any connection with the Communist Party.

However, the personal integrity of Philip Jessup is not the issue.

The real issue raised by Dr. Jessup's nomination in light of past and recent events is the approval or disapproval of our over-all far-eastern policy. Dr. Jessup has been identified with those forces in and outside the administration which were responsible for the far-eastern policy which has led to the present crisis. He was the editor of the China white paper. He was closely identified with the Institute of Pacific Relations, an organization some of whose employees have been suspected of Communist sympathies. He participated in the unfortunate events that led to the summary dismissal of General MacArthur without a hearing. He is the symbol of a group attitude toward Asia which seems to have been proven completely unsound. This is not a case of mere difference of opinion. This is an issue that may well involve the future of Asia and of the world.

It is vital that the people of the United States have confidence in their representatives to the United Nations Assembly. Issues of critical importance affecting Asia will soon be before that body. Dr. Jessup has not got the confidence of our people. He is a controversial figure. His confirmation, I fear, would divide the country at a time when above all else we need unity.

This issue is not a personal one. We must meet it objectively and courageously.

I have come to the reluctant conclusion that I must oppose Dr. Jessup's confirmation.

Mr. President, I make that statement with real regret.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does not the Senator from New Jersey believe that this nomination should be brought to the floor of the Senate so that the entire Senate might vote on it, and decide the issue? If it is not done in that way, it will then be possible for the President to make an interim appointment of Dr. Jessup to this very important post as a representative of the United States to the General Assembly of the United Nations.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. The vote in the subcommittee was three to two against Dr. Jessup, and the subcommittee referred the decision it reached to the full committee, with the urgent recommendation that the full committee meet as soon as possible and report the nomination to the Senate.

I may say, incidentally, that all the other delegates to the United Nations Assembly were approved by the subcommittee, and the whole slate of delegates will now be before the full committee. I hope it will meet immediately, and I agree with the Senator from Michigan that, in light of the present controversy, the Senate should certainly have an opportunity to express itself on this important nomination.

Again I emphasize that this is not a personal matter. There is the question of great principle involved. I emphasize again that I personally can clear Dr. Jessup of any charges of disloyalty or any charges of Communist affiliation.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator raises the question of the judgment of Dr. Jessup.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. And his identification with policies. I felt he was one of the leaders in shaping our policies in the Far East.

Mr. President, I must take the position I have announced; otherwise it would seem that the results of my visit to the Far East and the position I took would be negated by sending Dr. Jessup to the Assembly as our representative. That is the only reason for my decision. Dr. Jessup has ability and integrity, but I do not believe he enjoys the confidence of the American people in connection with the issues which will probably come before the Assembly next month in Paris.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it not true that hearings have been held before the Subcommittee on Internal Security, and that they showed Dr. Jessup's connection with the thinking behind the policy which was adopted as to the Far East?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. That is all a part of the case, and the hearings before that subcommittee have been very helpful to me. The chairman, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], has sent excerpts from the hearings to indicate the testimony that has been developed.

I wish to make it clear that I have no lack of confidence in Dr. Jessup's integrity or ability, but I do feel that a vote to confirm his nomination would be contrary to the best interests of the people of the United States.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the Senator from New Jersey also feels, does he not, that it would be unfortunate if an interim appointment were made, without a vote in the Senate, after an adverse report in the subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Of course, I agree with the Senator. There is wide public interest in the case. I am receiving hundreds of telegrams on both sides of the question, from all over the United States. There are many who support Dr. Jessup. But I desired to make it clear what the issue in the subcommittee was. It was not a question of his being a bad security risk, but the question was as to his attitude of mind.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BRICKER. I just came onto the floor of the Senate, and have not heard all the discussion, but I have been in conference with the Member of the House of Representatives from my own district, Representative VORYS, who has been appointed as a member of the American delegation, and I know the seriousness of the situation if there should be a failure to confirm the delegates.

I wish to know what assurance there is that the Senate will be allowed to vote on the nominations of Dr. Jessup and the other delegates. I cannot conceive that they are going to the General Assembly without a vote of the Senate.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I share the Senator's view, and I may say for his information that our subcommittee voted, by a very close vote of 3 to 2, against Dr. Jessup, and with reluctance I felt compelled to vote against him.

Mr. BRICKER. And the subcommittee voted favorably on the other delegates?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. We voted favorably on the others, and reported them to the full committee. I hope the full committee may vote promptly and report the nominations, so that the Senate will have a chance to vote on them.

Mr. BRICKER. In my opinion that is the only course to take that will be fair to the American people and to the Senate. I hope that the Senate may have a chance to vote on all the nominations.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I agree with the distinguished Senator from Ohio and his colleague, Mr. VORYS, in the House, who is one of the delegates. Naturally he is anxious that the Senate pass on his nomination. He does not want an interim appointment.

Mr. BRICKER. If the Senator will further yield, I am quite confident that he would not accept an appointment of an interim character, without the confirmation of the Senate. He would not go to the General Assembly without the full legal authority which he ought to have.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I cannot tell about that, but I believe that all the delegates would want us to act as promptly as possible, now that the subcommittee has finished its hearings and has made a report to the full committee.

Mr. MCCARRAN. Mr. President, I desire to express my commendation of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and to compliment him on his analysis of the case of Dr. Jessup from his standpoint. I must say that, having

been a participant in the hearings before the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee of the Senate, I cannot follow the reasoning of the able Senator from New Jersey. I can see how difficult it is for the Senator to come to the conclusion at which he has arrived. I compliment him highly for his patriotic and positive position. The nomination of Dr. Jessup should be brought before the Senate for a decisive vote, negative to his appointment.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I had not intended to speak on this subject at this time. However, in view of the statements made by the distinguished Senator from New Jersey, and similar statements by other Senators, to the effect that they did not believe that Ambassador Jessup was qualified to be a member of our delegation, representing the United States in the Assembly of the United Nations, and in view of the further fact that I do not know whether or not we shall have an opportunity to vote on this nomination, I wish to take this opportunity to state again my opinion of this great American. I am willing to stand up and be counted. I have followed the public hearings before the Foreign Relations Committee as closely as possible and I am convinced that Ambassador Jessup is qualified by character, by experience, by training, by high morality, and by loyalty, to represent the United States in the General Assembly, which will meet in Paris within the next few weeks. If the nomination is brought before the Senate I shall certainly wholeheartedly support it.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Did the Senator from New York hear my full statement?

Mr. LEHMAN. I did.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I made it clear that the issue was not as to his qualifications. The issue involved in the confirmation was the entire issue of our policy.

Mr. LEHMAN. I heard the Senator.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I made it clear that I have known Dr. Jessup for years and that I have no question of his integrity, sincerity, or loyalty to his country.

Mr. LEHMAN. I heard the Senator's statement, and I respect his point of view. However, I feel that the only charges affecting the qualifications of Ambassador Jessup to represent this country in Paris come from certain Senators and from a former Governor of the great State of Minnesota, Governor Stassen. I repeat that I have followed the hearings carefully. I believe that Ambassador Jessup disproved completely the charges made against him. I consider him fully qualified to represent the United States.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, if the Senator from New York will yield for a moment, I will say in answer to him that my judgment was based upon my own experience, my own contacts in the Far East, and my own talks with Mr. Jessup. My conclusion is based on my own experience.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 57. An act for the relief of Ertogroul Osman and Mehmed Fahreddin;

S. 118. An act for the relief of Nouhad Ann Khoury;

S. 519. An act for the relief of Moy Chin Shee;

S. 575. An act for the relief of Robert Jose Toribio;

S. 582. An act for the relief of Emma Burr;

S. 635. An act for the relief of Hans Lenk;

S. 775. An act for the relief of Dr. Anthony M. Opisso;

S. 839. An act for the relief of Alice Ibrahim Hannan Ibrahim, Ellen Issa Zakaria, Ruth Naomi Schut, and Roseileen Schut;

S. 954. An act for the relief of Dr. Charles Gordon Rennick Sell;

S. 1048. An act for the relief of Myrtle Harding;

S. 1274. An act for the relief of Vera Oumancoff;

S. 1436. An act for the relief of Mrs. Marie Y. Mueller;

S. 1622. An act to amend section 10 of the Flood Control Act of 1946;

S. 1640. An act for the relief of Cathy Dana Besser;

S. 1912. An act to provide for conveyance of certain land to the city of New Orleans;

S. 1970. An act for the relief of Louis E. Gabel;

S. 2007. An act for the relief of Sharon A. Gates; and

S. 2027. An act for the relief of Leo Kieve.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1236) for the relief of Rhoda Akiko Nishiyama.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3669) to amend the Railroad Retirement Act, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. CROSSER, Mr. BECKWORTH, and Mr. WOLVERTON were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills:

S. 264. An act to provide for granting to officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, and the White House and United States Park Police forces, additional compensation for working on holidays;

S. 1335. An act to readjust size and weight limitations on fourth-class (parcel post) mail; and

S. 1967. An act to amend or repeal certain laws relating to Government records, and for other purposes.

MUTUAL SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5684) making appropriations for mutual security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

GIFT-LOANS FINANCED BY AMERICAN TAXPAYERS

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the bill under consideration appropriates $7,208,401,400, to be given to foreign nations in the form of gifts, loans, or otherwise, without any specific conditions attached to such gifts.

ATLANTIC PACT DEFENDS COLONIAL POSSESSIONS

I invite attention to the statement made by the junior Senator from Nevada in March 1949, during the debate on the first extension of the Marshall plan, ECA. Under the heading "North Atlantic Pact," I stated:

I am coming back to the question in answer to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. All of the information on the real meaning of the North Atlantic Pact is that, in effect, we will be guaranteeing the protection and status quo of all the colonial possessions of the empire-minded nations of Europe. Further, we will have relinquished our right to go to war only when our peace and safety is threatened, and must go when the peace and safety of any of the European nations signatory to the pact is threatened.

On July 12, 1949, the junior Senator from Nevada said:

Mr. President, the North Atlantic Pact, simply and without question, guarantees the integrity of the colonial systems throughout Asia and Africa.

SECRETARY OF STATE DECLARES UNITED STATES IN ON EGYPT-ENGLAND CONTROVERSY

At this point I desire to call attention to a statement made by our Secretary of State on October 17, 1951. This is press release No. 944 of the Department of State. It reads as follows:

At his press conference today Secretary Acheson made the following statement:

"EGYPTIAN REJECTION OF MIDDLE EAST COMMAND PROPOSALS

"It is with genuine regret that the United States Government received notification on October 15 of the rejection by the Egyptian Government of the proposals presented to it on October 13 by the United States, France, Turkey, and the United Kingdom. This Government has noted with surprise that the Egyptian Government rejected proposals of such importance without having given them the careful and considered deliberation which they merited. These proposals were formulated by the nations interested in the welfare and security of the Middle East after the most intensive and thorough consideration of the special problems of the area. The invitation to join with the other sovereign nations of the free world in a joint and cooperative effort to make the world safe from aggression was wholly consistent with the independence and sovereignty of Egypt.

"Vigilance in protecting the liberties we enjoy is the responsibility of every nation of the free world. The spirit of responsibility to others requires that no nation carelessly precipitate events which can have no constructive end but which by their nature create those elements of confusion and weakness which tempt aggression. It is the hope of the United States Government that Egypt will carefully reconsider the course of action on which it has embarked and will recognize that its own interest will be served by joining the other nations of the free world in assuring the defense of the Middle East against the common danger.

"The United States Government must reaffirm its belief that the action of the Egyptian Government with respect to the Anglo-Egyptian Treaty of 1936 and the agreements of 1899 regarding the Sudan is not

in accord with proper respect for international obligations. For its part, the United States Government considers the action of the Egyptian Government to be without validity.

"It is the sincere hope of the United States that great restraint will be shown in the present situation and that the obligation of all nations toward the preservation of world law and order will be respected."

VANDENBERG RESOLUTION—ATLANTIC PACT—ARMS—MEN

The Vandenberg resolution in 1948, which the junior Senator from Nevada debated with the then senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], provided that we ask the President of the United States to make a pact with certain Atlantic European nations. The junior Senator from Nevada stated then that we would be morally bound to accept the pact, and that it would be breaking a precedent of the Senate which had stood for more than 175 years; never before had we asked the President to make a treaty or pact without specifying what that treaty should contain. Previous compacts, agreements, and treaties always came before the Senate and were considered in detail before they were approved or disapproved.

The distinguished senior Senator from Michigan at that time stated that there was no obligation to accept the compact. Nevertheless it was a commitment; we did accept it almost immediately without any change whatever.

The junior Senator from Nevada also stated that it would mean furnishing arms to these countries almost immediately. That was denied. It was stated that there was no obligation, and that any proposition of furnishing arms would have to come before the Senate. I said at that time that it would mean that boys would be sent to Europe. That also was denied. The answer was that if the time should come for such action, it could mean only 5 or 6 divisions, perhaps 90,000 or 100,000 men.

The junior Senator from Nevada followed up by saying, on this same date, July 12, 1949:

COLONIAL SLAVERY—AN OUTMODED FEUDAL WORLD

We know that the feudal world of Europe, Asia, and Africa—made up of petty kings, strong-arm despots, and colonial landlords—can no longer survive the conditions imposed by a scientific world.

We know that the colonial landlords of England, France, the Netherlands, and Belgium can no longer keep their serfs deindustrialized in an industrial world and producing only raw materials to be shipped to the master nation in return for which they are forced to buy the necessary manufactured and processed articles to cover their backs and to secure the necessary tools and implements to eke out a bare existence.

We know that some of these landlord nations have lived off the colonial areas of the Near East and the South Seas for more than 300 years.

We know all these things. Yet by our every action, through our national and international hybrid policies and programs, we seek to perpetuate these very European, Asiatic, and African feudal and nationalistic states, many of them living off the colonial countries and areas producing wool, meats, cotton, minerals, and many other products, including manufactured goods, with what amounts to slave or indentured labor in Africa, Asia, and the South Seas, which is intended to compete on even terms—through our "free trade" policies—with our own workingmen.

This type of a slave labor pool is only a step away from the Russian methods in their forced labor mining, manufacturing, and agricultural areas.

The North Atlantic Pact is simply another step down the road of guaranteeing the status quo in international affairs and holding in subjection the colonial peoples of these areas.

AMERICAN SOLDIERS KEEP PEACE OF WORLD—PRESIDENT SAYS

Mr. President, it will be remembered that the President of the United States recently reiterated what he has stated from time to time: we would find American soldiers wherever trouble broke out throughout the world.

Secretary Acheson has stated that Indochina is is in the same category as Korea. We take it for granted that that is the foreign policy of the administration, to hold the status quo throughout the world; wherever there was colonial slavery, then that is what it will continue to be. We will join the empire-minded nations in holding the status quo.

Mr. President, the Atlantic Pact followed the promotion of "free" trade and the removal of the metal base from our money. The latter was done so that the administration could print all the money it wanted to give to foreign nations. Incidentally, printing-press money has brought on the inflation about which the administration is now complaining.

FIVE-PART ADMINISTRATION PROGRAM

On July 12, 1949, on the Senate floor, I referred to what I called the "presently known five-part administration program."

The discussion on that date reads in part:

The long-range five-part program has been presented to the Congress and to the Senate by the President of the United States to correct the European problems, each as an emergency in its own right; however, taken together they include and interlock the national and international economy. The five-part program includes—

Mr. President, this was on July 12, 1949, more than 2 years ago. Continuing—

First. The North Atlantic Pact, which was not the first proposal made, but which is before us today. It would have the effect of:

A. Guaranteeing the integrity of the colonial system of all Asia, Africa, and Europe, thus extending the political and economic control of France's Indochina, New Caledonia, French West Africa, and Morocco; England's Singapore and Malayan States, East Africa and the Sudan country, South Africa, North Ireland, and many other areas; the Netherlands, Indonesia, and Belgian Congo in Africa—

Mr. President, I know the Sudan country, which is included in the announcement of the Secretary of State. The junior Senator from Nevada visited the British Governor of the Sudan country in 1948 when they were planting peanuts there with our money. They were not doing very well with it, either, I may say. They lost most of it. The Sudan is a part of Egypt. Without going into the history of it—because I intend to use some material a little later in my address which will review the history of the Sudan—what the British were doing with our money was increasing the production of cotton and other agricultural products and taking the water out of the Nile.

Water is the lifeblood of Egypt. The country which controls the upper Nile and the Sudan and has the money—of course, Britain had enough money, with our appropriating money in amounts of $7,000,000,000, $8,000,000,000, and $9,000,000,000 each year for Europe—such country can endanger, I say, the very life of Egypt on the lower Nile.

I read further from the remarks I made in the Senate on July 12, 1949:

B. Adding to the power and obligations of the Congress to later pass laws to discharge such obligations of the treaty, under the provisions of article I, section 8, of the Constitution which automatically become the law of the land upon the approval of such treaty by a two-thirds vote of the United States Senate—and which takes no account of the absence of action of the House in incurring in such future obligations, including the implied immediate and automatic declaration of war or other suitable action.

I quote the following from the Supreme Court:

"The Supreme Court, in the case of *Geofroy* v. *Riggs* (133 U. S. 266), says:

"'The treaty power, as expressed in the Constitution, is in terms unlimited except by those restraints which are found in that instrument against the action of the Government or its departments, and those arising from the nature of the Government itself and of that of the States. It would not be contended that it extends so far as to authorize what the Constitution forbids or a change in the character of the Government or in that of one of the States, or a cession of any portion of the territory of the latter, without its consent. * * * But with these exceptions, * * * there is no limit to the questions which can be adjusted touching any matter which is properly the subject of negotiation with a foreign country.'"

C. Abrogating the 173-year-old right of the United States Congress to alone decide when our ultimate security and safety is threatened, and provides that when the safety of any one of the signatories to the pact is threatened, we are automatically to consider our own safety in danger, regardless of the circumstances or of any independent judgment of our own.

Second. Appropriations to make up the trade-balance deficits of the European nations each year in cash, currently labeled the ECA, under which our chief export is cash.

Remember, Mr. President, that this speech was delivered by me in the Senate on July 12, 1949. I continue to read from that speech:

Third. The 3-year extension of the 1943 Trade Agreements Act under which the State Department has adopted a selective free-trade policy of lowering the tariffs and import fees below the differential between the cost of production in this country and that of our foreign competitors, on each particular product, on the theory that the more they divide our markets with the nations of the world, the less their annual trade-balance deficits will be.

Fourth. Approval by the Congress of the International Trade Organization, under

which 58 nations with 58 votes, each nation with 1 vote, we would have the same vote as Siam, would meet at least once each year, and would distribute among themselves the remaining production and markets of the world, eventually on a basis of population—we assign to this Organization all of our right to fix tariffs or import fees.

DISCREDITED SECRETARY OF STATE REMAKE INDUSTRIAL MAP OF UNITED STATES

Mr. President, at this point I pause in the reading to point out that this year, when the House and the Senate voted to extend for two more years the Reciprocal Trade Act, which would continue for two more years the right of a thoroughly discredited Secretary of State to remake the industrial map of the United States, we were told that the International Trade Organization would not again be brought before the Congress. However, those who told us that neglected to say that other acts which would be brought before the Congress would include provisions parallel with those of the International Trade Organization. Such provisions were made a part of the GATT, an international tariff and trade organization begun at Geneva, and completed at Torquay, England, this year. They have come in the back door, but the result is just the same.

The Customs Simplification Act recently passed by the House is a case in point.

I read further from the speech I made in the Senate on July 12, 1949:

Fifth. The bold new program heretofore outlined included under recommendation No. 10 of the mid-year economic report of the President, just transmitted to Congress, the proposal to enact legislation to provide technical assistance to underdeveloped areas abroad and to encourage investment in such areas.

Under that program, Point 4, Mr. President, we appropriate the money and spend it in those countries, and then take more of the taxpayers' money to guarantee the integrity of the expenditure. That would be something for a Senator to try on his banker sometime if he would know just how ridiculous such an arrangement is.

SECRETARY OF STATE INTRUDES US INTO EGYPT

Mr. President, it is obvious that the Secretary of State has intruded us into the Egyptian affair without a thorough understanding of the possible consequences.

We have had a couple of these great ambassadors in Iran, but about all they have succeeded in doing is muddying the water through threats, and Iran is in a greater turmoil than ever before. About all that was ever the matter in Iran, as shown by the facts now becoming known, was that since about 1890 England has taken about all the profit from the production of oil there and left very little for Iran. Even as late as 1948, when I was in Iran and inspected the operations at Abadan, including the oil fields, the British were paying a royalty of only 17 cents a barrel, whereas across the line, in Arabia, our American companies were paying royalties of 40, 50, or 60 cents a barrel. In addition, Britain was operating under some kind of a treaty by which she was allowed to make foreign investments out of the income from the Iranian oil fields and to tax the income before anything was left for the Iranians.

About 250,000 or 300,000 of the Iranians profited somewhat in terms of their standard of living, but the other 17,000,000 Iranians were still living off of dried dates and goats' milk, just as the people of Iran have lived for 5,000 years. Apparently those who now live in Iran did not like that arrangement very much and did not like to see all that wealth leave their country.

AMERICAN SOLDIERS HOLD STATUS QUO OF THE WORLD—160,000 DEAD, MAIMED, LOST

Mr. President, we have had the amazing statement of our President and our Secretary of State to the effect that when there is any disturbance or when there are any outward evidences of dissatisfaction with the status quo at any place within the entire world, our boys will go there and will settle the matter.

In Korea we have the sad situation of several thousand of our boys being killed or wounded or lost each week, without any emphasis being placed by the administration on that loss. Actually, about 160,000 of our boys have been lost, maimed, wounded, or frozen, suffering from frozen feet or frozen arms, or otherwise incapacitated, since the war began in Korea—that police action which our boys are not allowed to win and which they dare not lose.

NO FOOT SOLDIERS OUTSIDE AMERICA

In the first place, we never should have a foot soldier outside the United States of America. We should, instead, build up our Air Corps and our submarine force to the point where we could, for our own security and welfare, blockade or make untenable any area. We should put the matter on that basis.

NO PERMANENT FRIENDSHIPS OR ENMITIES

Mr. President, the policies of England and other nations are based upon the principle expressed by one of Britain's great Prime Ministers in 1858. Lord Palmerston in 1858 said:

We have no permanent friendships or enmities; we have but permanent interests.

Mr. Churchill voiced that again in 1945, when Mr. Roosevelt said to him that he thought Britain should abandon Hong Kong and thus save trouble in that area. Churchill expressed the same thought in these words:

I did not become the King's First Minister to liquidate the British Empire.

This virtually said that if the United States does not want to support the colonial slavery system, the United States is no longer a friend of Britain's.

WHEN THEY ARE IN WAR—WE ARE IN WAR

Mr. President, we find ourselves tied up in a treaty which says that we must go to the aid of Britain or any of the other North Atlantic Pact nations; in other words, we are at war when they are at war. In 1949, during the debate on the North Atlantic Pact, I said that they will get into a war by fighting to retain their colonial possessions.

Mr. President, colonialism is outdated. With our maximum power, we could not sustain the colonial system, even if we should want to do so.

At this time I wish to call attention to a dispatch appearing in the New York Journal American on yesterday, October 17, 1951, by Karl H. Von Wiegand. The article is headlined as follows:

KARL H. VON WIEGAND CABLES BRITISH UNABLE TO HOLD SUEZ WITHOUT UNITED STATES

(By Karl H. Von Wiegand, dean of American foreign correspondents)

In part, the article reads:

Britain cannot hold her position on Egyptian territory in the Suez Canal zone without the active support of America.

Mr. President, I have just read the statement by the Secretary of State. Apparently England has the active support of the United States of America. Let us see how this capable correspondent feels about what the effect is going to be. I continue:

If the United States supports Britain with the utmost diplomatic pressure and threats of military reinforcements or naval movements in the eastern Mediterranean, it will make the Arab States in the Near and Middle East and in parts of North Africa bitterly hostile to America in the event of war with Soviet Russia.

That in a few words is the situation that has swiftly followed Britain's loss of Persian oil and British evacuation of Persia.

If Britain carries Egypt's abrogation of the treaty of 1936 into the UN Security Council, the Egyptians are confident that Soviet Russia will veto any sanctions or military action that may be proposed.

It is the belief in Alexandria and Cairo that the American people have had enough of President Truman's and Secretary of State Acheson's military adventuring in Asia in the now 15-month-old Korean "police action" which has cost $5,000,000,000 and 170,000 casualties from all causes, and that they will oppose any further military interventions and dispersement of United States troops.

Mr. President, I again call attention to the fact that the number of casualties in Korea from all causes is not 87,000, as bandied about the Senate, but 160,000. I continue:

The impression also prevails that the Pentagon in Washington would not look upon any new commitments with favor.

AUDACIOUS MOVE

The action of Premier Mustapha El-Nahas Pasha, whom I have known for 25 years, and Foreign Minister Mohamed Salah El-Dine Pasha was a bold and audacious move at a time when Britain is experiencing one of her weakest periods of recent years.

It is an intense nationalist move and Nahas Pasha has all Egypt solidly behind him.

The demolition of a British barracks on the banks of the Nile in Cairo, where two Egyptian cabinet ministers with picks removed the first stones and bricks, is eloquent of public sentiment against the British and very symbolic of the situation.

The British are embittered and bellicose over Nahas Pasha's treacherous and illegal blow, as they call his surprise move.

Their dictum is, "the British will stay in the canal zone."

The Egyptians say, "the British will and must go."

The British troops in the canal zone, which is their Middle East base, cannot remain unless diplomatically and otherwise backed up by the United States.

EMPIRE-MINDED NATIONS CANNOT HOLD THEIR SLAVES

Mr. President, digressing at that point, it is obvious that none of the empire-minded nations can hold their colonial slavery nations unless backed up by the United States of America.

It is exactly as it was in Geneva when United States representatives were showing some signs of reason, saying they might withdraw on some occasion. The representatives of other nations who were present replied, "If you withdraw, there is no meeting." Of course, Mr. President, that is true.

If we withdraw there is no fight. If we withdraw from a trade agreement, there is no trade agreement. That is so because we today have the only markets in the world where it is possible to sell 10 cents' worth of merchandise and get the money. If we withdraw, there is nothing to be divided. It is like having a "sucker" in a poker game. When a "sucker" who has money comes in, four or five of the hangers-on get hold of him; if he should quit, there is no poker game.

Continuing Mr. Von Wiegand's article:

The British troops in the canal zone, which is their Middle East base, cannot remain unless diplomatically and otherwise backed up by the United States.

Nor can the Egyptians eject the 15,000 or more British troops in the zone. They threaten to cut off all supplies.

Mr. President, there are 40,000 British troops in the Suez Canal zone. That is the latest report. Ten thousand is the limit under the treaty, but the British themselves have violated the treaty. I continue:

A suggestion that defense of the canal zone be taken over by the Americans, French, Turks, and British has received some attention but so far there is no enthusiasm for that plan.

BRITISH-FOUR-NATION CONTROL

Mr. President, we on the Senate floor, at least those of us who have been in Egypt and England and these other nations, must know that it was only a subterfuge to cover up the control by the British. It was to continue the control, not over the Suez Canal, but over the Sudan country, the upper Sudan, which by all rightful conclusions would have to belong to Egypt. That is what that suggestion was for, and, of course, Mr. President, it would be very nice if our people could ignore those things and merely say, "Let us just hold the world forever as it was in 1945." I say, Mr. President, even if it were a good idea, we cannot do it, because there are not enough of us; history will show that this has been tried before. I continue with the Wiegand article:

The British are hated and there is no warm feeling for the Turks because of their cold aloofness for years and the Turkish attitude in the past toward the Moslem region since the overthrow of the Caliphate by Ataturk.

COOL TOWARD UNITED STATES

There is far from cordiality to Americans in the canal zone because of American support of Israel.

The present crisis in Egypt and on the Suez Canal is the direct outcome of Britain's defeat in Persia, and that grew out of America's United Nations war stalemate in Korea.

All three reveal to anyone who wants to see objectively and realistically what a failure the United Nations has been and is.

Utterly incompetent diplomacy has allowed the Near and Middle East to drift into becoming a dark, messy, oily political sea in which Soviet Russia and communism can fish with an invisible fishing pole, and with lines, hooks, and bait that cannot be seen.

With the unfinished Korean war on America's hands, it would be common sense and even wisdom if the White House, State Department, and Congress would go slow and consider most carefully the possible consequences before they engage in new and costly adventures in Egypt and the Middle East just to help out Britain.

It is too late to do much for the British. They have made too many blunders.

PREDICTIONS CAME TRUE

Mr. President, I have taken the floor today to put before the Senate some of the factual information which has come to light, supporting predictions made by the junior Senator from Nevada 3 years ago.

Mr. President, in that same speech of July 12, 1949, the junior Senator from Nevada said, further:

The operation of the North Atlantic Pact in relation to protecting the integrity of the colonial areas throughout Asia, Africa, and all of Europe, was correctly expressed by Sean MacBride, Prime Minister of Ireland, when he said that they would like to cooperate, but as a nation they could not. They are denied the first condition of action as a nation, namely, the possession and control of the soil of their national territory, of which six counties are kept by Britain and are claimed as part of the United Kingdom—the territorial integrity of which is, in effect, guaranteed by the Atlantic Treaty.

MAKING ENEMIES OUT OF NATURAL FRIENDS

Mr. President, we are making enemies of the very people who want to be our natural friends by our guaranteeing the integrity of captured territory; in other words, the colonial areas of the world.

It is obvious to anyone who will stop and study the matter for a minute that in the Middle East and throughout the territory of Northern Africa what we are doing is alienating the Moslem world. If, on the other hand, we would say that we are not supporting colonialism and try to protect a sovereign nation such as Iran, which did nothing more than nationalize its oil, we would be making friends of all those people who are the best fighters in Asia and who are more than ready and willing to be on our side in any battle.

THE FOUR-NATION PROPOSAL

Mr. President, I have before me the proposal which was made by four nations to take over England's job of policing the Suez Canal, which would hold the status quo in the Sudan. I ask unanimous consent to have the conditions appear in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks.

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

PROPOSAL PRESENTED TO EGYPT

1. Egypt belongs to the free world and in consequence her defense and the Middle East in general is equally vital to other democratic nations.

2. The defense of Egypt and of other countries in the Middle East against aggression from without can only be secured by the cooperation of all interested powers.

3. The defense of Egypt can only be assured through the effective defense of the Middle East area and coordination of this defense with that of adjacent areas.

4. It therefore seems desirable to establish an Allied Middle East command in which the countries able and willing to contribute to the defense of the area should participate: France, Turkey, United Kingdom, and United States are prepared to participate with other interested countries in establishing such a command. Invitations to participate in such a command have been addressed to Australia, New Zealand, and the Union of South Africa who have indicated their interest in the defense of the area and who have agreed in principle.

5. Egypt is invited to participate as a founder member of the Middle East command on a basis of equality and partnership with other founder members.

6. If Egypt is prepared to cooperate fully in the Allied command organization in accordance with the provisions of the attached annex, His Majesty's Government for their part would be willing to agree to supercession of the 1936 treaty and would also be willing to agree to withdraw from Egypt such British forces as are not allocated to the Allied Middle East command by agreement with the Egyptian Government and the governments of other countries also participating as founder members.

7. As regards armed forces to be placed at the disposal of the Allied Middle East command and the provision to that command of the necessary strategic defense facilities, such as military and air bases, communications, ports, etc., Egypt will be expected to make her contribution on the same footing as other participating powers.

8. In keeping with the spirit of these arrangements, Egypt would be invited to accept a position of high authority and responsibility with the Allied Middle East command and to designate Egyptian officers for integration in the Allied Middle East command headquarters staff.

9. Facilities to train and equip her forces will be given to Egypt by those participating members of the Allied command in a position to do so.

10. The detailed organization of the Allied ME defense organization and its exact relationship with NATO have yet to be worked out in consultation between all the powers concerned. For this purpose it is proposed that all founding members of the Allied MEC should send military representatives to a meeting to be held in the near future with the object of preparing detailed proposals to the government concerned.

TECHNICAL ANNEX

1. In common with other participating powers who are making similar contributions to the defense of the area—

(a) Egypt will agree to furnish to the proposed Allied MECO such strategic defense and other facilities on her soil as are indispensable for the organization in peacetime of the defense of the Middle East.

(b) That she will undertake to grant forces of the Allied MEC all necessary facilities and assistance in the event of war, imminent menace of war or apprehended international emergency, including the use of Egyptian ports, airfields, and means of communications.

2. We should also hope that Egypt would agree to the Allied Supreme Commander headquarters being located in her territory.

3. In keeping with the spirit of these arrangements it would be understood—

(a) That the present British base in Egypt would be formally handed over to the Egyptians on the understanding that it would simultaneously become an Allied base within

the Allied MEC with full Egyptian participation in the running of this base in peace and war.

(b) That the strength of the Allied force of participating nations to be stationed in Egypt in peacetime would be determined between the participating nations including Egypt from time to time as progress is made in building up the force of the Allied MEC.

4. It would also be understood that an air defense organization, including both the Egyptian and Allied forces would be set up under the command of an officer with joint responsibility to the Egyptian Government and to the Allied MEC for the protection of Egypt and Allied bases.

EGYPTIAN PREMIER STATEMENT

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I have before me a release dated October 10, 1951, regarding the Egyptian Premier's presentation to Parliament of draft bills as follows:

1. Abrogation of the 1936 treaty and 1899 convention with Britain.
2. Modification of the Egyptian Constitution to emphasize the unity of Egypt and the Sudan.
3. Draft constitution for the Sudan.

This release reads, in part, as follows:

Submission of these bills to Parliament at this time will have a good effect on Egypt and create a favorable atmosphere for the reception of the proposed plans for the joint defense of the Near East.

It should be kept in mind, however, that the recent action of the Egyptian Government did not grow out of a desire on the part of Egypt to divorce the country from its friends. On the contrary Egypt will be happy to cooperate with other nations so long as such cooperation will help to guarantee a realization of Egyptian aspirations and place the country on an equal footing with other nations. Once Egypt is assured that national aspirations will be met, the full strength of the country will be put forth and Egyptians will assume their full responsibilities.

We have passed that point, Mr. President. The junior Senator from Nevada stated in 1948 and in 1949 that we had reached the point of decision. In San Francisco, in 1945, when I was acting as special consultant to the Senate Committee on Military Affairs—I was not a Member of the Senate at that time, but was an observer at the conference where the United Nations was formed—the Nation was led to believe that every country in the world would be free, and if it was too small to protect its sovereignty, then the United Nations would form a protectorate.

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

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. The distinguished Senator was an observer at the San Francisco conference, and he knows that the United States and Great Britain did not vote that way. As a matter of fact, they voted against the Premier of Australia when he made a motion to carry out the Atlantic Charter. Is not that correct?

Mr. MALONE. I think that is correct. The whole atmosphere of the United Nations was to help people to become independent, self-supporting, and not to be humiliated and under the slavery of other nations.

Mr. LANGER. That was the ostensible purpose, but it was not carried out, was it?

Mr. MALONE. It never has been carried out. It was simply a question of getting some kind of a pact to show the world that the United States of America had become the leader of the world, and all we had to do was to support the world.

Mr. LANGER. It is true, is it not, that when the Original Thirteen Colonies were organized into the United States they all came in on an equal footing?

Mr. MALONE. That is correct.

Mr. LANGER. Yet, under the United Nations Charter, the veto power was given to five nations.

Mr. MALONE. That is correct.

Mr. LANGER. Does the Senator suppose for a moment that if we had given the veto power over South Carolina to New York, South Carolina would have come into the Union?

Mr. MALONE. It never would have come in, of course.

Mr. LANGER. That is what is wrong with the United Nations, is it not?

Mr. MALONE. I think that is probably one of the weaknesses of the United Nations. However, it has many other weaknesses.

Mr. LANGER. We cannot amend the Charter. Is not that true?

Mr. MALONE. I think that is substantially true. I would say to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota that at that time I said in a written release at San Francisco, which was published by many of the western newspapers, that there were not five major nations, there were not four major nations, there were not three major nations; there were but two major nations, and that the whole thing would degenerate into a matter of spheres of influence of those two nations, Russia and the United States. That was denied heatedly by State Department officials, but that is what has happened.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not true that historians and others who have made a study of the Charter, when we finally analyze what they have said, have really admitted that in all probability it might lead to perpetual war, and that is what we have?

Mr. MALONE. That is exactly what we have. The President and the Secretary of State have said that we are going to keep every area in the world status quo, but everyone who will casually examine the facts will know that is impossible because of the colonial slavery conditions which have been maintained for several hundred years.

Mr. LANGER. Does the Senator from Nevada know of any reputable military man who for a moment believes that the United States can go all over the world and maintain security?

Mr. MALONE. I know of no military man, reputable or otherwise, and I know of no reputable man of my acquaintance, who thinks we can do what Acheson and the President are trying to do.

BILLIONS TO HOLD UP THE DEAD HAND OF COLONIAL SLAVERY

What I am trying to do is to lay this matter before the Senate so that while the Senate is appropriating $7,250,000,000, it may have the facts before it. There will be another $1,000,000,000 for the Export-Import Bank to lend at random anywhere in the world, making $8,500,000,000, and when we add the Point 4 money and the World Bank money, it will be eight or nine billion dollars.

AFRICA WILL REVOLT

Before the Senate approves this appropriation, it would be well to take a look at the record and see what we are approving: appropriating money to try to browbeat smaller nations throughout the world so that the empire-minded nations can hold their possessions and continue their colonial slavery. It is deader than Julius Caesar, and even Africa, within 5 or 6 years, will run them out of Africa.

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

Mr. MALONE. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Did the Senator read the insertion I placed in the RECORD from the New York Times of Sunday, showing that just a few days ago the United States agreed to support a school for 150 boys in Santo Domingo, we to furnish half the money? It will mean an appropriation year after year, when as a matter of fact there are delinquent boys in the United States who really have not enough to live on, and certainly there are not sufficient funds available to provide good teachers in some places, as the Senator from North Dakota knows only too well, and as I believe the Senator from Nevada knows. Yet we are asked to establish a school for 150 boys in Santo Domingo. Will the Senator agree with me that if we establish that school in Santo Domingo, not under United States jurisdiction at all, we ought to establish schools all over the world?

Mr. MALONE. That is exactly what the State Department has in mind. In every nation in which the junior Senator from Nevada has been, the great Point 4 program, approved by the United States Senate, is used to guarantee our own investments, he found anywhere from half a dozen to 20 or 25 of these great hot-house-raised advisers from America.

They were there, hired by the State Department or some other department, to survey the health conditions, or survey the infant mortality conditions, or survey crop tests, or something else.

BORROW EXPERTS AND PAY THEM

I said to the presidents of the Central American countries, at one time or another during a conference, "Would it not be possible, if you needed these experts, simply to borrow them, as the State of Nevada does, for example, when it wants a road expert, and put them on your payroll?" "Of course," they would invariably answer, and I would then ask, "Why don't you do it?" The answer to that was, "Nobody ever asked us to."

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

Mr. MALONE. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. The distinguished Senator from Nevada is familiar, is he not, with a remark made by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], indicating

that at the very time when Kansas and Missouri asked for $300,000,000 in order to avoid the floods and loss of life which have affected those regions, we sent $300,000,000 to India to build dams in India

Mr. MALONE. The Senator is correct. I remember standing here and asking Senators on the other side of the aisle why it was necessary to give the nations so much. The answer was that the nations were short of dollars. Does the Senator remember the great hoax played on Americans, that the "dollar shortage" must be made up in cash?

The junior Senator from Nevada offered a little amendment, providing that when the other nations were short of dollars, we would take their money, rupees, for instance, and put them in the Treasury and then if they produced hemp and we needed it, or monasite sand, or 30 or 40 other items, we would allow any purchaser in the United States or the Government itself to go to the Treasury and take the rupees at the prevailing exchange rate, and buy the materials from India with their own money.

I am sure the distinguished Senator will remember that the Senate steamrolled over the junior Senator from Nevada. But they were not too enthusiastic as they started to think about it. There was no argument against handling the matter that way, with England or any other nation. We could take the pounds at the current rate of exchange and put them in a special fund, instead of appropriating the seven or eight billion dollars as we are today. Then when we want to buy wool from Australia, or want to buy gold or manganese or chromite from South Africa, from any of the countries in the sterling bloc, we could simply use the pounds at the current rate of exchange.

I still do not see anything wrong about that, unless we want to give them something for nothing, dividing the wealth of the United States of America on the old Marxist socialistic theory—from every man according to his ability, to every man according to his need. Carl Marx meant that impossible theory to apply only within a nation. We go him one better. We applied it internationally, between nations. Marx would roll over in his grave if he could see what is being done with his plan by the great Senate of the United States, the great exponents of private business and capitalism as against communism.

We give the nations of the world the choice of the capitalistic system or the communistic system. I think the Senator will agree that that is a fair statement. Our capitalistic system is represented in half the world by a colonial slavery system. So the Russians come along and say, "We will relieve you of this yoke of colonial slavery."

The junior Senator from Nevada has been in all the colonial slavery countries; and if there is anything a Malayan or an Indochinese or anyone in Africa could think of worse than colonial slavery, I do not know what it is. They do not know the final consequence of communism, and they cannot imagine anything worse than colonial slavery.

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

Mr. MALONE. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Does the distinguished Senator from Nevada know of any mistake our administration could have made in foreign policy in any country which it did not make?

Mr. MALONE. The junior Senator from Nevada knows of none.

This dispatch proceeds further to say referring to the treaty of 1936:

The British have violated the treaty in a number of ways, two of which stand out in importance. First, according to the treaty, 10,400 British troops are authorized to be stationed in the Suez Canal zone but this number has been exceeded. The figure now is approximately 40,000. Secondly, the British have failed to carry out their pledge to train and strengthen the Egyptian Army and to supply it with modern equipment.

It is axiomatic that no country can survive, particularly in such a troubled world as now exists, without devices with which to protect its national boundaries. Egypt needs arms—not for aggression, but for national defense and the defense of the free world. Egypt feels helpless in a world that is armed to the teeth.

Current opinions appearing in the American press which link the present Iranian dispute with Great Britain to the action taken by the Egyptian Government are unfounded. Needless to say that the Iranian question is of recent origin, while Egypt's case dates back to 1882, when British troops bombarded Alexandria and occupied the country by force, an occupation which has continued to the present and is causing the present indignation of the Egyptian people.

The second Egyptian problem concerns the Sudan. Here the conflict, which has gone on for many years, touches the average Egyptian personally inasmuch as he is related to the average Sudanese by race, language, religion, and traditions. Historically and geographically the Sudan and Egypt are one country united by the river Nile.

The river is the lifeline of both Egypt and the Sudan and has been so since Pharaonic times.

The treaty of 1899 with Great Britain—which was signed 17 years after the British occupation of Egypt—is a much discussed document. This agreement was an informal arrangement signed by the Egyptian Foreign Minister and the British Consul General in Cairo. No full powers were exhibited and the text was not subject to any ratification nor was it submitted ever for any legislative approval. Moreover, this agreement recognized the sovereignty of Egypt over the Sudan and established a system of joint administration. In practice, however, Egypt has never had anything to do with this administration which was and still is British.

Consistently and continuously, British policy has been directed toward the tightening of Britain's grip on the Sudan, the stifling of Egyption interests and the elimination of all Egyptian influence. In recent years, British propaganda has pictured the unity of the Nile Valley as a concept of Egyptian imperialism, as if it were imperialistic for Egyptians and Sudanese to seek to preserve the bonds which nature and history have forged. It is ironical that this should come from the British, who maintain in the Sudan an imposing number of colonial officials, backed by British garrisons, and who are intent on holding the territory indefinitely as a British dependency.

To Egypt this unity is not a matter of colonization; it is a matter of reintegration and association. Egypt wants the Sudan to have a liberal constitution, one that will be voted freely by the Sudanese in elections not controlled or dictated. We are certain that if the Sudanese are permitted to express their choice freely, they would elect unity with their northern brothers.

I shall not read in detail the address delivered by the Egyptian Prime Minister, H. E. Mustafa El Nahas Pasha, on October 8, 1951, to both Houses of Parliament in Cairo. In his address, the Prime Minister gave a comprehensive review of Anglo-Egyptian relations. He called for the cancellation of the 1936 Treaty of Alliance with Great Britain and two agreements of 1899 concerning the Sudan.

Nahas Pasha introduced bills to this effect, which were unanimously approved on October 13.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the speech delivered by the Prime Minister.

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

WORLD WAR DANGER—SOVEREIGNTY IMPERILED

Honorable members, when Egypt and Great Britain concluded the Treaty of Alliance on August 26, 1936, the danger of a Second World War was approaching very fast and the conflict between the Axis Powers on the one hand and Great Britain and her allies on the other was becoming graver and graver. Fascist Italy had its covetous eye on the Continent of Africa and was encircling Egypt and the Sudan both on the western frontiers of Egypt and on the southeastern frontiers of Sudan. British colonization, meantime, was battening with its full weight on Egypt. British colonists looked upon our independence and sovereignty with great misgivings. They assumed for themselves the responsibility of the protection of foreigners. They imposed their authority on our internal, international, and financial affairs. This hampered the progress of the country toward complete independence and held it back from proceeding to its appropriate status among the family of nations. Foreign capitulations, to give a third phase of the situation in 1936, were an instrument by which the financial, judiciary, and administrative sovereignty of Egypt were imperiled. In themselves the capitulations reduced the country to humility and blocked every way of our national activity. Fourthly, the English had exploited the assassination of the Sirdar incident in 1924 and cut every practical relation between Egypt and the Sudan. They had evicted the Egyptian Army from the Sudan and dismissed the Egyptian personnel from its administration. Fifthly, in 1936 the Egyptian Army felt the urgent need of liberating itself from English custody. It felt the urgent need for acquiring the necessary training and preparing for the defense of the homeland.

ARMS WERE PROMISED

In these circumstances and under the pressure of these factors, both material and moral, Egypt was compelled to sign the treaty of August 26, 1936. It was obliged to sign the treaty in order to cope with the expected dangers of the Second World War, and in order to come out in the aftermath of that war as an independent nation to redeem itself from the disgrace of foreign capitulation, and in order to establish without delay the Egyptian Army. According to the obligations of the treaty the British Government pledged to train the Egyptian Army and provide it with arms and equipment so that it might replace in the shortest period possible the limited number of British forces allowed by the treaty to be stationed in the

Suez Canal zone. Thus Egypt intended to deliver itself eventually from every vestige of the British occupation.

SHARED THE SACRIFICES

In September 1939 the imminent danger materialized, and Egypt provided Great Britain and her allies with the greatest services and the most profitable assistance. She shared with them the most dire sacrifices and her assistance had a far-reaching influence toward winning the war. To this have testified several such great personalities of Britain itself, military and civil, as Lord Alexander, Mr. Churchill, Mr. Eden, and Mr. Bevin.

AXIS POWERS BEATEN

The final victory of the United Nations in that war gave an utterly new turn to the circumstances in which the 1936 treaty had been contracted. The Axis Powers, against whom the treaty had been intended, were completely beaten and their military forces were irrecoverably wiped out; and with their defeat vanished the danger that had shown itself in 1936. On the other hand, the victors considered themselves as one united block. They joined in establishing a comprehensive system through which international relations were to be organized. Thus, not only has the threat of war against Egypt become nonexistent from the side of the Axis Powers, but any threat of war from any other side has become nonexistent too.

CHARTER OF U. N. PARAMOUNT

The Charter of the United Nations contracted in San Francisco in June 1945 was created to carry out these objectives. In the question of international transactions, the Charter is based on principles quite different from those on which the 1936 treaty was negotiated. The Charter of the United Nations bans war as an implement for settling international disputes; it sets up the machinery of peace through which such disputes should be decided. The Charter forbids that nations encroach on the independence of other nations or question the unity of their territories. It asserts the right of nations in self-determination and provides within its texts for the equality of sovereignty among member states. Furthermore, according to the United Nations Charter, if other interstate agreements run counter to the obligations devolving from the Charter, the latter will have to be adhered to and not the former.

TRIED FOR REVISION

In view of all that, and in view of the fact that the Egyptian Nation has stood united in regard to the immediate evacuation of British troops from Egypt and the Sudan and for the unification of these two parts of our homeland the Egyptian Government negotiated with the Government of Britain with an idea of revising the treaty of 1936 and superseding it with a treaty that might be appropriate to the new international outlook. These negotiations started at the beginning of April 1946 and terminated at the end of October of the same year, and the outcome was a draft treaty initialled by Sidky and Bevin. The two parties, however, differed as to the interpretation of the Sudan Protocol annexed to that draft treaty and the agreement did not materialize. The public opinion in Egypt unanimously rejected the agreement as it did not satisfy national aspirations.

EGYPT'S ACTION OF 1947

On July 8, 1947, the Egyptian Government brought the dispute between Egypt and Great Britain before the Security Council. Egypt pressed for the immediate and complete evacuation of the British forces from Egypt and the Sudan, and for the termination of the administrative system of government of the Sudan. The Security Council discussed the question in 11 sessions from August 5 to September 10, 1947, but it was unable to issue definite decisions since no motion for the settlement of the question gained the required majority. Both parties were called upon, through every one of the motions presented, to resume direct negotiations with a view to reaching a mutual agreement. The Chairman decided to retain the dispute on the agenda of the Council, and no further step was taken by the Council beyond that stage.

CORRESPONDENCE PROLONGED

After this, the Egyptian Government exchanged with the administration of the Sudan on the one hand, and with the British Government on the other, prolonged correspondence regarding the administrative and legislative reforms in the Sudan. Conversations in this connection were held from May 6 to 28, 1948, between the Egyptian Minister of Foreign Affairs and the British Ambassador to Egypt. Both correspondence and conversations terminated in utter failure, and the two parties did not come to any agreement even though the scope of conversation was limited and the discussions did not include the unification of Egypt and the Sudan.

In January 1950 elections were held in Egypt and the present Government was voted into power. During the elections the Egyptian Nation voiced again its unanimous demand for the realization of its national aspirations. The Government, in the speech from the throne, commented that unparalleled unanimity in the following words:

VALLEY BOUND BY SHACKLES

"The Nation has been unanimous to a man regarding the deliverance of our valley—Egypt and the Sudan—from the shackles that might restrict its freedom and independence, so that it may regain its prestige and proceed to its appropriate status in international life. My Government will make the most determined efforts to accomplish the evacuation (of the British troops) from the two parts of the valley and to safeguard its unity under the Egyptian Crown against any misusage or encroachment."

The Government then proceeded to carry out its pledges. Its first step was to try to reach an agreement with the English. We engaged in a long series of conversations which lagged for months; we tried in every possible way to convince the English of the rights of this country; we based our suggestions on realistic solutions but all our efforts were in vain. On November 16, 1950, the Egyptian Government felt that in the honorable carrying out of its pledges it could do nothing else than to announce its intention of canceling the 1936 treaty together with the two agreements of January 19 and July 10, 1899, regarding the joint administration of the Sudan.

THREE MONTHS LATE

The conversations between the two parties, however, went on. Our Minister of Foreign Affairs proceeded to London for direct talks with the British Secretary of the Foreign Office. These talks terminated on December 15, 1950, in a decision taken by the British Secretary to the effect that he would submit to the British Cabinet, a plan embodying new practical measures to be taken in order to solve the question of defense. He said he hoped to be able to report the reaction of his Government by mid-January 1951, or shortly after. The promised suggestions were received by the Egyptian Government as late as April 11, 1951—3 months after their fixed time, and then they were very far from satisfying our national demands.

On April 24, 1951, the Egyptian Government refused these suggestions, both as a whole and in detail. We sent back countersuggestions regarding evacuation and the unity of Egypt and the Sudan.

The British Government made a reply to our countersuggestions only on June 8, 1951.

While these conversations were lagging, the British Foreign Secretary delivered his address in the House of Commons on July 30, 1951. In his address he announced that the British Government was still clinging to occupation and the idea of the joint defense in peace under the pretext of international necessity. He also asserted that the British Government objected to the unification of Egypt and the Sudan under the Egyptian crown, giving as an excuse that the will of the Sudanese had to be first consulted.

POLICY STILL COLONIZATION

This announcement was an indication that there is an unbridgeable gap between the two parties. The British Government still bases its policy on the antiquated principles of colonization and empire that were so unsuccessful in America, in India, and Iran. It still assumes responsibilities that are not its own and resists national rights with various excuses and pretexts.

EGYPT READY TO CONSIDER

In answer to the British Secretary's address, the Egyptian Minister of Foreign Affairs made an announcement on August 6, 1951, before the two Houses of Parliament to the effect that the British Foreign Secretary had with his address, closed the door of conversations. But the British Foreign Secretary sent me, on August 17, 1951, a personal message denying that he had ever closed the door and that on the contrary he was investigating a new plan on the matter of defense. In my answer to him I enumerated the reasons why we considered that he had brought the conversations to a close, and I added that the evacuation of British forces from Egypt is only one part of the Egyptian question, the other part being the unity of Egypt and the Sudan under the Egyptian crown. These two parts of the question, I said, are one and indivisible. I also stated that what he had said about the Sudan would be sufficient reason why the conversations should cease. I regretted that his personal message to me did not alter the situation, yet I told him that nothing would please me more than these suggestions if they were received in time, and if the Egyptian Government found therein practical evidence that Egypt's national rights would be respected. In that case the Egyptian Government would be ready to reconsider its attitude.

BRITAIN FAILS TO FIX DATE

My answer was sent on August 26, 1951, and I received another personal message from the British Foreign Secretary on September 21, 1951, to the effect that he was unable to fix a date on which he could send his suggestion concerning the matter of defense and the Sudan. Upon receiving the message I asked H. E., the British Ambassador in Cairo, to transmit to the British Foreign Secretary that the Egyptian Government was bound to announce its plans to Parliament before the end of the current recess at the beginning of October.

LAGGED FOR 16 MONTHS

Honorable deputies, this is the history of the political conversations between the two countries. Needless to say England loses nothing by delaying and deferring these issues: The British occupation is existent in the Suez Canal zone and the British rule under the guise of the Condominion is carrying out its disintegrating effects in the Sudan. As to Egypt, it has become impossible for her to longer continue an impossible situation. These conversations have lagged for 16 months. They have been only one feature of a long series of endeavors carried out by Egypt since the end of World War II to convince Great Britain that she should respect Egypt's national rights and cease

encroaching on them with her efforts of colonizing supremacy.

Therefore, I find it incumbent on myself, now that the current parliamentary session has extended to 11 months and has almost overlapped the next one, to announce before your honorable House that the Egyptian Government considered that the time limit we promised Mr. Morrison in our personal message has expired, and that the conversations between the two countries have ceased in view of their futility.

As our incessant endeavors to realize our national demands through agreement have failed, it is time that your Government fulfilled the promises given in the last speech from the throne and to take immediately the necessary measures to cancel the treaty of August 26, 1936, and the two agreements of January 19 and July 10, 1899, regarding the administration of the Sudan.

I place the royal decrees prepared for these steps in the Office of this House.

GREEN BOOK IS DUE

The Government intends to issue very shortly a green book embodying the records of the conversations and the documents related to them. It will be shown clearly through these documents that we made indefatigable endeavors to come to an agreement. We never gave up patience; but we supported our demands with irrefutable evidence; but it was the British who persisted on the antiquated principles of a colonial empire, which in themselves form the real threat to international security and hamper the efforts for carrying out for universal peace.

Honorable members, after stating the foregoing I need not make any comments on the bills of law I am introducing; nor need I justify their enactment. The circumstances and reasons I have just stated are grounds enough for such justification. And, yet, I should like to enlighten you more regarding this grave historical event.

The English have argued that Egypt cannot cancel the 1936 treaty or the 1899 covenants, but there are numerous precedents for the unilateral revocation of international treaties and agreements. The following are some examples:

UNITED STATES BROKE 1850 PACT

1. In 1884 the United States of America canceled the Anglo-American Treaty, concluded on April 19, 1850, regarding the construction of a maritime canal in Central America.

2. On December 9, 1905, France canceled the agreements of the concordat contracted by herself and the Pope on July 15, 1801.

3. On October 3, 1908, Austria and Hungary canceled the Treaty of Berlin 1878, by annexing to her territories Bosnia and Herzegovina.

4. On October 5, 1908, Bulgaria canceled the Treaty of Berlin by proclaiming her own independence.

5. On September 9, 1914, Turkey canceled the system of foreign capitulations that had been organized through international obligations.

6. In 1919 China canceled the 1913 and 1915 treaties with Russia and Mongolia.

7. Between 1926 and 1928 China canceled all the treaties to which she had been an unequal party.

8. In 1932 France denounced the payment of her debts for the United States of America, which were contracted through agreement on April 29, 1926.

IRISH CANCEL TREATY

9. In November 1933 the Irish Free State canceled the Anglo-Irish Treaty concluded on December 5, 1921.

10. On September 13, 1934, Poland canceled her international obligation regarding the protection of minorities.

11. In December 1938 the Japanese Government canceled the Nine Power Pact signed on February 6, 1922, regarding the principles which had guided these powers in their dealings with China and had determined their relations to that country.

These are various examples of the precedents of the unilateral cancellation of international treaties and agreements. They differ as to cause and circumstances and the other party always argued that the cancellation was not legal, but they were canceled in practice and the cancellation had its legal effects in all events. It may be said that most of the countries that resorted to that measure were relying on material force; and that is true. This does not apply to us in this case as we have, in revoking the 1936 treaty, only the moral support of our own clear rights, universal justice, and the sublime principles embodied in the United Nations Charter. Our case, however, is far more justifiable than any of the precedents cited in the foregoing. Not one of them comes near to our own case as regards the soundness of evidence, the urgency of necessity, and the force of the grounds on which we base our cancellation. These grounds can be summed up in the following:

EGYPT HAD NO FREE CHOICE

First, this treaty was concluded under the influence of British occupation and the Egyptian party did not enjoy at that time necessary right of complete free choice. This is not an excuse with which we try to justify our attitude toward the treaty, but it was a view taken by the late Mr. Bevin, the former British Foreign Secretary. Mr. Bevin announced this view in the most unequivocal terms when the dispute between Russia and Iran was brought before the Security Council. He said that the British Government regretted that an agreement had been imposed on Iran by force while the Government of Soviet Russia occupied part of Iran.

On the same occasion Mr. Bevin said in effect, "We are powerful; we are sometimes called the Big Three; and we are undoubtedly identified with power. Power has its weight in negotiations."

Our view of this matter was adopted by the Security Council as its decision implied that the existence of foreign troops in another country's territory deprives her of her freedom of choice in negotiations.

WHOLE NATION INVOLVED

This is then the resolution given by the Security Council and the viewpoint of the British Foreign Secretary regarding agreements concluded under the domination of foreign occupation; and it is the true judgment that should be passed on the 1936 treaty which was concluded under the British occupation of the whole country of Egypt and not only of some of its parts, as was the case with Iran.

I find it necessary here to explain what we mean by the pressure of foreign occupation. This does not mean that anybody exercised any material coercion on us when we signed the treaty, but we mean that there was a state of moral coercion prevailing in the country. Egypt was at the time stifled under the occupation which dominated every phase of our life and tampered with each of our interests. Foreign capitulations had, on the other hand, their suffocating weight and we sought for an outlet. The treaty was only the first step in this direction and it should be followed by larger steps.

Secondly, the circumstances in which the treaty was concluded have undergone a complete change. This we have sufficiently explained in the foregoing.

TWO TREATIES IN CONFLICT

Thirdly, the treaty contradicts the Suez Canal Convention on the one hand and the U. N. Charter on the other. Both of these have the priority of execution and respect. The Suez Canal Convention had been concluded a long time before the treaty by several nations with a view of creating an important international status as to the neutrality of the canal and the complete freedom of passage to all countries. According to this convention the signatory parties are forbidden to seek any particular privileges whether regional, commercial, or otherwise, through international agreements. According to the same convention Egypt alone, as the proprietor of the region, has been placed in charge of the defense of the neutrality of the canal and the safety of passage through it. This has not been complied with by the treaty. The treaty itself is nothing but a collection of privileges gained by Britain against the independence of Egypt and its sovereignty; and Britain should not have seized this opportunity of her occupation and gained for herself all these privileges, thus running counter to the text of the 1888 convention.

As to the United Nations Charter, I have explained in the foregoing the points where the 1936 treaty contradicted the Charter. I need not repeat the fact that the Charter is most important and that it should have the priority of our adherence if any treaties were repugnant to it.

BRITISH ARE VIOLATORS

Finally, the United Kingdom herself has again and again violated the treaty. In fact, the English never adhere to the treaty unless they seek some pretext to support their occupation or to disunite Egypt and the Sudan. The bonds and obligations they undertook according to the treaty weigh nothing in their view. They exceed the number of forces allowed to be stationed in the Suez Canal zone; they overstep the bounds limited for these forces; they refuse to comply with the health and customs measures required by the Egyptian laws; they stand against the training of the Egyptian Army and preparing it according to the obligations undertaken by them in the treaty. In the Palestinian question they took, and they are still taking, only a hostile course. This has exposed Egypt to the gravest of dangers, though, according to the treaty, the British are bound in their foreign policy not to take an action hostile to our alliance with them. Furthermore they have pursued the policy of separating the Sudan and Egypt, and Southern Sudan from Northern Sudan. They have been only aiming at attaining their objectives of colonial empire by not complying with the 1936 treaty and the 1899 agreement at one and the same time.

ACTING UPON LEGAL RIGHTS

Honorable Deputies, you will realize from the foregoing that Egypt, in canceling the 1936 treaty, is only acting within her legal rights. The grounds we have discussed are the same for which we are also canceling the two agreements of 1899. These two agreements are still less binding than the treaty itself. They were concluded at the time when Egypt did not possess the right of entering into political treaties. Egypt was dictated to and coerced in the matter with the conventions signed by the Egyptian Secretary for the Foreign Affairs Administration on the one hand and the British Proconsul on the other. They are related to the administration of the Sudan; and the text does not include any time limit for the status imposed upon Egypt. The two agreements have only created a temporary state of affairs dictated by British authority in that period; and they should be terminated by the disappearance of that authority.

It would have sufficed if our Minister of Foreign Affairs had issued a decree canceling these agreements. But, in view of the relation between this act and the main national

case, we have included it in the bill for the cancellation of the treaty so that it may have your sanction.

KING OF EGYPT AND SUDAN

By the cancellation of the treaty and the two agreements the status of the Sudan before the British occupation is regained; and the King of Egypt will be the King of Egypt and the Sudan.

A system of government has to be organized in order to replace the existent administrative authority in the Sudan. A bill for this system of government is submitted to you. Through this bill the Sudanese, both in the north and in the south, will enjoy complete self-rule and a true democratic constitution. You will find that an outline of the principles has been drawn and the details are left to the Sudanese themselves to set up a constituent assembly truly representing the Sudanese.

The constitutional basis on which the Government of the Sudan will be organized will be in perfect harmony with the natural union of Egypt and the Sudan: this ancient union was recognized by Winston Churchill himself when he stated that the two parts of the Nile Valley form a palm tree that has its roots in the Sudan and its branches in the delta.

NO TIME FOR TALK

The time of talking has passed; and we have now to work without sound or fury. The situation demands united efforts on the part of all parties and we are determined to endure grim sacrifices to attain our just demands.

It is a divine omen that these measures will be taken under the guidance of His Majesty, King Farouk I, whose birth coincided with the birth of our revolution in 1919.

Honorable deputies, for Egypt I concluded the treaty in 1936 and for Egypt I am asking you now to cancel it.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, a dispatch in the New York Times of October 18, 1951, brings up to date the actions by the British in Egypt and in the Sudan. I ask unanimous consent to have this dispatch printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

EGYPT SAYS BRITAIN ILLEGALLY SEIZES CANAL ZONE AREAS—INTERIOR MINISTER CHARGES PLACES UNDER CAIRO RULE HAVE BEEN OCCUPIED—BRITISH SEND IN MORE MEN—PARATROOPERS ARE FLOWN FROM CYPRUS—PREMIER URGES THE EGYPTIANS TO REMAIN CALM

(By Albion Ross)

CAIRO, EGYPT, October 17.—Fuad Serag el-Din Pasha, Egyptian Minister of the Interior, accused the British tonight of occupying Egyptian installations in many parts of the Suez Canal zone.

His statement, made in the Senate, came shortly after Premier Mustafa Nashas Pasha had made a ringing appeal to the Nation to remain calm in what he called the greatest crisis in Egyptian history.

Earlier in the day the British began ferrying by Air Transport 3,000 paratroopers from the Island of Cyprus to reinforce their garrison at Adaba, 15 miles south of Suez.

Other British forces occupied various lines of communication, including a bridge at Kantara, the only bridge crossing the Suez Canal, and bridges on the Port Tewfik-Suez Road.

CHARGES MADE AGAINST BRITISH

Speaking of the day's events the Interior Minister said:

"British forces have occupied the customs passport offices and the quarantine offices in Suez after having made a forced entry. In the two cities of Ismailia and Port Said, British troops have occupied the railway offices and the office of medical inspection, breaking down the doors and arresting certain of the employees, and taking their arms. They struck a soldier when he refused to give up his arms and left him unconscious.

"British troops have occupied the Ferdan Bridge. [This is the sole bridge across the Suez Canal and used by the railway to Palestine.] British troops have occupied the public utilities in Ismailia, such as the waterworks and some bridges.

"British troops have seized the railway from Nafisha to Ismailia and halted communications and are inspecting trains. British troops also have seized ferries and all means of traversing the canal from the eastern bank.

SAYS VESSEL WAS SEIZED

"British troops have seized a vessel standing on the canal bank on the Sinai side and they have surrounded an Egyptian patrol on the eastern bank of the canal and have prevented it from being supplied with water and food."

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

Mr. MALONE. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. I noticed in the newspapers a few days ago that during the past 24 months 13 premiers have been assassinated in the areas concerning which the distinguished Senator is speaking. I should like to have the opinion of the distinguished Senator as to why those assassinations took place.

Mr. MALONE. In answer to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota, the junior Senator from Nevada will say that the colonial slave nations of the world are on the move. Make no mistake about it. It is the humble opinion of the Senator from Nevada that with all our power we cannot stop the movement. We really have no decision to make in the matter. If we could stop it, if it were possible to maintain the status quo of colonial slavery in the world, starting in the Malayan States in the Far East, in Indochina, and going over to Egypt, the Sudan country, and Africa, the question would be whether we should stop the movement. The junior Senator from Nevada was in every nation in Africa. Let me say to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota that the slavery which we had in the United States was a very pale thing in comparison to what is going on in Africa now, all the way from Liberia and Morocco to South Africa, and in nations of the Middle East which have been almost entirely controlled by empire-minded nations for a long time.

For perhaps 100 years the British were able to maintain order in the Far East and in other countries mainly by virtue of the fact that they had the best fleet in the world, which dominated the controlled areas. Then the airplane came along, and the fleet faded out of the picture. Now we have other means of warfare. We have the submarine and the atom bomb. Atomic power is going to do more to end quickly the colonial system throughout the world than perhaps any other single factor.

I say again to the Senate, stop, look, and listen. If we could hold the status quo in all the colonial slavery nations of the world, and all the dominated nations, it would then be a question of whether we should do it. I say without fear of contradiction—and the next 2 or 3 years will demonstrate it beyond question—that we cannot hold the status quo.

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

Mr. MALONE. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator from North Dakota is very much interested in ascertaining the attitude of the Senator from Nevada with reference to the colonial empires about which he is speaking. When the premier of a country is assassinated, as happened in Pakistan the other day, is it the Senator's opinion that the so-called mob, as the newspapers term it, consists of Communists, or is it his opinion that they are patriots fighting for their own country?

Mr. MALONE. If the word had been in existence at the time of the Civil War, I suppose that either the North or the South would have been called Communist by the British because they would have wanted to split us. It would have made no difference whether they had sided with one or the other, so long as they could have split the United States and made it easier to again take over.

I do not say that there are no Communists in the nations to which I have referred. However, I do say that there are many people in the colonies who are loyal to their own people and to their own country. As examples, I cite my friends, Soekarno and Dr. Hatta, in Indonesia.

Whenever there is an insurrection somewhere and a dominant nation comes in and kills a few people and quiets it, the uprising is called a Communist uprising. Investigation may show that it was only the people trying to get back their own country.

The distinguished Senator from North Dakota can remember, as can the junior Senator from Nevada, the events of the past 30 or 40 years. Forty years ago, when we picked up the newspaper, we saw that there had been an uprising in the Malayan States. A British gunboat would be on the way in the morning. It would throw a little grapeshot over into the jungle and that would be the end of the uprising. The name "Communist" had not yet been invented. The uprising was the rebellion by some stout souls in the jungle who did not want to continue to work for no return.

However, since the radio was developed and became practical and the airplane came into general use, many of the people from Liberia, Morocco, and various other nations in Africa, including Egypt, and many people from Iran, the Malayan States, and Indochina, have gone to school outside their own respective countries.

COLONIAL PEOPLE ARE NOT INFERIOR

When we meet the leaders of those countries face to face we find that they are not inferior. In the United States we are led to believe—and unfortunately most of our people still believe—that we are dealing with savages. They are not

savages. Of course, there is not a large percentage of them who are educated, but there are enough educated people in those countries so that all the people know what is going on. There is no chance of reestablishing the colonial slavery system. We might prolong it for a little while, but only for a very little while. I predict that within 5 or 6 years the Negroes of Africa will run the empire-minded nations out of Africa.

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

Mr. MALONE. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Should not the proper designation, in the judgment of the Senator from Nevada, be "Nationalist" rather than "Communist"? Are not those people fighting to control their own country?

Mr. MALONE. In answer to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota, let me cite Indochina. The junior Senator from Nevada was in Indochina when trouble was brewing. Having been in several conflagrations, one of which was called World War I, the Senator from Nevada was not particularly perturbed about being over there where the fighting was going on. He wanted to go to Jogjakarta from Batavia to see Dr. Hatta and Soekarno, but my application for a permit to fly from Batavia to Jogjakarta was denied. The junior Senator from Nevada woke up the pilot that night at midnight and the pilot said, "It is too bad they are not going to let you go to Jogjakarta."

The junior Senator from Nevada said, "Of course, I am going over there. It is all a question of how I am going to get there. Would it embarrass you greatly if I just showed up at the airport and stepped aboard the plane?"

The pilot said, "Of course not. I am for you. I would like to take you. However, what are you going to do if somebody stops you from getting on the plane without a permit?"

I said, "Who is going to stop me?"

Mr. President, nobody tried to stop the junior Senator from flying to Jogjakarta. I flew over the battle lines. I wanted to see the gunboats in the harbor that were preventing the shipping of vast amounts of rubber, tin, and copper.

I met with the Cabinet. They showed me how the tin, copper, and rubber were being stockpiled. All that material was lying there in huge piles. Nevertheless we were giving the Netherlands $475,000,000 a year, helping to finance her army in the jungle.

I would say to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota that President Soekarno and Dr. Hatta were fighting the Communists and the Dutchmen at one and the same time. They were nationalists. They wanted independence, and they got it. The other countries are going to get independence, with or without our help.

Why are we now proposing to appropriate $7,500,000,000? We are doing it, in fact, to permit the continuance of colonial slavery throughout the world.

One hears a great deal of talk about supporting Eisenhower in Europe. Mr. President, the greatest thing in the world that we could do would be to bring him home, and bring our foot soldiers home.

We ought never to put any foot soldiers anywhere outside of this country. We should use our submarines and airpower. We should build both of them up strong enough so that we can draw a line anywhere and say, "This is our Monroe Doctrine"—or whatever we want to call it—"and if you cross that line, we will make the whole area untenable for you."

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

Mr. MALONE. I am very happy to yield.

Mr. LANGER. Would it embarrass the distinguished Senator from Nevada if, very humbly, the Senator from North Dakota were to ask him about the so-called bipartisan policy, particularly with reference to the Republicans who support it?

Mr. MALONE. The junior Senator from Nevada has made himself clear several times with reference to the so-called bipartisan policy. Whenever two branches of the Government get together—the Congress of the United States with the State Department—and agree that whatever is brought here will pass without question, it is collusion, and every man connected with it ought to be impeached.

That is what some Republicans and the Democrats here set up; that is part of the so-called bipartisan foreign policy.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. I yield for a question.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I must catch a plane for Newark, N. J. Would the Senator permit me to make two insertions in the RECORD?

Mr. MALONE. The Senator from Nevada does not yield for anything but a question.

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

Mr. MALONE. I am happy to yield for a question.

Mr. LANGER. I should like to ask whether or not in fairness to the American people the main issue in the next President election ought not to be the foreign policy of the United States of America. Does not that issue override everything else?

Mr. MALONE. I would say to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota that we have a foreign policy tied to a domestic policy. We have a free-trade policy. We laughingly call it reciprocal trade. The act transfers the authority of the United States Congress to regulate foreign trade to a discredited Secretary of State, who can thus remake the industrial map of the United States of America at will.

It means that we remove the floor under the wages of workingmen and the money of investors in this country and divide our markets with foreign countries, so as to readjust their so-called trade-balance deficits, while at the same time using Marshall plan money to make up the difference.

There is a pattern to this whole thing, Mr. President. Each part is part of a mosaic. It started in 1924. We recognized Communist Russia. That is when it all started. We put no safeguards whatever into the agreement. We removed the metal base from our money, so that the Administration could print all the money it wanted without having to tie our money to anything. Then came the reciprocal-trade policy. Then, the policy of dividing the wealth of our to tie our money to anything. Then taxes designed to end our economy. Under the income-tax amendment to the Constitution, Congress has a perfect right to go not only to 88 percent, which the current tax bill does, but to 100 percent. I will say to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota that Congress can make it 125 percent any time it wants to do so and take over everything for the Government.

We are playing with fire. We get a seven-, eight-, or ten-billion-dollar tax bill from the President's office, and the Senate jumps through a hoop to pass it. Senators do not look around. They do not seem to know that all these things are tied together, part of a pattern.

The mistake that the Senators and the Representatives in Congress are making is in believing these things are coincidental, are separate. They fit into a pattern, I say to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota. It leads up to one economic world.

The distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] has introduced a bill which would have us join a federation of nations. We would join 11 other nations. That would lead, of course, to other nations coming in. Why? To bring about a federation of 12 nations, each with one vote, with perhaps two senators, and perhaps representatives appointed on the basis of population, governed by a majority vote. It would mean that by a majority vote taxes could be levied on the people of America to support these countries in a style to which they would like to become accustomed.

Without the embarrassment of having to come to Congress, they could appropriate, say, $7,500,000,000 for the federation of nations. I say to the Senator from North Dakota that is the ultimate objective of the whole program.

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

Mr. MALONE. I am very happy to yield.

Mr. LANGER. Assuming that the Democrats nominate an internationalist like President Truman, and the Republicans also nominate an internationalist, how are the American people who are opposed to the present foreign policy of the administration going to be able to register their protests?

Mr. MALONE. If the Republican Party should succumb to the extent of nominating a man who would carry on the Truman internationalist program, I would say that the senior Senator from North Dakota might as well start catching up on his catfishing, because the Nation's economy would then be gone.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not true that there has been no real choice in the last three elections?

Mr. MALONE. Yes; there has been no real choice.

I noticed with interest a great speech which was made before the American Legion National Convention. I was invited to the convention, but I could not miss the proceedings here in the Senate. This will be the first time in many years that I have not attended the American Legion Convention.

After reading General MacArthur's speech, I do not feel quite so badly about missing the convention. I stood here in 1949, at a time when representatives of Britain and Canada were in Washington for an international conference, and said that as soon as the representatives returned home, Britain would revalue her currency. Mr. Cripps denied that seven times. However, as soon as they got home, Britain devalued her currency.

Everyone should have known that would happen, because no one had been paying more than $2.60 for a British pound for a number of years. Although the British said that their pound was worth $4.03, all that anyone had to do was to go to Hong Kong and, at the exchange window of a bank, exchange an American dollar for $16.50 Hong Kong currency, and then take that to another exchange window and learn that the British pound was worth about $2.60 of United States funds in the free market.

Mr. President, at the present time the British pound is worth about $2.26. Who would pay more for it? The British pound can be obtained for that amount of American funds in the international exchanges of the world. However, the British still keep up the subterfuge and hocus-pocus that their pound is worth $2.80, although no one except the American Government is silly enough to pay that much.

Not one cent of our funds should ever go into any of these nations except on the condition of the establishment of a United States of Europe. Only thus can those countries strengthen themselves. They should be forced to stop this hocus-pocus of kings, dictators and presidents for each little nation there, half of which could be lost in Nevada without being found for a number of years unless a prospector happened to go into that area. Each one of them keeps up a full-dress parade, and we support it. They will not trade with each other. They have all the quota systems and all the barriers to trade between themselves.

They will trade with us, though. At the moment we are sending coal to England.

Mr. President, I think most of us remember that when we were studying in the third grade or fourth grade in school, one of the common ways of saying that a thing was ridiculous, was to say that it was as silly as sending coal to Newcastle. Well, Mr. President, we have reached that point now; we are actually sending coal to Newcastle, and we are appropriating $5,225,000,000 to do so.

PRIVATE INVESTMENTS ABROAD IN JEOPARDY

Mr. President, another condition we should place on further aid is the requirement that the recipient nation guarantee the integrity of private investments. We are now sending money abroad in order to support nations in such a way that any private investor who invests his money there will not be able to take the money out.

THROUGH MARSHALL PLAN WE ARM RUSSIA

Mr. President, we appropriate billions and billions of dollars under the Marshall plan for the European nations which use that money for materials and goods which they sell to other European nations, some of which, in turn, sell the goods or materials to Russia and her satellite countries. Those materials go to Russia and the iron-curtain countries by means of the 96 trade treaties to which I have previously referred, and which probably have increased in number to 125 now. We are making it possible for Russia and the iron-curtain countries to obtain everything they need for world war III and to consolidate their gains.

I would say to the Senator from North Dakota that this program has been planned from the beginning. We are following England's lead, and England is helping Russia.

Unfortunately, the Senate is jumping through the hoop without stopping to think.

Personally, Mr. President, I am not in such a hurry to go home that I cannot stay here and vote against the tax bill and the appropriation bills for the next 14 months, which will bring us to the first of 1953. Of course during that time I shall be running for office. However, I am not in such a hurry to get home that I would not be willing to remain here and work against these bills.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, the Senator from Nevada knows how I feel. I am perfectly willing to stay here with him. Does not he know that I am willing to do so?

Mr. MALONE. Yes; I am sure of it.

Mr. President, the latest Egyptian budget for the fiscal year 1951–52 is balanced as follows: Income, 212,415,000 Egyptian pounds, which equal approximately $630,000,000; expenditures 230,000,000 Egyptian pounds, which equals approximately $690,000,000—the deficit being drawn from the reserve funds.

EGYPT AND ENGLAND

The Egyptian pound rate of exchange is $2.87. The present rate of exchange for the pound sterling is $2.80.

Mr. President, by law Britain is still indebted to Egypt for the sum of 230,000,000 Egyptian pounds, which is equivalent to approximately $690,000,000.

I wish to say that that is one of the things wrong with those countries; because of lack of confidence, private investments in those nations have stopped. Yet, we still support that system.

Mr. President, in closing I wish to say that I have little hope that we can stop this appropriation bill. I think the administration will go right off the deep end and will finance all these nations in their crooked schemes; and we shall find out, when the knot is finally tightened, that we have no help on the Continent. An attempt is made to argue that this appropriation bill should be passed by the Congress on the theory that to refuse to pass it would amount to a failure to support General Eisenhower. Mr. President, today General Eisenhower is the greatest failure in Europe. General Eisenhower is getting American troops and American money; he is not getting anything from Europe.

I should be glad to debate that point if anyone would like to debate it with me.

Mr. President, I hope that when we return in January, after we have visited our constituents, we will bring back a little common horse sense, which is about the most uncommon thing in the Congress at this time.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield for another question?

Mr. MALONE. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. LANGER. The distinguished Senator from Nevada knows that in the United States there are 13 States which have an assessed valuation of less than $1,000,000,000. In short, by means of this appropriation bill, if we vote for it, we shall be voting to give to Europe, the Near East, Africa, Asia, the Pacific area, and the American Republics seven times everything—every horse, every cow, every acre of land, all the money on deposit, everything there—in seven of the States of the United States of America; and that will be done when only a few Senators are present, and when apparently they are acting in a hurry. It will be done at a time when they are in a hurry to go home, whereas as the distinguished Senator from Nevada has said, some of us are perfectly willing to remain here until New Year's, if we can prevent this great calamity from falling on the people of the United States.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I have said that I am ready to remain here. I agree with the distinguished senior Senator from North Dakota. Of course, there are 38 States out of the 48 States which, if they were called on to pay their per capita share of the national debt, they could not do so even if they could realize the total assessed valuation of every bit of property within their borders. That is what we have done in the past 18 years.

Mr. President, the $41,000,000,000 which has been committed and sent to foreign countries since World War II is $5,000,000,000 more than the assessed valuation of all the property in the 11 Western States, including California, Oregon, and Washington, and the 14 Southern States, including Texas. Two more bites, and they will have it all.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Benton	Fulbright	Kerr
Bricker	George	Kilgore
Bridges	Green	Knowland
Butler, Md.	Hayden	Langer
Butler, Nebr.	Hendrickson	Lehman
Carlson	Hennings	Magnuson
Case	Hickenlooper	Malone
Connally	Hill	Martin
Cordon	Hoey	Maybank
Dirksen	Holland	McCarran
Dworshak	Humphrey	McCarthy
Eastland	Hunt	McClellan
Ecton	Ives	McFarland
Ellender	Jenner	McKellar
Ferguson	Johnson, Tex.	McMahon
Flanders	Johnston, S. C.	Millikin
Frear	Kefauver	Monroney

Murray	Saltonstall	Thye
Neely	Schoeppel	Underwood
O'Conor	Smathers	Watkins
O'Mahoney	Smith, Maine	Williams
Pastore	Smith, N. C.	Young
Robertson	Sparkman	
Russell	Stennis	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

Mr. GEORGE obtained the floor.

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

Mr. GEORGE. I will be glad to yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, we have been debating this appropriation bill all day, and I am wondering whether we cannot by unanimous consent pass the bill at the present time. It is ready for passage. I do not think any Senator will ask for the yeas and nays, and it will only take a moment or two.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I hope we may have a voice vote on sustaining the recommendation of the Appropriations Committee reducing by 5 percent the appropriations contained in the bill.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I have no objection to a voice vote. I see no reason why we cannot vote at this time and dispose of the bill. I could not agree to a unanimous-consent request, because I am not in favor of the bill as reported.

Mr. McKELLAR. I can understand that, but I ask unanimous consent for a vote. I hope the Senator from North Dakota, who has just risen, will not object.

Mr. LANGER. There is no objection to a voice vote on the amendments, but I want a yea and nay vote on the final passage of the bill.

Mr. GEORGE. That means several roll calls before it is over, and I shall be obliged to call up the conference report on the tax bill, a matter which has been under consideration for a long time.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator is within his rights.

Mr. GEORGE. If there were merely one vote, I should be very glad to consent to having it.

Mr. LANGER. I am only asking for one record vote, and that is on the final passage of the bill.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. GEORGE. Are the amendments to be voted on en bloc? Has there been an agreement of that kind?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that there has been no such agreement.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I did not hear the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. GEORGE. I made inquiry as to whether there had been an agreement to vote on all the amendments en bloc.

Mr. McKELLAR. I understood there was such an agreement, but, if not, I ask unanimous consent that that may be done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair advises the Senator from Tennessee that there has been no such request.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate vote on all the committee amendments en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The committee amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

Under the heading "Mutual security," on page 1, line 11, after "section 101 (a) (1)", to strike out "$5,072,476,271" and insert "$4,818,852,457."

On page 2 line 13 after "section 101 (a) (2)", to strike out "$1,012,000,000" and insert "$961,400,000"; in line 14, after the word "addition", to strike out "$10,000,000" and insert "$9,500,000"; in line 17, after the word "the", to strike out "Administrator" and insert "Director", and in line 25, after the word "appropriation", to insert a colon and the following proviso: *"Provided,* That after December 1, 1951, no funds herein appropriated shall be made available to any nation of which a dependent area fails in the opinion of the President to comply with any treaty to which the United States and such dependent area are parties."

On page 3, after line 4, to insert:

"Assistance to Spain: For economic, technical, and military assistance, in the discretion of the President under the general objectives set forth in the declaration of policy contained in the titles of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 and the Mutual Security Act of 1951, for Spain, $100,000,000."

On page 3, line 12, after "section 201", to strike out "$396,250,000" and insert "$376,437,500."

On page 3, line 21, after "section 203", to strike out "$160,000,000" and insert "$152,000,000."

On page 3, line 24, after "section 301", to strike out "$535,250,000" and insert "$508,487,500."

On page 4, line 6, after "section 302", to strike out "$237,155,866" and insert "$225,298,073."

On page 4, line 22, after "section 401", to strike out "$38,150,000" and insert "$36,242,500."

On page 4, line 24, after "section 402", to strike out "$21,245,653" and insert "$20,183,370."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is a sufficient second. The yeas and nays are ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MOODY] are absent on official business.

I announce further that if present and voting the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MOODY] would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from California [Mr. NIXON], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is paired with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Jersey would vote "yea," and the Senator from Missouri would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is paired with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT]. If present and voting, the Senator from Ohio would vote "yea" and the Senator from South Dakota would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 57, nays 13, as follows:

YEAS—57

Benton	Hoey	McMahon
Bridges	Holland	Millikin
Butler, Md.	Humphrey	Monroney
Carlson	Hunt	Murray
Connally	Ives	Neely
Cordon	Johnson, Tex.	O'Conor
Eastland	Kefauver	O'Mahoney
Ellender	Kerr	Pastore
Ferguson	Kilgore	Robertson
Flanders	Knowland	Russell
Frear	Lehman	Saltonstall
Fulbright	Magnuson	Smathers
George	Martin	Smith, Maine
Green	Maybank	Smith, N. C.
Hayden	McCarran	Sparkman
Hendrickson	McCarthy	Stennis
Hennings	McClellan	Thye
Hickenlooper	McFarland	Underwood
Hill	McKellar	Watkins

NAYS—13

Bricker	Ecton	Schoeppel
Butler, Nebr.	Jenner	Williams
Case	Johnston, S. C.	Young
Dirksen	Langer	
Dworshak	Malone	

NOT VOTING—26

Aiken	Douglas	Mundt
Anderson	Duff	Nixon
Bennett	Gillette	Smith, N. J.
Brewster	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Byrd	Kem	Tobey
Cain	Lodge	Welker
Capehart	Long	Wherry
Chavez	Moody	Wiley
Clements	Morse	

So the bill (H. R. 5684) was passed.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments, ask for a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. CORDON, and Mr. SALTONSTALL conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I am grateful to the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] for his generosity in allowing the appropriation bill to be passed before proceeding with the conference report on the tax bill. I thank him with all my heart.

REVENUE ACT OF 1951—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4473) to provide revenue, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The report was read.

(For conference report see proceedings of the House of Representatives.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

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

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, the tax bill has been discussed at great length in the Senate, and Senators are entirely familiar with practically all the amendments made. I am quite sure that Senators are also familiar with such changes as have been made in the conference. I should like to file a statement relating to each of the amendments made, and then I hope I shall be able to answer any question any Senator may wish to ask. I request that the statement be printed in the RECORD.

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

There were 264 Senate amendments. Of this number the House receded on 96; the Senate, 44. The balance were receded to with amendments.

I will discuss the rates of the individual income tax. Under the Senate amendment, individuals were subject to an 11 percent increase in the tax or an 8 percent increase in take-home pay, whichever was the lesser. The House imposed a 12½ percent increase in the individual income tax on individuals. There was a difference of over $400,000,000 in revenue between the two bills. The conferees first agreed to a proposal which would levy in effect an 11¾-percent increase in the individual income tax or a 9 percent increase in the take-home pay, whichever was the lesser. The Senate ceiling of 88 percent was retained. This added approximately $115,000,000 to the Senate bill. As a result of our second conference today, it was agreed that the increase in the first bracket of individuals should be 11 percent instead of 12½ percent.

The House conferees originally agreed to the Senate amendments which eliminated the House provision increasing the 25 percent tax on capital gains of individuals and corporations. However, today an agreement was reached increasing this rate to 26 percent.

The House conference agreed to the Senate amendment striking out the provisions of the House bill applying a withholding system to dividends, interest, and royalties.

The House conferees agreed to the Senate amendment providing that the increases in the corporate normal and surtax should be effective as of April 1, 1951, instead of as of January 1, 1951, as provided under the House bill. However, we were forced to yield to the House conferees in applying the corporate income tax increase to the normal tax instead of spreading it between the normal tax and the surtax as provided in the Senate bill.

The Senate bill struck out the provision of the House bill reducing the average earnings credit from 85 percent to 75 percent. An agreement was reached among the conferees reducing the credit to 83 percent, effective January 1, 1952. The conferees modified this today so that the decrease in the earnings credit from 85 percent to 83 percent will be effective July 1, 1951, instead of January 1, 1951, as originally agreed to. This means in effect that a corporation on the calendar-year basis will have an average earnings credit of 84 percent for the calendar year 1951 and an 83 percent credit for the calendar years 1952 and 1953.

Under the Senate bill, the ceiling on total corporate income and excess profits taxes was made 69 percent by providing a limit on the excess profits tax of 17 percent of the excess profits net income. Under the compromise agreement the 17 percent figure was increased to 18 percent, making a ceiling of 70 percent.

The House conferees agreed to the Senate amendment striking out the provision of the House bill allowing one surtax exemption of $25,000 and one minimum excess profits credit of $25,000 for certain controlled groups of corporations. However, in lieu of this, the conferees agreed to an amendment which denied such multiple credits to a controlled group in case of transfers by one of a controlled group to another of the controlled group on or after January 1, 1951, of property other than money unless the transferee corporation establishes by a clear preponderance of the evidence that the securing of such credits was not a major purpose of the transfer of property to it by the transferor. This provision does not apply to controlled corporations created prior to January 1, 1951.

Our conferees accepted the provisions of the House bill giving to a head of a household one-half of the benefits of income splitting accorded to married persons. The Senate bill only allowed 25 percent of such benefit to the head of a family. The House agreed to the Senate amendment eliminating descendants of a stepson or stepdaughter of the taxpayer from the category of persons who may qualify as head of a household.

I was very much disappointed that we were unable to get the House conferees to agree to the provisions of the Senate bill making the provisions of the House bill dealing with family partnerships retroactive to the date of the Internal Revenue Code. It seems to me that it would be much better to apply the rule in the House bill to all open cases, so that these controversies could be settled. However, the House conferees were adamant on this amendment and we were forced to yield in order to get a bill.

The House conferees agreed to the provisions of the Senate bill taxing mutual savings banks, building and loan associations, and cooperatives, with a few changes. However, as was originally intended, the requirement as to information returns in the case of patronage refunds was expressly stated in the conference agreement finally reached today not to apply to REA payments or payments by mutual insurance companies and other organizations covered by section 101 (10) of the Internal Revenue Code.

In the case of mutual savings banks and building and loan associations the deductible bad debt reserve limit was changed from 10 percent of deposits to 12 percent of deposits, and these organizations were exempted from the excess-profits tax.

The House conferees agreed to the provision of the Senate bill extending depletion allowances. However, under the conference agreement borax, fuller's earth, tripoli, refractory and fire clay, quarzite, diatomaceous earth, metallurgical limestone, chemical grade limestone, and garnet are placed in the 15-percent category as they appeared in the House bill. Potassium chloride is removed from the minerals which the Senate granted a 5-percent rate, in order to avoid duplication. The conferees also agreed to the Senate amendments placing asbestos, wollastonite, brucite, dolomite, magnesite, perlite, calcium carbonates, and magnesium carbonates in the 10-percent category, aplite in the 15-percent category, and if from brine 5 percent for calcium chloride, magnesium chloride, and bromine.

The House conferees agreed to the Senate amendment dealing with livestock, except that it excluded turkeys from the definition of livestock.

I was also very much disappointed that we were unable to get the House conferees to agree to the provisions of the Senate bill providing a 4-year carry-over of net losses in the case of corporations organized in the base period. This provision would have afforded substantial relief to new corporations formed in the base period. However, the conferees at a meeting today agreed to allow new corporations organized in the base period a 3-year carry-over of net losses for 1947.

The other part of the Senate amendment related to net losses for taxable years beginning in 1948 and 1949. Under the Senate amendment these losses could be carried forward for a period of 4 years. Under the conference agreement losses for 1948 and 1949 are permitted to be carried forward 3 years instead of 4 years.

The conferees accepted the Senate amendments with respect to coal royalties with two exceptions. First, all references to timber were eliminated from the section, since capital gain treatment for timber is provided for under existing law. Second, the section was clarified so that coal royalties will still be considered as royalties and not as capital gains for the purpose of computing the penalty tax under section 102, or the personal holding company tax.

The conferees have agreed to accept all of the excess profits tax provisions which were in the Senate bill. In addition to a number of technical amendments, the conferees made some modifications affecting the substance of the excess-profits tax provisions. The conference agreement makes the special ceiling rates for new corporations applicable only to the first $300,000 of a new corporation's income instead of the first $400,000 as in the Senate bill. The provision permitting certain fiscal year corporations to include the first 3 months of 1950 in computing

their general average earnings credit was modified by the conferees to require that the income for these 3 months be reduced where they are part of a fiscal year which extended beyond June 30, 1950. The conferees modified the provision dealing with the computation of base period capital additions in the case of banks to make the provision elective instead of compulsory in the case of taxable years beginning before the date of enactment of this bill. The conferees also modified the provision with respect to inadmissable assets which are the stock in trade of municipal bond dealers in order to make it applicable to partially tax-exempt as well as wholly tax-exempt bonds.

The conferees modified the provision which permits substitution of the industry rate of return for actual earnings in the case of an extremely low-base-period year. Under the conference agreement the substitution may be made only if an abnormality occurred in the year before the low-income year. The conferees modified the provision which permits regulated intrastate pipelines to qualify as regulated public utilities. Under the modification these pipelines may qualify only if their rates are subject to the jurisdiction of a State public utility commission. The conferees made two modifications in the section which provides relief for newspapers which have consolidiated their operations. The first modification puts two of the eligibility requirements in this section in the alternative rather than requiring that both requirements be met. The second modification permits an adjustment to be made for increases in wages and increases in the price of newsprint.

The conferees amended the relief provision for television broadcasters so that the radio broadcasting industry rate of return or the radio broadcasting rate of return of the individual taxpayer (whichever is higher) will be applied only to the taxpayer's television assets at the end of the base period, rather than to the taxpayer's total radio and television assets.

The provision in the Senate bill relating to a corporation which increased its capacity after the close of the base period was modified by the conference agreement so that it is applicable only where the new construction was substantially under way during the base period and was completed during the taxpayer's first excess-profits tax year. The provision in the Senate bill which in certain cases permitted a corporation to base its excess-profits credit on the earnings experience of a business which it purchased was modified by the conferees in several respects. The modifications make it clear that the provision covers a case where the assets of an old corporation were purchased from its stockholders immediately after its liquidation, that the provision covers the sale of a separate business owned by a sole proprietor, and that the provision covers the split-up and sale of separate businesses operated by a partnership.

The effective date of the provision requiring a corporation to reduce its total assets by the amount of certain loans it has received from its parent corporation before applying the industry rate of return to its total assets was modified so as to make the provision applicable for all excess-profits tax years.

The amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], extending the time for filing a claim under the Renegotiation Act was accepted by the House conferees.

An amendment offered by Senator CONNALLY dealing with the taxation of unrelated business activities carried on by two colleges was modified by the House conferees to permit the earnings from such business to be applied during 1951 to 1953 against any debt incurred by such schools in acquiring the business before the income of such business is subject to Federal income tax.

The Senator from South Carolina, Mr. MAYBANK, offered an amendment which added to the list of feeder corporations exempt for years prior to 1950 those organizations all of the profits of which inure to the benefit of an eleemosynary institution exempt under section 101 (6) of the Internal Revenue Code. The House receded with an amendment striking out this provision but providing a clarifying amendment to the effect that no inference was to be drawn from this section of the bill as to the tax status of feeder organizations not covered by this section. The House conferees agreed to that part of the amendment exempting the earnings of a feeder corporation for years prior to 1951 which inured to the benefit of a hospital or to certain types of institutions for the rehabilitation of physically handicapped persons. I believe this last amendment was offered by the Senator from New Hampshire, Mr. BRIDGES.

In genera , the Houso conferees agreed to the excise-tax changes in the Senate bill. However, the conferees eliminated electric shavers from the taxable list, but retained the Senate provision applying the 10-percent manufacturers' tax on electrical appliances to garbage-disposal units.

The House conferees also agreed to the Senate amendment eliminating house trailers from the tax.

Snow toboggans and sleds 60 inches or less in length were exempted from the sporting-goods tax. The Senate provisions relating to the tax on sporting goods were accepted by the House conferees, except that under the conference agreement skates are exempted from the sporting-goods tax.

The Senate agreed to the House provision with respect to the photographic items. This provision eliminated certain business cost items and imposed a tax on the articles retained at the rate of 20 percent.

The conferees also retained the tax imposed by the House on Diesel oil used on the highways.

The conferees agreed to impose a manufacturers' tax on mechanical pencils, fountain pens, and ball-point pens and mechanical lighters for cigarettes, cigars, and pipes at the rate of 15 percent.

The House conferees agreed to the Senate amendment reducing the tax on domestic telegrams to 15 percent.

The House conferees also agreed to the Senate amendment exempting from the telephone tax any telephone or radio-telephone message which originates within a combat zone from a member of the Armed Forces regardless of who pays for the message.

Other Senate amendments agreed to by the conferees included one permitting contractors to transport excavated material within the boundaries of and adjacent to a construction project without being subject to the freight tax, and one excluding from the transportation tax on persons a tax on transportation by water on a vessel which makes intermediate stops at ports within the United States, Canada, or Mexico, if the vessel making such intermediate stops is not authorized both to discharge and take on passengers.

The conferees agreed to the Senate amendment regarding exemptions from the admissions tax with a slight change.

The House conferees agreed to the Senate amendment eliminating the House provision providing for a 3-percent tax on the transportation of oil by water when transported by the owner of the oil.

Among other amendments introduced on the floor, which were accepted by the House conferees, were the following:

An amendment offered by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], applying the net loss carry-back and carry-forward provisions to casualty losses.

An amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], placing bauxite in the list of strategic minerals exempt from the excess-profits tax.

An amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], providing tax refunds to manufacturers for spirits lost in floods.

An amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], providing for a refund in the case of a tax paid by a trust, the beneficiary of which was killed in action in World War II. This amendment was rewritten in conference to carry out the purpose intended. However, another amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], requiring net worth statements from certain law violators was rejected on advice of the Treasury that the authority to require such statements is already contained in existing law.

An amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], in regard to a publishing business carried on by a university was accepted with modified language to carry out the intent.

An amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], reducing the tax on smoking tobacco to 10 cents a pound to conform to the action of the Finance Committee in reducing the tax on plug and twist chewing tobacco and snuff to 10 cents a pound.

The House conferees also agreed to another amendment offered by Mr. ROBERTSON exempting from the tax on toilet preparations miniature samples bought and exhibited by house-to-house salesmen.

An amendment offered by the Senator from Deleware [Mr. FREAR], permitting a lessor railroad to file a consolidated return with its lessee railroad for the purpose of securing the utility credit for excess-profits tax purposes.

An amendment offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], adding garnet to the list of minerals accorded a 15-percent depletion allowance.

An amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], exempting admissions to games between two high-school teams which inured to the benefit of a children's hospital.

An amendment offered by Mr. DIRKSEN exempting electric, gas, and oil appliances of the industrial type was modified by the conferees. As agreed to in conference, the tax on electrical appliances will not apply to electric direct motor-driven fans and circulators of the industrial type. In the case of all other electrical appliances, the tax will apply only to those of the household type.

An amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] amending the Social Security Act with a proviso that the State must enact legislation prohibiting the use of information obtained from the relief rolls for political or commercial purposes.

In regard to the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], the House receded with an amendment which eliminated the provisions of the Senate amendment increasing the compensation of the President, the Vice President, the Speaker of the House, and the Members of Congress, but removed the tax-exempt status of the expense allowance of such officials. This tax exemption in the case of the President and Vice President is removed as of January 20, 1953, and in the case of Members of Congress as of January 3, 1953. The President, the Vice President, the Speaker of the House, and each Member of Congress will be required to account for such expense allowance insofar as is necessary for the purpose of deducting such expenses for income-tax purposes.

At this point, I wish to insert a table which shows the estimated revenue to be derived under the conference agreement in a full year of operation and the effect on receipts in the fiscal year 1952.

I believe that the additional revenue under this bill may well exceed $6,000,000,000 instead of the $5,700,000,000 estimate of the staff. In any event, the total annual tax bill of the American people will be, when this bill becomes law, around $67,000,000,000. I wish to point out that our corporate rates are now higher than those imposed in other countries. And in many cases our income tax on individuals is higher than the income tax imposed by other countries. Our economy can be destroyed through confiscatory and oppressive taxation. Therefore, I believe that we should hesitate about placing any further additional tax burdens upon the American people. I, for one, am opposed to any further increases in taxes except in case of another world war. We must make every effort to keep our expenditures in line with our receipts. Every waste in Government and nonessential spending must be curtailed. The American taxpayer must receive full value in the expenditure of his tax dollar.

I hope that the additional taxes imposed by this bill will be removed within the time limit provided for in the bill; that is, at the end of 1953 in the case of individuals and before April 1, 1954, in the case of corporations and excises. In my opinion, the economy will not be able to stand such a heavy burden over an extended period of time.

I wish to insert a table which shows the tax burden imposed on individuals in the past year.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield for a question?

Mr. GEORGE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I have been somewhat confused about the situation, as I think most other Members of the Senate have, and would appreciate having the distinguished chairman of the committee state the legislative status of the tax bill, in view of the House action.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, the conferees agreed some days ago on the 264 amendments made to the bill in the Senate. The Senate had asked for the conference, and the House therefore acted first upon the conference report.

I am sure the Senate is familiar with the outcome of the procedure in the House on the conference report. A motion to recommit was made, which was rejected by the House, but on a motion to agree, the House rejected the conference report itself by a vote of 204 to 157.

There was an important issue raised on the individual income rates. Originally the House bill called for a straight percentage increase in individual rates of the 12½ percent in all brackets. The Senate bill provided for an increase of 11 percent or 8 percent on the take-home pay, whichever was the lesser.

In the first conference report, which was rejected by the House, the conferees had agreed upon 11¾ percent, or 9 percent of the take-home pay, whichever was the lesser tax. On the first bracket group, the increase was 11½ percent. The conference report which has been agreed to by the conferees today has adopted the Senate provision of 11 percent so far as the first tax bracket is concerned. In other words, that is as low as the conferees could go with respect to taxpayers in the first bracket. The rate for the brackets above the first bracket was agreed to as in the original conference, that is, 11¾ percent, or 9 percent of the take-home pay, whichever was the lesser. This agreement, as originally made, increased the revenue by an estimated $186,000,000. The amendment to which the conferees agreed today reduces that increase by approximately $68,000,000. So the total increase in individual taxes is above the original tax bill passed by the Senate. It is, of course, below the original bill as passed by the House.

I now offer for the RECORD at this point a statement of the burdens of these rates, showing the tax burden for previous years and the burden on unmarried taxpayers and married taxpayers with two dependents. I believe that the table indicating the burden upon married taxpayers without dependents has been deleted from this particular statement.

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

Comparison between the individual income tax burden in the years 1944–45, 1948–49 and under present law, with that under H. R. 4473 as agreed to by the conferees for the years 1952 and 1953

A. SINGLE PERSON—NO DEPENDENTS

Net income (after deductions but before exemptions)	Amount of tax			Increase in tax liability due to 1950 act		Amount of tax under H. R. 4473	Increase in tax liability of H. R. 4473 over present law		Cumulated increase in liability due to the 1950 act and H. R. 4473	
	1944–45	1948–49	Present law	Amount	Percent		Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent
$600	$23									
$800	69	$33	$40	$7	20.5	$44	$4	11.0	$11	33.7
$1,000	115	66	80	14	20.5	89	9	11.0	22	33.7
$1,500	230	149	180	31	20.5	200	20	11.0	50	33.7
$2,000	345	232	280	48	20.5	311	31	11.0	78	33.7
$3,000	585	409	488	79	19.2	542	54	11.1	133	32.5
$5,000	1,105	811	944	133	16.4	1,052	108	11.4	241	29.7
$8,000	2,035	1,546	1,780	234	15.1	1,992	212	11.9	446	28.8
$10,000	2,755	2,124	2,436	312	14.7	2,728	292	12.0	604	28.4
$15,000	4,930	3,894	4,448	554	14.2	4,968	520	11.7	1,074	27.6
$20,000	7,580	6,089	6,942	853	14.0	7,762	820	11.8	1,673	27.5
$25,000	10,590	8,600	9,796	1,196	13.9	10,940	1,144	11.7	2,340	27.2
$50,000	27,945	23,201	26,388	3,187	13.7	28,466	2,078	7.9	5,265	22.7
$100,000	69,870	58,762	66,798	8,036	13.7	69,688	2,890	4.3	10,926	18.6
$500,000	444,350	[1] 385,000	429,274	44,274	11.5	436,164	6,890	1.6	51,164	13.3
$1,000,000	[2] 900,000	[1] 770,000	[3] 870,000	100,000	13.0	[4] 880,000	10,000	1.1	110,000	14.3

B. MARRIED COUPLE [5]—2 DEPENDENTS

$2,000	$45									
$3,000	275	$100	$120	$20	20.5	$133	$13	11.0	$34	33.7
$5,000	755	432	520	88	20.5	577	57	11.0	146	33.7
$8,000	1,585	974	1,152	178	18.3	1,282	130	11.3	308	31.6
$10,000	2,245	1,361	1,592	231	17.0	1,774	182	11.4	413	30.3
$15,000	4,265	2,512	2,900	388	15.4	3,236	336	11.6	724	28.8
$20,000	6,785	3,888	4,464	576	14.8	5,000	536	12.0	1,112	28.6
$25,000	9,705	5,476	6,268	792	14.5	7,004	736	11.7	1,528	28.0
$50,000	26,865	16,578	18,884	2,306	13.9	21,088	2,204	11.7	4,510	27.2
$100,000	68,565	45,643	51,912	6,269	13.7	56,032	4,120	7.9	10,389	22.8
$500,000	442,985	358,677	402,456	43,779	12.2	411,224	8,768	2.2	52,547	14.7
$1,000,000	[2] 900,000	769,314	857,456	88,142	11.5	871,224	13,768	1.6	101,910	13.2

[1] Maximum effective rate limitation of 77 percent.
[2] Maximum effective rate limitation of 90 percent.
[3] Maximum effective rate limitation of 87 percent.
[4] Maximum effective rate limitation of 88 percent.
[5] Income earned by 1 spouse.

Mr. GEORGE. I should also like to offer for the RECORD at this time a statement with respect to certain changes made by the conferees in their meeting today. Some of these changes are referred to in a general statement which I shall wish to place in the RECORD, but I think it proper to insert at this time a statement of the changes agreed to by the conference committee today.

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

1. INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAX RATES

The increase in tax in the first bracket is reduced from 11½ percent to 11 percent. This change will reduce the yield of the bill by $68,000,000 in a full year of operation, of which $43,000,000 or 63 percent would go to taxpayers with adjusted gross incomes of less than $5,000.

2. MAXIMUM RATE ON CAPITAL GAINS

The maximum rate on long-term capital gains for individuals and corporations is to be increased from the present 25 percent to 26 percent. This will increase revenue by approximately $28,000,000.

3. EFFECTIVE DATE OF THE 83 PERCENT EXCESS PROFITS TAX CUT-BACK

The effective date of the cut-back of the average earnings credit under the excess profits tax from 85 percent to 83 percent will be changed from January 1, 1952 to July 1, 1951. This will increase liabilities on 1951 profits by $60,000,000.

4. EXCISE TAXES

Electric garbage disposal units are added to the list of electrical appliances subject to the 10-percent manufacturers' tax. Skates are removed from the list of articles subject to the 15-percent sporting goods tax. There is a $2,000,000 loss on skates and a $2,000,000 gain on the taxing of garbage disposal units.

5. INFORMATION RETURNS

Rural electrification cooperatives and certain companies exempt under section 101 (10) or (11), and mutual insurance companies taxable under Supplement G are exempted from the requirement of filing information returns with respect to patronage dividends or refunds made to their patrons.

6. HOLDING PERIOD FOR TIMBER

The present method for computing the holding period in the case of timber subject

to the provisions of section 117 (k) (2) is retained. Under the present law the holding period runs only to the date of the contract for disposal of the timber, instead of the date of the cutting of the timber as under the bill.

7. COAL ROYALTIES

The provision giving capital-gain treatment to coal royalties is made inapplicable in computing the income subject to the surtax on improper accumulations under section 102 and the surtax on personal holding companies under section 500.

8. TERMINATION PAYMENTS TO EMPLOYEES

The provision in the bill giving capital-gain treatment to lump-sum payments received at retirement upon the release of rights to future profits of the employer is restricted to cases where the employee was entitled to such profits either for the duration of his life or for at least 5 years after retirement.

9. CARRY-OVER OF NET OPERATING LOSSES

The provision in the bill allowing 3-year carry-over of net operating losses for years 1948 and 1949 be liberalized to include 1947, in the case of new companies. This will lose approximately ten million.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, has the distinguished Senator any objection to reading the changes?

Mr. GEORGE. The changes which were made today?

Mr. LANGER. Yes.

Mr. GEORGE. I shall be glad to do so.

The first change was in the individual-income-tax rate, as I have already stated. The increase in tax in the first bracket is reduced from 11½ to 11 percent. This change will reduce the yield of the bill by $68,000,000 in a full year of operation, of which $43,000,000, or 63 percent, would go to taxpayers with adjusted gross incomes of less than $5,000.

The second change agreed to today was with respect to the maximum rate on capital gains. The maximum rate on long-term capital gains for individuals and corporation is to be increased from the present 25 percent to 26 percent. This will increase revenue by approximately $28,000,000.

The third change made today was in the effective date of the cut-back on the average earning credit allowed corporations in computing their excess-profits taxes. The effective date of the cut-back of the average-earnings credit under the excess-profits tax from 85 to 83 percent will be changed from January 1, 1952, as originally agreed to by the conferees, to July 1, 1951. This will increase the liabilities on 1951 profits by approximately $60,000,000. That change is equivalent to applying an 84-percent rate to the average-earnings credit of the corporation for the calendar year 1951 and to 83 percent for the calendar years 1952 and 1953.

The fourth change related to excise taxes. The change is minor. Electric garbage disposal units are added to the list of electrical appliances subject to the 10-percent manufacturers' tax. Skates are removed from the list of articles subject to the 15-percent sporting-goods tax. There is a $2,000,000 loss on skates and a $2,000,000 gain on the taxing of garbage-disposal units, according to the staff estimate. One approximately offsets the other.

The subject of informational returns led to some confusion. There is no tax placed in this bill on rural electric cooperatives and certain companies exempt under section 101 (10) or (11), and mutual-insurance companies taxable under supplement G. The conference agreement made today exempted such corporations from the requirement that they file information returns with respect to patronage dividends or refunds made to their patrons.

The sixth change made today relates to the holding period for timber. The present method for computing the holding period in the case of timber subject to the provisions of section 117 (k) (2) is retained. Under the present law the holding period runs only to the date of the contract for disposal of the timber, instead of the date of the cutting of the timber, as under the Senate bill.

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

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That means, in effect, that there is no change at all.

Mr. GEORGE. There is no change at all from the present law so far as timber is concerned.

The seventh change relates to coal royalties. The provision agreed to today, giving capital gains treatment to coal royalties, is made inapplicable in computing the income subject to the surtax on improper accumulations under section 102 and the surtax on personal holding companies under section 500.

The eighth provision agreed on today relates to the termination payments to employees. It will be recalled that a provision in the bill gave capital gains treatment to lump-sum payments received at retirement upon the release of rights to future profits of the employer, where an employee had been employed for over a 20-year period. By the agreement made today by the conference committee, the provision is restricted to cases in which the employee was entitled to such profits either for the duration of his life or for at least 5 years after retirement, so as to bring the provision more directly in line with the general provision relating to pensions.

The ninth provision agreed to by the conferees today relates to the carry-over of net operating losses. The Senate version of the bill contained a provision for a 4-year carry-over of net operating losses for new companies, that is, companies organized in the base period. By the conference agreement made finally today a 3-year carry-over of net operating losses for the year 1947 is allowed such new companies. This will result in an additional loss of $10,000,000. Both old and new companies can carry forward for 3 years net losses for the years 1948 and 1949.

On the whole, the bill as now reported will produce approximately $5,691,000,000, according to the staff estimates. In my opinion the bill will bring in at least $6,000,000,000 in a full year of spending.

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

Mr. GEORGE. Yes.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the distinguished Senator for making this statement. May I inquire what happened to the family partnership provision?

Mr. GEORGE. The family-partnership provision as it passed the Senate was made retroactive to the date of the enactment of the Internal Revenue Code in 1939. The House conferees objected to this retroactive provision. The House conferees were adamant, and we finally yielded to the House conferees on that point. The bill contains the family-partnership provision as it was originally written in the House bill itself, but it is not made retroactive beyond January 1, 1951.

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

Mr. GEORGE. Yes.

Mr. LANGER. What was done relative to wiping out the distinction between individual taxes and taxes on corporations.

Mr. GEORGE. There is no actual distinction.

Mr. LANGER. The rate was lower for corporations in the bill we sent to conference.

Mr. GEORGE. We did make a change in the corporate rate. The House insisted upon the application of the corporate rate increases to the normal tax rather than to the surtax. The Senate had split it. We in the Senate thought that in the interest of the smaller corporations—at least smaller earning corporations—it would be more equitable to apply 2 percent of the increase to the normal tax and 3 percent to the surtax, thus aggregating a 5-percent increase.

We yielded to the House on that point. The net effect of it will produce $150,000,000 more annually. The increase is borne by all corporations. However, the smaller corporations will bear a heavier increase than under the Senate bill, because of the $25,000 surtax exemption.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the distinguished Senator.

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

Mr. GEORGE. Gladly.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I wish to commend the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and the other Senate conferees on doing a good job.

Mr. GEORGE. I thank the distinguished Senator from Virginia on behalf of the conferees and myself. I hope that the job is a fairly good one.

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

Mr. GEORGE. I gladly yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. The junior Senator from South Dakota is attempting to run down the plus and minus figures on the changes, according to the estimates which the distinguished chairman of the committee has given. If I have followed him correctly, it would leave us with a net increase of $10,000,000 over the bill that first went to conference; is that correct? There was a loss of $68,000,000 on the first change, the individual income taxes. There was a gain on the change in the average carrying base of $60,000,000. That would leave a net loss of $8,000,000. There was an increase of

$28,000,000 on the capital gains change, which would leave a net increase——

Mr. GEORGE. Approximately $10,000,000, I would say to the Senator, taking into consideration the nonrecurring items, which on the effective date of the excess profits credit and the allowance of net losses for 1947.

These items will only effect revenue for 1 year, and amount to a net gain of $50,000,000. The changes in the individual income tax and the capital gains tax result in a loss of $41,000,000, which is a permanent let loss. The net is, therefore, around $10,000,000.

Mr. CASE. In other words, it is a net gain of about $10,000,000.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes.

Mr. CASE. I thank the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. GEORGE. I neglected to insert in the RECORD another table, although the material is already covered by an insertion which I have already made. I believe the table should go into the RECORD also as a separate statement. It represents the estimated effect of the conference bill on tax liabilities in a full year of operation and on collections in the fiscal year 1952. The individual income tax for a full year will be increased by $2,280,000,000, and for the fiscal year 1952 by $1,190,000,000.

The corporate income and excess profits taxes are increased for a full year by $2,207,000,000, while for fiscal year 1952 the effect will amount to $787,000,000.

The excise taxes have been increased by $1,204,000,000. The fiscal year 1952 effect is $787,000,000. The total increase in the bill, as I have stated, under the staff-Treasury estimate, is $5,691,000,000, of which $2,764,000,000 will be realized in the current fiscal year.

I ask that the table be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

Estimated effect of the conference bill on tax liabilities in a full year of operation and on collections in the fiscal year 1952

[In millions of dollars]

	Full year effect	Fiscal year 1952 effect
Individual income tax	2,280	1,190
Corporate income and excess profits taxes	[1] 2,207	[1] 787
Excise taxes	1,204	[2] 787
Total	5,691	2,764

[1] Net increase after allowing for reduction in individual income taxes due to lower dividends.

[2] Assumes excise tax changes are effective November 1, 1951.

Mr. GEORGE. I believe there is one other table which I should insert. It shows the revenue effects of the conference agreement. The money amounts are shown in millions of dollars. For the adjusted gross income class under $5,000 the liability under the present law is $8,684,000,000. The increase over the present law from the conference agreement for the taxpayer under $5,000 gross income is $951,000,000. By percentage points it is 39.2 percent.

For the adjusted gross income class over $5,000 the liability under the present law is $14,771,000,000. The increase over the present law from the conference agreement is $1,478,000,000. Percentagewise it is 60.8 percent.

The total tax liability under the present law on all individual income taxpayers is $23,455,000,000. The increase over present law, as a result of this agreement, amounts to $2,429,000,000.

Mr. President, I should like to have this table printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

Revenue effects of conference agreement on individuals

[Money amounts in millions of dollars]

Adjusted gross income class	Liability under present law [1]	Increase over present law from conference agreement	
		Amount	Percent
Under $5,000	$8,684	$951	39.2
Over $5,000	14,771	1,478	60.8
Total	23,455	2,429	100.0

[1] Normal tax, surtax and alternative tax on net long-term capital gains.

NOTE.—Estimates include rate changes and Head of Household provisions.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I earnestly hope the conference report will be approved.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUNT in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the report.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I shall not delay the Senate in reaching its decision on this tax bill.

On behalf of the Senator from New York (Mr. LEHMAN), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DOUGLAS), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MORSE), and myself, I submit, for printing in the RECORD, a joint statement on the tax bill and the second conference report which we are now considering.

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

JOINT STATEMENT ON THE TAX BILL BY SENATORS HUMPHREY, LEHMAN, DOUGLAS, AND MORSE

The decision of the House of Representatives to send the tax bill back to conference gave the Senate and House conferees an opportunity to improve some of the deficiencies in the bill. We regret that the conference has not acted to correct these deficiencies. The tax bill still represents a violation of the principle of fair treatment. It is grossly inadequate and inequitable.

We urged the conference committee to arrive at a truer "middle ground" between the Senate and House versions. The new tax bill should raise much more revenue. The new tax bill should distribute its burden close some loopholes. To do otherwise is to bear that burden. The new tax bill should close some loopholes. To do otherwise is to invite new pressures for price rises, and subsequent inflation.

The bill as it now stands will bring in only $2,500,000,000 during the current fiscal year in the face of a prospective deficit which may exceed $10,000,000,000 and which will undoubtedly grow. It will only raise a total of $5,700,000,000 in a full year.

The conference committee should have improved the tax bill by making corporation taxes retroactive to January 1; establishing a withholding plan for the payment of taxes on dividends and corporate bond interest; lowering the excess-profits tax "earning base" to 75 percent; increasing the capital-gains rate to 28 percent; and eliminating many of the new minerals which have been added to the privileged "percentage depletion" tax reduction class. These will yield a total of $1,400,000,000.

A study of the conference report shows that in arriving at a so-called compromise between the Senate and House versions the conference report favored those who earned incomes of more than $5,000 at the expense of the lower income groups. In deciding to decrease the amount raised by individual income taxes from the House version by $432,000,000, only 30 percent of that amount, or $129,000,000, benefited families with less than $5,000 income—yet those families comprise 80 percent of the individual taxpayers of this country. We fail to see equity in a proposal where 80 percent of the taxpayers get only 30 percent of the relief while 20 percent of the taxpayers get 70 percent of the relief.

We have, of course, other criticisms of the conference report. There is one which we cannot fail to mention now. We are shocked by the action of the conference in accepting the so-called Jenner amendment, which has nothing to do with taxes but has everything to do with the dignity and welfare of unfortunate people who happen to need public assistance. This amendment is a rider which will permit the States to make public the names of those who receive relief or other public aid. It will allow newspapers to publish the names of the children, the aged, the needy mothers, and the needy blind on the public-assistance rolls. Now school children will be told which of their parents are receiving public aid. This is cruel. This is inconsistent with every principle of humaneness associated with our public assistance program. This rider must be rejected.

An effective tax bill is vital to defeat inflation. The American taxpayer would prefer to pay for the defense mobilization program through taxes which he can see and understand rather than through the hidden tax of inflation and high prices.

Mr. President, the second conference has resulted in very few changes. The changes are insignificant and do not meet the requirements of a fair and equiptable tax bill. The tax measure still fails to meet the needs of our fiscal situation. It raises inadequate revenue. It will add to inflation; it opens new tax loopholes. It violates the principle of the ability to pay and equitable treatment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on my own behalf—and I commend this matter to the reading of every one of my colleagues—I present, for printing in the RECORD, an analysis of corporate profits for the years 1940 up to the third quarter of 1951, based on a study of the Federal Trade Commission's reports up to the third quarter of 1951. This report has been carefully checked by the economic consultants of the Federal Trade Commission; and it represents what I consider to be a factual analysis of corporate profits, which are unprecedented in the history of the United States.

Let me refer to just one item, Mr. President. In 1929, corporate profits were running at the rate of 6.7 percent on the total amount of stock equity; in 1951, they were running at the rate of 13.6 percent on stock ownership. I think this fortifies the point which was made during the debate on the tax bill, namely, that the tax structure on corporate income can well stand a considerable boost, so as at least to give some equity to the tax program of the Government.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to have this statement printed in the RECORD.

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

AN ANALYSIS OF CORPORATE PROFITS BASED ON STUDY OF THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION REPORTS

The profits of corporations have grown during the past decade by utterly fantastic proportions. The corporations are now taking profits—after taxes—at a rate which was undreamed of even during World War II, and undreamed of even in the heyday of 1929.

The Department of Commerce has recently released a compendium of statistics showing the growth of corporate profits over the last 10 years—1940 to 1950, inclusive. I should like to read these figures. They are profits for all corporations—including manufacturing corporations, mining corporations, corporations in the wholesale and retail trade fields, in the banking, service, transportation and all other fields. They reflect, in short, profits of all business corporations in the United States. And I might emphasize that these figures reflect net profits after all taxes. The figures are as follows:

	Billion dollars
1940	6.4
1941	9.4
1942	9.4
1943	10.6
1944	10.8
1945	8.5
1946	13.9
1947	18.5
1948	20.7
1949	17.3
1950	22.8

Here it may be noted that corporation profits last year reached their highest peak in all history. They were almost three times what they were in 1945, the last full year of World War II. This was after taxes.

Now, how are the corporations faring under the present wartime tax law? The Federal Trade Commission has just this week released its financial statement for the second quarter of the year. This statement shows the profits before and after taxes for corporations in the manufacturing business. Manufacturing corporations account for about half—or usually somewhat more than half—of the profits of all business corporations. The Commission does not compile up-to-date figures on corporations other than manufacturing corporations and no up-to-date figures on the other lines of business are available. But let's look at the manufacturing corporations.

In the second quarter of this year—that is, April, May, and June of 1951—manufacturing profits before Federal taxes were even greater than in the same quarter of last year. In the second quarter of last year, net income before Federal income taxes totaled $5,100,000,000. In the second quarter of this year they totaled $6,900,000,000. But, of course, we have had a new excess-profits tax law since last year, and this has taken a small bite—sort of a flea bite—out of corporate profits. Profits of manufacturing corporation after set-asides for Federal income taxes totaled $3,200,000,000 in the second quarter of last year—$3,100,000,000 in the second quarter of this year. In other words, on the face of it, it would appear that the present tax law has reduced profits of manufacturing corporations by about $100,000,000 per quarter. Actually, however, this appearance somewhat overstates the matter. There have been certain offsets—certain increases in real profits which are not reflected in the figures. In short, the increased deductions allowed because of the accelerated amortization program are taken out of the profits figures for this year.

But even so, how do the profits figures compare with past times? We must, of course, take account of the increased investment in corporate assets. Much of the increase in corporate assets is in the form of idle money—that is, a large proportion of the assets represent undeclared dividends from past profits, and this is money which is not needed for production facilities or for operating capital. A large proportion of it is in Government bonds and has nothing to do with the corporations' physical plant for turning out goods. Nevertheless, we will take account of the increased investment—whether the assets be enlarged plants or increased corporate savings. We will assume that all the money the corporations have is needed to run their businesses.

In 1929, net income of manufacturing corporations, after taxes, amounted to a return of 6.7 percent on the stockholders' total equity. In 1945, the last full war year of World War II, these same profits, after taxes, amounted to an annual rate of return of 7.1 percent on stockholders' equity. Taxes during World War II could, therefore, hardly be said to be cruel to manufacturing corporations. The rate of return was substantially higher in 1945 than in 1929. But what about now—1951? Compared to a rate of return of 6.7 percent in 1929, and 7.1 percent in 1945, second quarter 1951 profits were at an annual rate of 13.6 percent—more than twice the 1929 rate and almost twice the 1945 rate.

What could this mean in tax dollars? Would 1945 be a fair basis of comparison? If corporate taxes were increased so that manufacturing corporations were still allowed to keep profits at the same rate they were allowed in 1945, this would mean that these corporations would not be retaining about $6,400,000,000 a year instead of the $12,900,000,000 which they will retain this year, if they do as well for themselves during the second half of the year as they did in the first half of 1951. This would also mean an additional $6,500,000,000 coming into the Federal Treasury from manufacturing corporations alone. Considering all the other business corporations, taxes which allowed retention of profits at the 1945 rate would probably bring in about $13,000,000,000 more than is now coming in. Let me emphasize again, this would not mean allowing corporations to retain the same absolute amount of profits they retained in 1945. On the contrary, the additional $13,000,000,000 which they ought to be paying in taxes makes allowances for increased business investment. It would allow corporations to retain profits at the same rate of return which prevailed in 1945.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on this question I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish the RECORD to show that on this question I will vote "no." In view of the fact that the yeas and nays have not been ordered by the Senate, I wish the RECORD to show distinctly that I will vote "no."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The RECORD will so show.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, if we have reached the point in the proceedings where we are about to vote on the question of agreeing to the conference report, I wish to be registered as voting "no" on this question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report. [Putting the question.]

The report was agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, in the absence of a yea-and-nay vote, I should like to have the RECORD show that on that vote I voted "no."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The RECORD will so show.

PURCHASE OF AUTOMOBILES OR OTHER CONVEYANCES BY CERTAIN DISABLED VETERANS—VETO MESSAGE (S. DOC. NO. 83)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUNT in the chair) laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying bill, ordered to lie on the table and to be printed:

To the Senate of the United States:

I am returning herewith, without my approval, S. 1864, Eighty-second Congress, "An act to authorize payments by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs on the purchase of automobiles or other conveyances by certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes."

The purpose of the enactment is to authorize payment of not to exceed $1,600 on the purchase price of an automobile or other conveyance for any veteran of World War II, or of service on or after June 27, 1950, and prior to a date to be determined by the President or the Congress, who is entitled to compensation under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration for the loss, or loss of use, of one or both hands or feet, or for defective vision to a prescribed degree.

Previous laws accorded a similar benefit to each World War II veteran entitled to compensation for loss, or loss of use, of one or both legs, at or above the ankle, with the requirement that the veteran be qualified to operate the vehicle. Although the authority for that program expired on June 30, 1951, nearly all of the eligible World War II veterans with leg disabilities have already qualified for and received a conveyance. The principal effect of the present proposal on World War II veterans would be to grant assistance in obtaining a vehicle to those with service-connected disabilities of the upper extremities and to those with seriously impaired vision. It would also qualify veterans of the emergency period beginning June 27, 1950, for this benefit for the first time.

This proposal is very similar in essential respects to S. 2115, Eighty-first Congress, which was passed by the Congress in the fall of 1949, and on which I withheld my approval for reasons set forth at length in a memorandum of disapproval of October 31, 1949.

It is significant that the considerations set forth in that memorandum of disapproval were accepted as sound by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare when it reported favorably on the original version of S. 1864, Eighty-second Congress, on July 25, 1951. At that time the bill would have simply extended the previous World War II program of assistance in obtaining

automobiles for veterans with compensable leg disabilities to include those suffering the same types of disabilities in the active service since June 27, 1950. Apparently recognizing the necessity for restricting this benefit to those having a definite need, in addition to compensation and other existing benefits, for assistance to overcome the handicap of decreased mobility, the committee stated that it had "confined this bill to the same sound standards of rehabilitation which have governed this program since its inception for the benefit of World War II veterans." The Senate accepted and passed the original bill embodying this principle.

However, the bill as finally adopted by both Houses of the Congress is subject to most of the basic objections raised against S. 2115, Eighty-first Congress. While, unlike the previous bill, this one does not include World War I veterans, it does depart materially from the principle upon which the original World War II program was founded, by extending the program to include veterans with disabilities of the upper extremities and blind veterans. As indicated with reference to S. 2115, the factor of materially diminished mobility, which was an underlying basis of the original program of automobiles for disabled World War II veterans with injury or loss of lower limbs, would be largely disregarded in the cases of the relatively large group of veterans with disabilities of the upper extremities who would be brought in by this bill. In addition, this proposal would dispense with the requirement of the original program that the veteran must be able to drive the vehicle, at least in those instances where someone else is available to drive for him. S. 1864 would, with respect to a considerable proportion of the beneficiaries, abandon the principle upon which the original program was based.

The question of policy arising from this legislation should certainly be determined on a more solid basis than the theory that the proposed benefit is a desirable convenience. The proper test is whether it would be a necessary, sound, and substantial part of the program of rehabilitation and readjustment which the Government is obligated to provide for veterans seriously disabled in the service.

The broad program which has already been placed into effect is based upon the concept that the best help which can be given the disabled veteran is that which directly assists him to the maximum extent possible in overcoming his service disability. Sound measures to this end include medical and hospital care, prosthetic appliances, vocational rehabilitation training, and liberal rates of monthly compensation, including additional amounts for dependents in severe cases. Blind veterans may be provided with guide dogs and electrical or mechanical equipment to aid them in overcoming their physical handicap. Special increased rates of compensation are granted to those with specific disabilities such as the loss of one or both hands or feet, or blindness. Veterans who would benefit by S. 1864 receive monthly compensation payments ranging from $102 to $360, with extra amounts in most cases for those with dependents. To these benefits the bill would add a payment on one automobile, which would necessarily afford but a temporary type of assistance.

It is difficult to perceive how this bill would fit into the existing benefit structure, for the reason that in a great many instances the benefit provided would not be geared to a peculiar and urgent need for rehabilitative assistance of this nature and would not be in keeping with the underlying objective of assisting these disabled veterans to be as nearly as possible self-reliant and self-sustaining members of society.

As I pointed out in the statement on the Eighty-first Congress bill any proposal to make gifts of specific nonmonetary benefits to a selected group of disabled veterans easily leads to serious inequalities. The previous World War II automobile program sought to avoid these inequalities by restricting the benefit to those with leg injuries constituting a material handicap to their mobility. The present bill would include more than 9,400 World War II veterans and an unknown but substantial number of veterans of the present emergency, with disability of the upper extremities. About 9,200 of these World War II veterans would have loss, or loss of use, of only one hand or arm. Many of these would have a disability rating of only 60 or 70 percent, with only slight impairment of mobility, if any, while at the same time a much greater number of veterans dated as 100 percent disabled, but without the specific disability covered by this proposal, will not receive automobiles. It would be easy to find wholesale discriminations as the result of enactment of this legislation. For example, of the estimated 11,700 World War II veterans who would become eligible for assistance in obtaining automobiles under this legislation, approximately 41 percent, or 4,800, would be cases rated for compensation purposes as disabled 70 percent or less, while only some 3,000 would be rated as 100 percent disabled. At the same time, at least 70,000 World War II veterans receiving compensation for 100-percent disability from the Veterans' Administration will have been unable to qualify for automobiles under either this or the prior law.

What was stated by way of conclusion in the memorandum of disapproval on S. 2115, Eighty-first Congress, is just as applicable in testing the merits of this legislation:

> When we move beyond the provision of individually fitted prosthetic appliances for disabled veterans into the field of compensation, the sound and equitable method of meeting the needs of disabled veterans is through the provision of a carefully considered scale of compensation rates paid in cash on a monthly basis. This is our long-tested practice from which I believe we should not depart.

Although I am impelled for the foregoing reasons to withhold my approval from S. 1864, I would be glad to approve legislation which would limit eligibility to veterans of World War II and to each person who, after June 27, 1950, and until termination of the present emergency, has served in the military forces of the United States, and who is entitled to compensation for the loss, or loss of use of, one or both legs at or above the ankle.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 18, 1951.*

TERMINATION OF STATE OF WAR BETWEEN UNITED STATES AND GERMANY

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, the joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 289, to terminate the state of war between the United States and the Government of Germany, was debated somewhat yesterday. I should like to have the joint resolution passed while Senators are present on the floor. Following action on the joint resolution we can take up routine matters.

I think it was generally the consensus of everyone that the amendment attached to the joint resolution by the committee should be rejected and the subject matter should be dealt with in separate legislation. I should like to have the Senate act quickly on the resolution and pass it, rejecting the amendment, the subject matter of which to be considered by a committee separately. This resolution has been pending for some time, and I fear that the German people may not understand the reason for the delay. I therefore move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House Joint Resolution 289.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 289) to terminate the state of war between the United States and the Government of Germany, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations with an amendment on page 2, after line 9, to insert:

> Any citizen (or his successors in interest) whose property was acquired by vesting or otherwise by the Alien Property Custodian and who thereafter instituted suit to recover such property in the manner provided in section 9 (a) of the Trading With the Enemy Act, and subsequent to the institution of such suit, and during the existence of the state of war with Germany hereby terminated, entered into an agreement with officers or agents of the United States, purporting to compromise or release his claim without a full hearing on the merits by a court of competent jurisdiction to determine whether such property was validly vested under the Trading With the Enemy Act, may, within 1 year of the effective date of this resolution, institute suit to recover such property in the manner provided in section 9 (a) of such act; and no agreement, compromise, or release executed by such citizen during the state of war and purporting to convey such property to the Alien Property Custodian or to release any claim by the citizen to such property and no judgment entered on any such agreement, compromise, or release shall be pleaded in bar of such suit, it being the intent of this section to afford every such citizen whose property was so acquired by the Alien Property Custodian an opportunity for full hearing on the merits of his claim to such property. A claimant hereunder shall not be required, as a condition precedent of instituting such suit, to tender back

any benefit or consideration received by him in connection with any release, compromise, or agreement executed by him, but the court shall, in its final judgment, make such order with respect to any such benefit or consideration as it shall deem equitable in the circumstances.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I understand there is a motion to strike out the amendment and proceed to vote on the joint resolution.

Mr. McFARLAND. It is unnecessary to strike it out. It is a matter of voting to reject the amendment, after which we can pass the resolution. Thereafter the amendment can be considered in the form of separate legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I do not intend to take up the time of the Senate. I have already spoken twice on this subject, and I think my position is well known. I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the body of the RECORD a statement which I have prepared in connection with the amendment to House Joint Resolution 289.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Reserving the right to object, I have not read the statement. I should like to ask the Senator simply to tell me whether there is in the statement any reference to the Senator from Wisconsin, or any other personal reference.

Mr. LEHMAN. No; but it will only take me about 3 or 4 minutes to read it. In order that no question may be raised, I should like to read it, if I may. It will not take long.

Mr. President, I trust and hope that the Senate will disagree with the committee amendment. I cannot conceive that this body will agree to this rider, for the benefit of one man, to a bill deciding a question of war and peace for our country.

Although this amendment is couched in general terms, its effect is frankly intended to be specific—to permit a Mr. Ernest Halbach to reopen a claim which has been disposed of as thousands of other claims have been and are being disposed of every day by the Government.

I think the claim itself, on the basis of the facts known to me, is unjustified and unwarranted. But there are legal avenues open to Mr. Halbach to seek the reopening of his claim, to set aside the settlement made with him more than 6 years ago. He can go to the courts. He has gone to the courts. His case is even now pending before the Federal court in New Jersey.

If he desires to press his claim before the Congress, he can do so, if he can get one Member of Congress to introduce such a bill. The Judiciary Committees of both House and Senate handle hundreds of private bills.

The Judiciary Committee would, I am sure, go into this matter with great thoroughness, and get at the facts, all the facts, in this strange case of Mr. Halbach.

Mr. President, I have looked at a great deal of data on this case. I have read the RECORD of the proceedings and affidavits and depositions in the original case, which was settled 6 years ago by the payment to Mr. Halbach of $557,000, and in the current case, which is still pending before the Federal court in New Jersey. I do not think it necessary for me to discuss these facts at this time, although I am prepared to do so.

I want only to say that as far as I can see the Government was more than fair in its treatment of Mr. Halbach. I think the Government leaned over backward in its efforts to be fair. The Government paid Mr. Halbach a half million dollars in settlement of whatever claim he had, and paid him more than a half million dollars in salary in the years since title to the property in question was vested.

This was, in my judgment, enemy property. This was enemy property in the judgment of the Alien Property Custodian who vested that property. It was property used to advance the interests of Nazi Germany. The record, before the Kilgore committee in 1945, is very clear on this point, and on the point of Mr. Halbach's activities in support of those interests up to the very moment we got into war with Germany.

But all this is aside from the question facing us today. That question is: Are we going to attach the Halbach case to this resolution declaring war with German at an end?

I can think of nothing more incredible. Even if the case was on its surface, absolutely clear, this rider should not be attached to this high declaration of national purpose and policy. The Judiciary Committee, and not the Foreign Relations Committee should consider such a proposal. It is a private bill, and not a matter of foreign policy, or of our relations with Germany.

If it is a question of relations with Germany, if it is a question of returning this property to Germany, rather than to Mr. Halbach, the Senate should be told about it.

I do not think it is. I think it is an attempt to gain control of General Aniline & Film Co. There is ample evidence in the record, including a statement by my good friend, Mr. Leo Crowley, that control of General Aniline & Film Co. cannot be separated from control of General Dyestuffs Corp. Is this resolution of peace with Germany to be tied up with that question?

That would be a sorry spectacle for the Nation and the world to regard. What would our children think and our children's children, in reading this declaration of peace, to see, in their history books, this strange language, specifically written to cover Mr. Halbach, and his alleged claim for the return of property that was seized as enemy property, that was used to advance the purposes and interests of an enemy nation?

What a come-down is this. What a descent from the heights of foreign policy to the pedestrian level of the financial claims of one man, of an effort to secure a lever on the control of one corporation through the control of another.

The language of the amendment does not speak of Mr. Halbach. His name is not mentioned or spelled out. It is general language. The Justice Department tells me that, inevitably, this language will cover a score of claims, that have been settled in the same way as that of Mr. Halbach. Is that the way to conduct Government business?

The Government settles thousands of tax claims every month, by stipulation, duly approved by courts of record. Perhaps some of those settlements are questionable in their justice. Would the Finance Committee presume to attach an amendment to a tax bill opening up these settlements to further court review years after the claims have been settled? Of course not. That would result in chaos and anarchy.

If Mr. Halbach has a proper claim, let him continue to pursue it in the courts. What are we doing here but presuming to prejudge a pending court case?

If he does not get satisfaction in the courts, he can get somebody to introduce a private bill, which can be passed on by the Judiciary Committee. I urge the rejection of the committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, in order to get away from the difficulty concerning the amendment, at the opening of the session today I introduced a private bill which can be taken up on its merits in the Judiciary Committee. The amendment on which we are about to vote is long overdue, but I think it is too bad that the joint resolution should become mixed up with a private matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the joint resolution it is proposed to insert the following:

SEC. 2. In furtherance of the purposes of section 1 hereof, the President of the United States hereby is requested to proceed with the negotiation of a treaty of peace between the United States and the Government of Germany and to submit the same for the consideration of the Senate at the earliest practicable date; and the President is advised that it is the sense of the Congress that said treaty of peace should be negotiated jointly with the allies of the United States in the war against Germany except that if such joint negotiations prove impossible or impracticable, the treaty should be negotiated as was the treaty with Japan.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, the junior Senator from South Dakota is proceeding under no illusions with respect to the situation with which we are confronted today. Congress has one eye on the clock and the other eye on the calendar. Senators are anxious to dispose of the resolution which is now pending and to get down to other business. But the memory of World War II is still very clear in our minds. We ought not continually to be "behind the eight ball" insofar as taking the initiative in Europe is concerned. The initiative today rests

with Russia; it rests with Eastern Germany. Evidence of that is the number of news dispatches which have been coming out of that country within the past few weeks, added to the announcement of the East German Government that German unity discussions have started with Western Germany. That proposal of the East German Government for unity discussions with Western Germany has stalled the movement of General Eisenhower in connection with bringing West Germany into Western Europe for the defense of the West against the inroads of communism.

Mr. President, I have in my hand a special dispatch to the New York Times dated Berlin, October 13, only 5 days ago, the first sentence of which is as follows:

President Wilhelm Pieck said today that his East German Government wanted to start German unity discussions immediately without imposing any conditions. He said skeptical Bonn officials were mistaken if they interpreted the appeal made Wednesday by the East German People's Chamber as excluding such talks unless Bonn's negotiations on rearmament with the Allied High Commission were dropped.

Herr Pieck insisted that East German Government was not demanding that West Germany make a choice between the east and the west.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire dispatch be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

PIECK DENIES HIS REGIME WANTS BONN TO END DEFENSE TALK AS CONDITION FOR UNITY

BERLIN, October 13.—President Wilhelm Pieck said today that his East German Government wanted to start German unity discussions immediately without imposing any conditions. He said skeptical Bonn officials were mistaken if they interpreted the appeal made Wednesday by the East German People's Chamber as excluding such talks unless Bonn's negotiations on rearmament with the Allied High Commission were dropped.

Herr Pieck insisted that East German Government was not demanding that West Germany make a choice between the east and the west.

He said the East German offer was intended as a mark of his Government's readiness to reach an understanding on the basis of a compromise. He cited the East German willingness to discuss the neutral supervision of any all-German elections as evidence of his Government's readiness to reach a compromise solution.

Herr Pieck did not say whether Otto Grotewohl, East German Premier, had dropped another condition he voiced in the People's Chamber Wednesday—the exclusion of his opposite number, Chancellor Konrad Adenauer, from these proposed talks of Germans at one table.

An article by Walter Ulbricht, secretary general of the Socialist Unity (Communist) Party in appearing today in the East German press supported the unity appeal in terms that underlined the objective—to prevent or delay West German participation in the Atlantic Alliance, in any way, shape or manner.

Herr Ulbricht, who is believed to be closer to the Kremlin than any other East German official made it clear that the main weight would be brought to bear against the use of the Ruhr industries, rather than against German divisions yet to be born even on paper.

As a formula for top-level diplomacy Herr Ulbricht stressed support for the Soviet proposal of a peace accord among the powers, including Communist China.

It is generally believed that if and when the Russians, decide to play a real all-German settlement card they will have to offer it on a 4-power basis.

Herr Ulbricht hailed the Soviet Union as the land with the highest development of human society from which Germany must learn.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I have several articles with reference to this question. While I do not intend to take too much time, I am trying to fulfill a responsibility which I feel in laying them before the Senate tonight.

On the 12th of October Stewart Alsop published an article in the Washington Post in which he reviewed the situation and said, starting out with a quotation from General Eisenhower:

"We can do the job without the Germans, if that becomes absolutely necessary."

This recent remark is reliably attributed to Gen. Dwight Eisenhower.

Then Mr. Alsop points out that although General Eisenhower said it could be done, we should not rest with that, and goes on to say:

Yet the stick is not enough—there must also be a carrot, and a large one.

Quoting further:

The best men here are becoming increasingly convinced that we must be prepared to accept the risks of offering the West Germans the only carrot which will really tempt them—genuine complete internal sovereignty, within a Western European framework. And surely as the choice between the carrot and the stick is made very clear, there cannot be much doubt in the end about how the Germans will choose.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire article by Mr. Alsop be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

MATTER OF FACT

(By Stewart Alsop)

THE STICK AND THE CARROT

BONN.—"We can do the job without the Germans, if that becomes absolutely necessary." This recent remark is reliably attributed to Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower. Presumably, Eisenhower thinks that, given great air power and atomic superiority, the defense of Western Europe without a German manpower contribution is militarily feasible. And in the peculiar atmosphere of this artificial political capital, the remark takes on great significance.

For the demonstrable fact is that something has gone very wrong with allied plans for a West German defense force. Consider the facts. It is more than a year now since Secretary of State Dean G. Acheson, pushed and chivvied by the Pentagon, and against the advice of able United States High Commissioner John McCloy, demanded immediate German rearmament. At that time, the Pentagon planners, suffering from the delusion that the militant German nation would spring to arms at the word of command, were talking of an important German military contribution in a matter of months.

Yet now, a year later, the first German soldier in the western alliance is unlikely to put on his uniform for at least 10 months—and only then if all goes more smoothly than there seems much reason to expect. And the best private guess here is that, under present conditions, Western Germany will not contribute more than about eight rather thin divisions by the end of 1953—hardly a decisive contribution.

In short, in the time of great danger immediately ahead, the job will simply have to be done without the Germans. Meanwhile, in the view of some very able men here, it is time to have a good hard look at what has gone wrong.

Many things have gone wrong. For one thing, the effectiveness of the Soviet-Communist unity line has been vastly underestimated in the west, a matter which will be examined in a later report. But what seems to have gone principally wrong is that the Pentagon planners, fascinated like a rabbit by a snake by the thought of future German divisions, have fixed a rigid but entirely unrealistic time table for German rearmament. Thus the western administrators here, including the extremely able United States High Commissioner John J. McCloy, have been robbed of the flexibility required in negotiation.

Any negotiation is a matter, in the end, of the carrot and the stick. And because the German politicians are convinced that the west must have a German defense contribution at any cost, the allied negotiators had no stick.

Logically, the Germans should be begging the Allies for the means to defend their own soil. Instead, the Pentagon-planned program has placed the Allies in the position of doing the begging. This immensely stimulates the sort of irrationality displayed by such a man as the powerful, fanatically nationalist, Dr. Kurt Schumacher, leader of the Social-Democratic Party.

Schumacher haughtily dismisses the Schuman plan and the European army, now the twin pillars of American policy in Europe, as French trickery. He would permit German rearmament only on the impossible condition that there were sufficient Anglo-American ground strength to halt a Soviet attack at the Elbe and once this condition was fulfilled, he strongly implies, Germany would rearm only in order to march to the Vistula.

With this sort of internal political pressure to deal with, it is not surprising that negotiations between the high commissioners and the brilliant aging Chancelor Konrad Adenauer move sluggishly from deadlock to deadlock. The fact is that until both a large stick and a juicy carrot can be made clearly visible to the Germans, the German rearmament project will continually bog down, as it has for more than a year now.

The nature of the stick was summed up by one wise official here about as follows: "We should be in a position to tell the Germans flatly that if they really want it that way, we shall concentrate everything on the defense of the Rhine. Western Germany will then become a temporary useful outpost and maneuver area in case of war."

This is tough talk, but particularly in this country, tough talk sometimes clears the air. Yet the stick is not enough—there must also be a carrot, and a large one. Because the risks of rearming Germany are so frightening, there has been a great tendency in all three allied capitals to try to keep Germany in rather clumsily concealed leading strings during the rearmament period. This just will not work. A nation simply cannot be rearmed and kept in leading strings at one and the same time.

The best men here are becoming increasingly convinced that we must be prepared to accept the risks of offering the west Germans the only carrot which will really tempt them—genuine complete internal sovereignty, within a western European framework. And surely as the choice between the carrot

and the stick is made very clear, there cannot be much doubt in the end about how the Germans will choose.

Mr. CASE. I do not know, Mr. President, whether, with my brief references, the point is clear, so I desire to state it very simply and definitely. My amendment proposes to add a section to the pending resolution which would advise the President that we believe he should immediately seek to negotiate a treaty of peace with Germany. The pending resolution would merely be a one-sided declaration that the state of war with Germany is at an end, but it does not give West Germany the status of a country which has a treaty of peace. The fighting in Europe stopped many months before the fighting stopped in the Pacific, yet we have already negotiated a treaty of peace with Japan. Japan can look with confidence toward standing on her own feet. Germany cannot.

This one-sided, unilateral resolution is, again, a flagrant example of lack of initiative of the State Department. It is negative action. It leaves the initiative with East Germany, which is now proposing unity talks, and it is that proposal which has stalled General Eisenhower's attempt to bring the West Germans into European harmony. That is not merely my conviction or that of Mr. Alsop; it is also the conviction of Mr. Enno Hobbing, who, in Time magazine, has an article of some length, entitled "Germany; Up From the Ashes."

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

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. This resolution has already passed the House, and if we tie to it the Senator's amendment, it would have to go to conference and would probably be killed. Why cannot the Senator let the joint resolution be passed, and offer his proposal as a separate measure? We will take care of it.

Mr. CASE. I may say to the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee that that is exactly what I am going to suggest at the end of my remarks. The amendment which I have offered has been before the Committee on Foreign Relations since it was submitted on the 12th of August 1951. However, I feel that I would be derelict in my duty at this time, when we are passing this half measure, if I failed to bring to the attention of the Senate and the country the situation which exists in Germany, and to point out why we do not have the initiative.

Mr. President, I shall not read this entire article. I shall read a paragraph from it, if I may, and then I shall ask permission to place the entire article in the RECORD.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, did I correctly understand the Senator to say that at the conclusion of his remarks——

Mr. CASE. I intend to follow the suggestion of the distinguished Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator. I shall not ask him any more questions.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, the Time correspondent, Mr. Hobbing, has a four-column article in Time magazine for August 6, 1951, the key paragraph of which reads as follows:

> What is needed is a whopping gesture, something on the order of the Japanese treaty, saying in effect: "O. K., boys. The war is over and we are ready to be friends again, pledged to defend each other."

That is the recommendation of the Time correspondent in Germany, and those Members of the Senate who have followed the editorial policies of Time magazine through the years will know that when Time publishes this four-column story under the heading "Germany; Up From the Ashes," and discusses the problems which General Eisenhower confronts in Germany today in attempting to bring them into the organization with the other western European countries, Time is not making its recommendation that "What is needed is a whopping gesture, something on the order of the Japanese treaty," without there being a real need for it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article from Time magazine may be incorporated in my remarks at this point.

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

GERMANY; UP FROM THE ASHES

(By Enno Hobbing)

The people of Western Germany have turned a big corner. Six months ago, stagnation was still everywhere; today, from the Elbe to the Rhine, everything is in motion. Ponderous blocks of new building bulk cleanly amid the jagged skylines. In Hamburg, Frankfurt and Essen, brick red factory construction and flashy white housing projects chase the gloom of rubble gray. The ruins no longer depress, but act as a stimulant to German energy. A Hamburg shipping magnate curtly told me why: "If I don't get something done, I'll go crazy. That's sure. A war may take it all away again—maybe. But we'll take that chance."

PROSPERITY

German trade unions have virtually dropped the class-warfare creed. In the coal and steel industries the unions are jealous of their newly won right to share in management's decisions. Labor leaders are striding into statesmanship; they support the Schuman plan, German rearmament. By choosing Christian Fette as chairman to succeed the late venerated Hans Bockler, the unions have affirmed their political independence. Stern, stubby Chairman Fette, 56, will not dance when the doctrinaire Socialist Party pipes; his business is practical gains for German workers.

Under able Finance Minister Fritz Schaffer, employment is up, luxury taxes are stiffer. As economic inequality tends to diminish, a feeling of opportunity grows. On the streets, fewer Germans glare enviously at expensive automobiles; cheap Volkswagens, Opels and Fords are nearer the public's reach. Already, more Germans own cars than in 1936. In Bad Godesberg, a German mason carped at the new apartment houses for United States officials: "I wish we were that well off." Promptly two of his colleagues chipped in: "Don't worry. We will be."

BONN DOING WELL

All is not strawberries and cream, however. Western Germany's prosperity still rests on a bedrock of $400,000,000 annual United States aid. The housing shortage is still acute, and so is the economic plight of the war victims. In a camp, just beyond Bonn itself, 50 bombed-out families live like animals. Across the land, there are well over a million people unemployed. Conspicuous consumption by the wealthy (encouraged by a tax system that allows huge exemptions for business expenses) makes for glaring contrasts with poverty.

But these defects are no longer dominant in German thinking. "We've stopped remembering how poor we were only 5 years ago," said a Frankfurt clerk. "Now we look ahead."

Up and down Western Germany, I found a new note in politics. To any number of political questions, people replied: "That's up to Bonn." The Bonn Federal Government has gained grudging acceptance, even respect. Local elections center on Federal issues. Western Germany's body is beginning to respond to its brain.

Bonn, for the provisional capital it was originally intended to be, looks remarkably permanent. It quietly attracts hard-working, talented men from all over Western Germany. The work of parliamentary committees and cabinet ministeries has become impressively competent.

Chancelor Konrad Adenauer has moved his office out from under the stuffed animals of the König Museum into the newly redecorated, million-mark Schaumburg palace. "If we want to be a power again," says Adenauer, "we have to look like one."

GUILT

Physical recovery is still far ahead of psychological recovery. Ripped loose from tradition in 1933, tossed by tyranny and war, submerged under occupation, the Germans are mentally still very much at sea.

On the tense uncertain faces, personal tragedies have graven bitter lines. Often, helpless hysteria bursts through the curtain of self-control; at other times, Germans seek emotional relief by unburdening their life stories to any listener. Whining and self-pitying creep into ordinary conversations. The Germans are not yet a happy people. How could they be?

On the surface, the postwar Germans appear to be still busy denying Nazi sins, justifying themselves and criticizing the occupation powers. But why should the Germans be so terribly eager to minimize nazism, unless they felt that nazism was a black blot on their record? Why should they take so much time and effort justifying themselves, unless they knew that their reputations were ruined? German criticism of other countries is mainly defensive. When a German angrily declares that "die Amerikaner sind auch nicht besser" (the Americans are not better, either), he makes himself feel that he is not the only one who bears a burden of guilt.

FANATICISM FINISHED

Most Germans these days live by and for themselves. They are, in the main, unkind to each other. They lack confidence in any community and are skeptical of new sacrifices for the common interest. Thus there is little prospect that German resentments will take the form of organized violence.

The atomization of society has its good side: social mobility. Many a professional soldier has lost his Prussianized kinks after working in the Ruhr mines, many a previous failure has proved himself in the tough scramble of postwar life. Healthy distrust of outworn German codes is surging. Fanaticism for the state is finished. On this point, the Germans are explicit: "Wir sind nicht noch einmal die Dumen" (We're not going to be played for suckers again).

At bottom, the Germans seem to seek a chance to work off the weight of guilt. The Germans naturally want to feel again that they belong, somewhere. But they will not blindly buy another new order.

This state of mind produces no easily definable political pattern. It is rather meaningless to talk of democracy in Western Germany: The Germans at this point are neither particularly prodemocratic nor antidemoncratic.

Nationalism is an equally irrelevant term. Since their destruction and partition in 1945, the Reich and the nation have simply not been realities to the Germans. The very meager successes of the noisy nationalist parties signify more protest against existing economic inadequacies than passion for a political ideal.

THE LEADERS

Durable, level-headed Konrad Adenauer is undoubtedly the best available Chancelor for the Germans. To a people weary of bombast, Adenauer makes calm speeches; to a people fearful of the state, he gives unobtrusive administration. His chief stock in trade is still his shrewd knack for compromise. Rather than have the workers grow restive, Adenauer, the conservative Christian-Democrat, has given trade-unions more responsibility than they ever had in Germany. In order to keep former soldiers from deserting to the radical right, Adenauer the antimilitarist courteously receives influential former generals.

In dealing with the Allies, Adenauer and company have adopted tactics that seem unusual for Germans: politeness and waiting. When confronted with an allied order they dislike, they often ask courteously for time to think it over.

Socialist Leader Kurt Schumacher, Adenauer's implacable political foe, has a more dramatic vision than the Chancelor. Schumacher better understands Communist aims and tactics. His utopian goal is a big Europe, a continent free from the Atlantic to the Soviet border; he considers the little Europe envisaged by projects like the Schuman plan a trap on the road to his larger objective. This all-or-nothing attitude makes the Socialist boss a hard man for the west's statesmen to deal with. It also cuts down Schumacher's popularity in Western Germany.

REARMAMENT

On foreign policy, the Adenauer-Schumacher feud cleaves the Bundestag. Many German and Allied officials hope, probably in vain, for a great coalition of conservatives and Socialists so that German rearmament can be launched by bipartisan decision. German opposition to rearmament has decreased greatly in the last 6 months. There has been what the Germans call zeit zum umdenken—time to think it over. General Eisenhower's declaration that the German soldier never lost his honor soothed much injured pride. Oddly enough, neo-Nazi Ernst Remer (Time, May 21) has also been helpful. A German veteran explained how: "When that scum, Remer, started lambasting rearmament, we soldiers figured rearmament must be the right thing." Two other factors: Rising prosperity gives the Germans a feeling they have something to defend; and Allied successes in Korea suggest that joining the west is not joining the hopeless side.

Adenauer has wisely entrusted his embryonic defense ministry to a sober, militarism-proof trade-unionist, Theodor Blank. Blank's top experts, Gens. Adolf Heusinger and Hans Speidel, have anti-Nazi records, though they also had brilliant military careers.

NEW GERMAN DANGER?

The increased readiness to rearm will go for nothing unless the Germans get gleichberechtigung (equality of rights), i. e., removal of the last discriminatory restrictions on Western Germany. Specifically, this would mean the abolition of the Allied nursemaid, the High Commission. Many Americans here feel sure that the United States could just as well exercise economic controls through the ECA, political controls through an ambassador, military controls through Ike Eisenhower.

What is needed is a whopping gesture, something on the order of the proposed Japanese treaty, saying in effect: "O. K., boys. The war is over and we are ready to be friends again, pledged to defend each other."

German leaders are not going to rearm a second-class people, and Germans are not going to fight as second-class soldiers. The French give the impression that they still want to avoid both a German Army and German equality. Britain, while rigorously rearming at home, has gone slow on Germany, apparently in deference to its anti-United States left-wing Socialist sentiment. United States officials have been waiting for everybody else to make up their minds.

In recent weeks, there have been signs of progress. United States High Commissioner John J. McCloy came back from Washington with speed-up orders. Britain officially ended the state of war with Germany, and the United States and other countries are following suit. All the arguments for delay fall flat before the fact that, on the basis of NATO plans, Western Europe cannot be made defensible without the Germans.

The "German danger" today is not that the Germans will dominate or desert the West. The danger is rather that the Germans will not be put into position to do their proper share for the West.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I call attention to a United Press dispatch from Bonn today which I copied from the ticker, which quotes High Commissioner John J. McCloy as saying that he opposes any German unity program which would prevent full German membership in the Western European community. I ask unanimous consent that this dispatch may appear in my remarks at this point.

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

BONN.—United States High Commissioner John J. McCloy said today that he opposes any German unity program which would prevent full German membership in the Western European community.

Communist and western leaders alike have been exploiting the deep-rooted German desire for unification in a recent barrage of plans and counter plans, but there has been no indication so far that any effective action is likely.

McCloy said the United States would welcome a Communist agreement to accept western proposals for free, all-German elections to choose a single government for the divided country.

He added, however, that "certainly no steps may be taken or agreements made which would preclude the possibility of German integration (into Western Europe)."

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, in this matter, as a Member of the Senate, I do not have any more responsibility than any other Senator, but it does happen that 4 years ago I spent 6 weeks in Germany and wrote the report for the so-called Herter committee which dealt with Germany. I wish to read one paragraph from that report in order that the RECORD may show that my interest has been based on some background and upon a continuity of conviction on the subject.

In a paragraph which appeared on page 4 of our interim report, our committee said:

We recommend that the states of Germany which are free to do so be encouraged to form a constitutional government at the earliest possible date: a government with powers prescribed by and derived from the member states, a government which other German states could join when free to do so, and free itself to join any federation of free states looking toward the economic stability of Europe and world peace.

Mr. President, too long a delay elapsed before the states of Germany were encouraged to form that constitutional government, but today they have it, and its headquarters are at Bonn. It is now late in the day, but we should proceed to see that the Bonn Government is free to join the Federation of Free States looking toward the economic stability of Europe and world peace, and the only way they can experience that freedom is to have a treaty of peace so that they will feel that they are an independent nation. The consciousness, the realization that they are free to develop, that they are free to be accepted as partners in a western European federation for peace, is what is necessary to get away from the holding back which up to this time has made the task of General Eisenhower so difficult. It is the lack of such a consciousness which has stalled West German rearmament, which has delayed the West German build-up and which has killed initiative on the whole German question.

I recognize the situation which has been mentioned by the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations. I realize that the Congress is approaching adjournment. I realize that if this amendment were agreed to tonight it would require a conference with the House, and concurrence by the House, or at least further consideration. I do not wish to delay the taking of the half step that is proposed in the resolution now pending, so I am not going to press for action on the amendment now. I shall, however, ask permission that the amendment may be offered as an independent resolution and appropriately referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations for further consideration. But in taking that step, Mr. President, I am doing so because I do not wish to delay action on the joint resolution. However, I desire to say, with all the earnestness at my command, that just as Germany is the key to peace in Europe, just as peace in Europe is the key to whether or not there will be a third world war, or whether or not this Congress and other Congresses will wrestle with problems of raising troops or sending troops abroad, of raising taxes, and of condemning yet unborn generations to pay the bills for the difficulties of today, just so surely the step now proposed should be taken, we should have a treaty of peace with Germany, we should put Germany on such a basis that she can join with the other nations of Western Europe against the encroachments of communism.

Having said this, and presented the situation, I bow to the situation we now confront. I want this half step to be taken, I do not want any delay. Therefore, I withdraw my amendment, and I ask that it be submitted as a separate resolution and appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the request of the Senator from South Dakota is granted.

The resolution (S. Res. 226), submitted by Mr. Case, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Resolved, That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, requested to proceed with the negotiation of a treaty of peace between the United States and the Government of Germany and to submit the same for the consideration of the Senate at the earliest practicable date; and the President is advised that it is the sense of the Senate that said treaty of peace should be negotiated jointly with the allies of the United States in the war against Germany except that if such joint negotiations prove impossible or impracticable, the treaty should be negotiated as was the treaty with Japan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 289) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. KEFAUVER subsequently said: Mr. President, in connection with the joint resolution in regard to the treaty with Germany, and the amendment reported by the Foreign Relations Committee to that joint resolution, I ask unanimous consent to have a statement by myself printed in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ESTES KEFAUVER

This resolution providing for the termination of a state of war with Germany is a resolution relating to a high policy matter in the field of our international relations.

As such, it should not be marred with an amendment, such as that added by the Foreign Relations Committee, which has absolutely no place in a solemn resolution of the Congress of the United States ending the state of war with Germany.

Stated as briefly as possible, the amendment would permit the reopening of many cases of vesting of enemy property, which cases have already long since been settled by compromise agreements by the claimants and the Government. To my mind this amendment is objectionable for a number of different reasons, which I shall outline briefly.

In the first place, as I have indicated already, the principal resolution is a very serious matter of high policy in the field of foreign affairs, whereas this amendment relates to a domestic matter and has no place in the consideration of the principal resolution.

In the second place, the amendment, while it is general in nature and would open the doors to many other cases, actually seeks to benefit one particular claimant, one Ernest K. Halbach, who claimed ownership of a number of shares of General Dyestuff Corp. of New York. Those shares, along with others, were vested during the war by the Alien Property Custodian in connection with the I. G. Farben industries group. Mr. Halbach sued for return of this property, but while the suit was pending he agreed to a settlement by which he received over twice the amount of money which he had originally invested in the stock. He claims that this settlement was unjust, and this amendment has for its real purpose the reopening of that one particular case. Therefore, it is a matter which, if proper for the Congress to consider at all, should be dealt with through private legislation and not through a general bill. And I might add that I doubt if it is proper for Congress to consider this at all.

In the third place, although the amendment is designed to reopen that one case, it would at the same time reopen many cases where property has been vested and settlements finally concluded with the claimants. This would mean that years of effort on the part of the Office of Alien Property to liquidate the assets under its jurisdiction would be rendered completely futile.

In the fourth place, this, in turn, would mean a delay in the transfer of moneys to the War Claims Fund. I should like to point out that the War Claims Fund, which was established under the Trading With the Enemy Act, is the source of moneys from which the claims recognized by the War Claims Act of 1948 are paid. Further, it was evidently the intention of Congress that this fund should be a potential source for the payment of such meritorious war claims of American citizens as the Congress might later wish to recognize and compensate, including prisoner-of-war claims.

Principally for these reasons, but also for others, this amendment which has been added to House Joint Resolution 289 by the Foreign Relations Committee, is objectionable and should not be allowed to stand.

AUTHORITY TO REPORT SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL—LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM—AMENDMENT OF DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations be permitted to report during the recess of the Senate following today's session the second supplemental appropriation bill, H. R. 5650.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, of course, I do not object to that, but I should like to take this opportunity to ask the Senator from Arizona what his plans for tomorrow are.

Mr. McFARLAND. I should like to make the appropriation bill the unfinished business, if there is no objection. If we are to adjourn on Saturday——

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I hope the Senator will make the request he has just indicated.

Mr. McFARLAND. I so request, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the Senator from Arizona a question for the RECORD about Order No. 745, Senate bill 2104. I reported that bill, and I should like to request the majority leader to put the bill on the agenda. It is an extremely important measure in connection with our international relations.

Mr. McFARLAND. What bill is it?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is a bill reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency, to repeal section 104 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended. I reported the bill, and I have some responsibility in seeing that it is considered, if the majority leader will agree to have that done.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, there is some objection to the bill. If we can get time before the session adjourns, I have no objection to having it considered, but we need to have a call of the calendar. If we are to conclude the session by Saturday night, the first matter of importance is the passage of the appropriation bills. We have to have conferences after the appropriation bills are passed. The next matter on the agenda is the call of the calendar.

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

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think I have the floor for the moment, Mr. President. I merely wish to say that the American Farm Bureau is extremely concerned about the action taken in the passage of the last Defense Production Act, in the inclusion of the section which Senate bill 2104 would repeal. I have received letters from them. The Department of Agriculture is also very much concerned about it. I am informed that if the Senate does not act there will be retaliation immediately by the foreign countries concerned and very great hardships will be caused to aspects of agriculture other than the part concerned in the bill. A small segment of the cheese industry is about the only group concerned about the bill, the blue cheese manufacturers.

I merely desired to make this statement for the RECORD, so that the Senate would know the importance of the bill, and that it would not be overlooked. If we do not take any action, I am reliably informed that some six or eight countries will be forced to take action which will be detrimental to agriculture in this country as a whole. That is the view of the American Farm Bureau Federation. The letter is in the RECORD. I have received a subsequent communication from them on this subject. They are greatly concerned about our not taking any action. They point out very clearly that there are two alternative ways, perfectly legitimate, recognized ways, for the cheese industry to protect itself under existing law. I wish only to emphasize the importance of the situation. I feel that I would be derelict in my duty if I did not call it to the attention of the Senate and the majority leader. I think the bill ought to be considered and passed.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I stated several days ago that so far as I was concerned I would be perfectly willing to have this bill considered. We are trying to meet a goal. We are trying to get away from here by Saturday night. If there were any possibility of action on the part of the House I would not mind taking up the bill and remaining in session for another week, if that is what the Senate wants to do. But if the House is not going to act on the bill—and it has not given any indication that it intends to act on these bills—I see no reason for the Senate remaining in session for another week in order to debate the bill. If we have time during the crowded hours of tomorrow and the next day to dispose of this bill and of other measures, it is agreeable to me to dispose of them.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to make it clear that I am told that

if the Senate alone takes action on the bill, that will indicate to the parties concerned that we intend to do something about the situation, and that that would serve the purpose, even though the House did not take action.

This matter involves a long-term program in our foreign trade. We have just passed a bill providing appropriations of more than $7,000,000,000 for mutual security. We are paying out our own money in an effort to build up the same countries which we are tearing down by means of this provision in the law. So it seems utterly inconsistent to me for us to adopt two divergent policies.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. This is the first time I have heard that anyone would consider action by one body of the Congress as evidence that a bill would be passed. It does constitute a step, of course. However, reporting the bill constitutes a step. The House has refused to act. I know that the debate on this bill would require considerable time. We would not be able to pass it promptly. I am willing to talk with Members of the House to see if we can get some indication that the House will take action on the bill. I am willing to have the Senate remain in session for another day if it wishes to take up the bill. Otherwise, I do not want to assume the responsibility for taking it up and passing it merely as a gesture, when it will not be enacted during this session.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I wish to make it clear to the Senator that it is not merely my opinion that the passage of the bill by the Senate would be advantageous. I am told by the Department of Agriculture and the Department of State that it would have that effect. The reason it would have that effect is that this is not something which represents merely the imposition or lifting of an embargo. It involves what is considered by other countries as a breach of faith, in this sense: For the past 5 years our own representatives, particularly in ECA and the Department of Agriculture, have encouraged other countries to develop the very types of cheese which they have started importing into this country. We helped to finance the building of some of the factories, on the theory that they were largely noncompetitive, and that thereby those countries would be enabled to earn dollars, rather than being the recipients of grants. They undertook to do that, particularly in Denmark, the Netherlands, and Italy. Just when they have built that industry up to a point where it becomes significant, we take the rug out from under them and, by an embargo, limit our imports to what they were 3 or 4 years ago, which is really a less over-all amount than those countries exported to this country back in 1939.

So the matter of good faith is involved. It is not merely a question of the immediate impact for a few months. The question is whether or not we intend to follow a policy which will enable other countries to earn money, or whether we intend immediately to put up our tariffs in such a way that they will be unable to do any trading with us. That is why an expression by the Senate is significant. I do not see anything illogical or unusual about it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, does the Senator from Arkansas have the floor?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I had the floor on a reservation of objection to the unanimous-consent request. Does the Senator wish me to yield to him for a question?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am glad to yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I think the RECORD should show that the situation is not quite so simple as the Senator from Arkansas makes out. In the first place, there are some American plants going out of business. Secondly, we had some very substantial testimony in support of keeping section 104 in the Defense Production Act.

Thirdly, it should be pointed out that while there was no cheese purchased by the Commodity Credit Corporation from April to September, it is now taking surplus cheese off the market. If I correctly remember the figures, it took off half a million pounds in September. To me it seems like a rare inconsistency, indeed. I think that is one reason why a number of members of the committee opposed the repeal of section 104. We feel constrained to oppose it on the basis of the testimony, and because of the inconsistency which develops in the agricultural program.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I did not say that the report was unanimous. I am quite willing to admit that the Senator from Illinois objected to the bill in the committee, and is opposed to it. The only really serious objection to the bill was from a constituent, I believe, of the Senator from Illinois, representing a cheese company which is in the blue-cheese business. As I previously stated, there are some 20 blue-cheese factories in this country, the operators of which feel that this bill would be injurious to them. There is no question about that. I know of no way in which free or even relatively free, international trade can be carried on without some conflict somewhere.

I do not pretend that there is no one who does not feel that this bill would be an interference with his business. I am saying only that the American Farm Bureau Federation supports the bill. I do not think the Senator from Illinois disputes that. The Farm Bureau Federation speaks as a great agricultural organization. It has made it very clear that, in view of the fact that our exports are far greater than our imports, and that it is to the interest of this country's agriculture, certainly—and I believe the interest of the entire economy—to have some degree of foreign trade, the bill would be beneficial to agriculture as a whole, not merely to one cheese manufacturer.

I recognize that the Senator from Illinois has a perfect right to oppose free trade. That is traditional in his party. His party likes fully to protect every single industry in being, and possibly potential industries. There is a legitimate, honest difference of opinion as to the importance of international trade. I do not wish to sit here and not invite the attention of the Senate to the importance of this bill. I think it has great importance to agriculture as a whole, as distinguished from the cheese manufacturers who are represented by one or two men.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield the floor.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I wish to make one further observation. The cheese and dairy industry is a very considerable industry in itself. The Cheese Institute of America appeared and gave what I thought was some very substantial testimony. There was additional testimony before the committee. As I appraise the whole situation, it is not so simple as it might appear.

For that reason, and in view of the fact that there is a definite inconsistency when the Commodity Credit Corporation, with the cash of the American taxpayer, takes cheese off the market, and at the same time there is an importation of certain types, notably blue cheese, which has already put a number of cheese plants out of business and reduced others to 50 percent production, I am opposed to the bill.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Inasmuch as the bill is not before us for consideration there is no use in going into its merits. I do not accept as a fair presentation what the Senator has said about so many plants going out of business. Most of the concern about this bill is over the possibility that in the future it might cause some harm.

I am quite willing to recognize the importance of the dairy industry, but I do not believe the dairy industry is in any way threatened by the proposed legislation. A few manufacturers of blue cheese might be slightly injured. They have a perfectly proper defense to their interests through the escape clause in the reciprocal agreement and in section 101.

I wish only to emphasize that I believe it is important to recognize that in a year or two, or perhaps 3 years, we will have to recognize that we have made a great mistake in returning to the traditional policy of high tariffs and cutting off our own nose to spite our face, because even in the dairy industry, even in products that are derived from the dairy industry, we export more than we import. If we cut off importations, I believe it will be to the detriment of that industry itself.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—it is my understanding that the majority leader intends to take up tomorrow the second supplemental appropriation bill, if it is ready, and then to have a call of the calendar starting from where we left off the last time. Am I correct?

Mr. McFARLAND. That is the intention. I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations be permitted to report during the recess of the Senate the second supplemental appropriation bill, H. R. 5650.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ORDER MAKING SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL THE UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate convenes tomorrow the second supplemental appropriation bill, H. R. 5650, be the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR CALL OF THE CALENDAR ON FRIDAY

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that after the disposition of H. R. 5650, the second supplemental appropriation bill tomorrow, there be a call of the calendar beginning at the point where we stopped on the last call of the calendar.

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

JOINT COMMITTEE ON RAILROAD RETIREMENT LEGISLATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 51) establishing a Joint Committee on Railroad Retirement Legislation, which was, on page 1, line 9, strike out "chairman of that committee" and insert "Speaker."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes. This is not the resolution which, I think, the Senator from Massachusetts has in mind.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is this the measure amending the Railroad Retirement Act?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The concurrent resolution creates the joint committee, which is the study committee. The concurrent resolution passed by the Senate has been accepted by the House, with the exception that instead of the chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce appointing the three members of the group, the Speaker of the House shall appoint them. I understand that is in accordance with the House rules.

I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to.

ALLOCATION OF STEEL FOR CONSTRUCTION OF SCHOOLS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate Resolution 225, to allocate steel for the construction of schools.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

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

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, this is the resolution which was considered last night and was held up by the majority leader. I know of no objection on this side of the aisle. Personally I believe it is very appropriate. I should like to invite the attention of the Senator from Minnesota, however, to page 2 of the resolution. I believe it is a little stiffer than it is wise to have it. I have shown the Senator a suggested change in the language, which I hope he will accept. I believe it would accomplish his objective, and at the same time give a little more leeway to the Defense Production Administration, which I believe they should have.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have studied the amendments suggested by the Senator from Massachusetts. I believe they are not only worthy amendments, but would improve the resolution. I am glad to accept them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendments offered by the Senator from Massachusetts.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 3, after the word "should", to strike out "allocate" and insert "reconsider its allotments of"; in line 4, after the word "a", to strike out "sufficient" and insert "greater"; in line 6, after the word "as", to insert "may be"; and in line 7, after the word "required" to insert "better."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments offered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL].

The amendments were agreed to.

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

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the National Production Authority and the Defense Production Administration should reconsider its allotments of steel, copper, and aluminum in such manner as to provide a greater quantity of such metals and products fabricated from such metals for the construction of and additions to schools and hospitals as may be required better to protect the health and educational standards of the Nation.

The preamble was agreed to, as follows:

Wheras the health and education of the American people is vital to the strength of this Nation;

Whereas the health and education of the American people has a direct relationship to our military strength and economic productivity;

Whereas there is a demonstrated need for additional schools and hospitals;

Whereas an adequate and dependable supply of steel, aluminum, and copper are critical items in the programs to alleviate existing hospital and school inadequacies;

Whereas the amounts of steel, copper, and aluminum necessary to alleviate such existing inadequacies have not been allocated in sufficient quantity or otherwise made available for the construction of hospital and educational facilities.

The title was amended so as to read: "Resolution favoring increased allocations of steel, copper, and aluminum for construction of schools and hospitals."

Mr. HUMPHREY subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, following the adoption of Senate resolution 225, an editorial entitled "School Construction," appearing in the Washington Post of today, October 18, 1951.

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

SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

The Defense Production Administration's decision that it can allot only 96,000 tons of steel for school construction during the first quarter of 1952 raises serious problems for the country's public-school system. For nearly two decades—first because of the depression, then because of the war, and now because of the threat of war—urgently needed school building has been deferred. When this lag is considered in conjunction with a rapidly growing school-age population, the concern expressed Tuesday by Commissioner of Education Earl McGrath in testimony before a House Education and Labor subcommittee is easy to understand. The American schools face the worst crisis in their history.

In many communities, as Mr. McGrath pointed out, "classrooms are so overcrowded as to make effective teaching almost impossible. * * * In many instances school authorities are having to resort to half-day sessions and less to carry the load. Deferral of construction in the first quarter of 1952 will mean deferral for at least five quarters of the educational opportunity of the school children concerned." In critical defense housing areas, for the relief of which the House Tuesday approved the Barden bill to provide liberalized Federal aid, the situation is particularly acute.

DPA Administrator Fleischmann said that he tried to give the educational system enough structural steel to provide elementary schools for these critical defense areas, to replace condemned buildings, and to complete—"perhaps with some delay"—other projects now under way. Even with the most economical use of the steel available, even with a shift wherever possible from structural steel to reinforced concrete, 96,000 tons won't meet even the most elementary needs. Granting the primary importance of elementary school construction high-school and college building cannot be wholly neglected without serious consequences. Students cannot be kept in cold storage until buildings are ready. The Office of Education figures that an absolute minimum of 150,000 tons is needed for the first quarter of the year ahead.

This is not so much, really, when it is considered in relation to the tremendous steel output of the Nation—and in relation to the pressing need. One hundred and fifty thousand tons amounts to no more than about three quarters of 1 percent of the steel that will be produced in the United States during the first quarter of 1952. A country girding for defense ought to be able to spare that much for the use of what it is defending. The enrollment in American schools this fall was greater by about 800,000 than in the fall of the previous year. Next fall, enrollment will be increased by an additional 1,700,000. We cannot deny these children the chance at education which has always been an American birthright.

CONDITIONS IN THE MIDDLE EAST—AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I do not wish to delay the Senate. I merely desire to say that, in my judgment, this country and the world are today in one of the most ominous and dangerous situations they have been in

since the close of World War II. The headlines today point out that there is a battle for the Suez Canal, and that the British and the Egyptians are engaged in a shooting war, in effect, although it may be only a minor war, and although only a few persons may be killed.

I wish to point out that the United States, so far as the State Department's policy is concerned, is again taking a step toward destruction, in my opinion, when they tie our destiny to the tail of the diving British colonial kite. The announcement of the Secretary of State of the apparent utter and complete support of the British colonial policy, which we have opposed in our own country since the Revolutionary War, may be a step toward that ominous beginning of a third world war.

The Moslem world, in my opinion, is aroused. The New York Times today, in a rather cavalier editorial—at least it is somewhat cavalier—states that the Secretary of State made a courageous statement and that there were evidences of phony nationalism in the Middle East, which should be interpreted properly in the light of what they mean.

Mr. President, in my opinion the nationalism which is showing itself in the Middle East is not phony, but is deadly serious. Those countries today do not have the military might to defeat England or the United States, but so far as the masses of humanity in the Middle East are concerned, we must reckon with them, if we are to live in a peaceful world in the future and the near future at that.

I believe that our policy in the Middle East has failed. I believe we are taking step after step over there which are leading us, first, closer to a complete alienation of three of four hundred million people and, secondly, are perhaps driving those people day by day into the orbit of Soviet Russia.

I expect to discuss the subject a little bit later, but events are moving rapidly in this world. We recall that it was the stupidity of Yalta that gave communism domination over a third of the population of the earth. It was the mistaken policy in Korea prior to the invasion of South Korea by the North Korean Reds that led to a war which has cost us 100,000 battle causalties and 100,000 nonbattle casualties.

Again, Mr. President, it is the policy on the part of the State Department to support completely British colonialism, which is not only on the way out but which is known and recognized as being on the way out by every country in the world.

I am not anti-British. I believe that the English-speaking people of the world have basic principles in common, such as community of language, community of laws, and community of principles between individuals. I have supported a great many measures which have sustained the British Government. However, there is a difference between sustaining the principles of Anglo-Saxon justice and supporting the principles of colonialism over the world, which violate every principle the American Government has ever stood for. We are treading dangerous ground today, Mr. President.

I do not wish to detain Senators any longer this evening. I am merely stating this matter for the record, and I am pointing out that the path we are taking as a result of the announcement by the Secretary of State, on behalf of the Government of the United States, is a dangerous one indeed; and it is entirely possible that in the years to come we shall rue this decision with a bitterness which we would rather not have to face.

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

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield. Of course, I assured the majority leader that I would not take up much time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I merely wish to observe that a person would have to be blind, indeed, if he was familiar with the situation in Egypt, if he did not see that when a country like Britain has her soldiers scattered all over Egypt and, in the second place, can tell Egypt year after year how much dollar exchange she can have from the United States, and can deny cotton-producing machinery to Egypt, thereby perpetuating her impoverished condition, that situation is bound to break out in ferment at some time. Someone has simply missed the boat in regard to this matter.

Mr. President, this is not a "phony" matter; it is a ferment.

I had an opportunity to find out about it by sitting on a balcony in Cairo, Egypt, in 1945, with a member of the Egyptian Cabinet, and hearing the story. The Egyptians do have some devotion to freedom; and when we ask them what their principal problem is, they will simply shout it to you, and then will point to all the foreign soldiers in their land.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I point out that although there may be a difference between the attitude of the people of this land and the people of the Middle East in respect to the world of today and the world of tomorrow, nevertheless those people are proud and individualistic. We, as Americans, have enjoyed their respect in times past. However, I say that we are dangerously close to losing the respect on their part which has been built up over a period of 150 years. The policies we are following now cannot benefit us; they can only harm us.

I have no intention at the moment of going into a discussion of the merits or demerits of the dispute. I am merely saying that the United States may be putting its finger into a jam jar into which it has no business putting it, and we may be supporting policies which will rise up to condemn us. I shall discuss this matter at greater length in the very near future.

DISTINGUISHED SERVICE AWARDS TO MEMBERS OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE FROM THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, this afternoon, the Department of State made a number of distinguished service awards to members of the Foreign Service and others who have ably served this country, in a civilian capacity, in the fields of diplomacy and foreign relations.

I am proud that four of those awards went to residents of New York. One of those four fine public servants is a resident of Glens Falls; another, of Scarsdale; and two, of New York City.

One of the four, who until recently was American Minister to Hungary, and who arranged the release of William Vogeler, is well known to me personally. His name is Nathaniel P. Davis. He has been in many a troubled and dangerous situation, and has always conducted himself in the highest traditions of the Foreign Service.

These men, who ordinarily receive little public acclaim, and whose chief reward is the satisfaction of a job well done, deserve the gratitude of their countrymen.

I ask unanimous consent that the citations of the four citizens of New York, Mr. Davis, Mr. James C. Dunn, Mr. Howard Fyfe, and George Q. Herrick, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

NATHANIEL P. DAVIS

Having entered the Foreign Service more than 32 years ago as a clerk, Mr. Davis recently ended his long tour of duty with the highest rank a career officer can achieve. In addition to his loyal service in the Department in Berlin, Pernambuco, and London, his experiences during World War II and the execution of his last two assignments as Ambassador to Costa Rica and then as Minister to Hungary have earned him this highest award of departmental recognition. During World War II, Mr. Davis was a prisoner of the Japanese from January 1942 to September 1943 in Manila. Refusing to withdraw under military protection to a safe area, he assumed full responsibility for the welfare and comfort of those Americans who became interned with him. After the war he served again in Manila as counselor of the Embassy with the personal rank of Minister. In 1948, as American Ambassador to Costa Rica, Mr. Davis found himself in the midst of a 6-week revolution which broke out in the spring of 1948 between the government in power and Communist-inspired rebels. At the request of the Costa Rican Government, the diplomatic corps appointed a committee to seek a basis for a general suspension of hostilities. Mr. Davis was on of the most active member of this committee, and at extraordinary personal risk, crossed no-man's land between the Government and rebel forces 20 times. On one trip he was fired upon five times and on another the car in which he traveled, although carrying the United States flag and the flag of the Apostolic Nuncio, was fired upon and damaged. In his last post, as American Minister to Hungary, Mr. Davis added another outstanding achievement to his record, and, upon accepting his resignation, President Truman praised the skill and determination with which he carried to a successful conclusion the long and difficult negotiations for the release of Robert A. Vogeler, an American citizen unjustly imprisoned by the Communist-run Hungarian Government.

Mr. Davis was born in Princeton, N. J., and now lives in Silver Bay, N. Y.

JAMES CLEMENT DUNN

Having assumed his present position as American Ambassador to Italy in 1946, Mr.

Dunn was in one of the most crucial areas of high postwar tension. Italy, suffering materially and spiritually from the ravages of war, could either become another Soviet satellite or could take her place in the community of free, democratic nations. Ambassador Dunn, with energy and zeal, has demonstrated throughout this period the highest diplomatic skill and judgment in representing the United States in Italy. He is now known throughout Italy as the symbol of a friendly United States and Soviet imperialism has lost another potential slave state. Since joining the Foreign Service in 1919, Mr. Dunn has served in Habana, Madrid, Port-au-Prince, Brussels, Haiti, and London, as well as in the Department and on the United States delegation for numerous international conferences. During World War II, his skill and experience were utilized in the successful planning and execution of a number of the highly important political problems which arose in the Allied conduct of the war. He served as Assistant Secretary of State in charge of political affairs from 1944 to 1946, and as the Secretary of State's deputy in the negotiations in the Council of Foreign Ministers of the Treaties of Peace With Italy, Bulgaria, Rumania, and Hungary, Mr. Dunn's immeasurable contribution to the success of American policies in Italy and in every assignment he has held, has contributed to an extraordinary degree to the cause of the free world.

Mr. Dunn was born in Newark, N. J., and considers New York City his home.

HOWARD FYFE

As United States dispatch agent in New York City, Mr. Ffye heads the largest individual freight-forwarding enterprise in the world—responsible for the shipments abroad of the State Department and other Government agencies. Beginning his career in 1911 at the age of 15, Mr. Fyfe literally grew into his present job, which he has held since 1930. Although it would require 50 trips of the Queen Mary to carry the yearly shipments handled by the dispatch agency, Mr. Fyfe has never failed to live up to his creed to the effect that no shipment will miss a boat due to mistake on the part of himself of his staff. This is an outstanding record as the packing cases full of equipment forwarded by Mr. Fyfe and his staff each month, if stacked one on top of another, would make a pile 60 times the height of the Empire State Building. His efficiency and initiative have made him a legendary figure with all Foreign Service personnel. In fact, he has become such an institution among members of the Foreign Service and other Government personnel traveling abroad that he once had a difficult time convincing a Foreign Service officer's wife whom he met at the pier that "Howard Fyfe" was not just a fictitious name used for the office of the United States dispatch agency in New York. An honorary member of the American Foreign Service Association, Mr. Fyfe was born in Brooklyn and has lived in New York all his life.

GEORGE Q. HERRICK

As Chief of the Facilities Branch of the Division of International Broadcasting in New York City, George Q. Herrick was faced with the problem of Soviet jamming of Voice of America broadcasts to the U. S. S. R. Showing a high degree of technical skill, he developed a device and applied it to Voice transmitters. Combining very unorthodox methods with a good deal of ingenuity, Mr. Herrick has substantially increased the level of intelligibility and therefore the level of effectiveness of the radio arm of the campaign of truth. Engineers in this country and abroad originally scoffed at his device. However, experience has proven that Mr. Herrick's ideas were correct.

Mr. Herrick was born in Newburg, N. Y., and his present address is 109 Nelson Road, Scarsdale, N. Y.

SUPPRESSION OF INFORMATION BY GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, recently we have heard a great deal about the lack of open and complete disclosures, not only to the Congress and to congressional committees, but also to the American people, about much which goes on in the departments and agencies of the Government. On the contrary, we have seen made an effort to black out the information concerning the activities of certain executive departments and agencies of the Government.

I think this practice of secrecy is wrong. I wonder what there is to hide, or why it should be hidden.

In this month of October 1951 there appeared in the Farm Journal an editorial entitled "The Honest Do Not Hide." I believe that this timely editorial should be read and heeded by all departments of the Government. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

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

THE HONEST DO NOT HIDE

An ever-present fear constantly terrorizes every person who lives under the Communist tyrannies behind the iron curtain. The same fear pervaded Hitler's Germany and Mussolini's Italy.

At any hour of night or day uniformed officers may appear at any door. The member of the family who is summoned—father, brother, mother, or daughter—has to go instantly with the officers. Where? Usually no one ever learns. Why? That is secret, too. Whether any word will ever be heard, or whether the victim will ever return, no one can learn.

That sort of thing is today common in all Communist countries. The overwhelming power of secret government leaves the individual completely helpless.

Beyond what is essential to military security, the least tinge of secrecy in government is dangerous to the people.

If no other reasons argued against secret actions by public servants, it would be enough that government by the people depends upon free and complete access to information. How can the people decide unless they have all the facts?

Other highly important reasons make secrecy abhorrent. Secrecy offers a convenient cover for corruption. It hides mistakes. And it permits Government's officers to exert power to which they have no right.

In this issue Farm Journal reports the extraordinary facts of the potato marketing agreement referendum which was conducted last year. The Iowa farming firm of McKinley & Sons has challenged the procedure, and unreasonably annoys, embarrasses, and oppresses the United States Government, according to the Federal attorney who is trying to prevent all the facts from coming to light.

The key point in this matter is secrecy. Department of Agriculture officials, making their own rules, kept the counting of ballots secret, and refused to allow growers as observers.

This is a far cry from the trembling Russian who is seized from his home by night. But both situations arise from the same evil—the evil of secrecy in government.

President Truman last week signed an order which directs all agencies of Government to classify as secret certain kinds of information. So far as this protects military secrets, it is customary, and necessary. But this order went far beyond military matters. If permitted to stand it will help to cloak mistakes, hide corruption, and to hold out information vital to fair judgment by the people. Only recently the New York Times published an impressive list of secrecy acts, by the State, Treasury, and Defense Departments, for which obviously no justification could be found, and which concealed facts to which the public was entitled.

The secret diplomacy of the State Department, from Yalta on, has misled Americans, and has built up toward the tragedy of Korea and the costly tensions of today's world.

Secrecy is indispensable to dictatorship and destructive to freedom. Let's not tolerate it in the United States of America.

TREATY OF FRIENDSHIP, COMMERCE, AND NAVIGATION WITH ISRAEL—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUNT in the chair). As in executive session, the Chair lays before the Senate, Executive R, Eighty-second Congress, first session, a treaty of friendship, commerce, and navigation between the United States of America and Israel, together with a protocol and an exchange of notes, relating thereto, signed at Washington on August 23, 1951. Without objection, the injunction of secrecy will be removed from the treaty, and the treaty, together with the President's message, will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the message from the President will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The message from the President is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith a treaty of friendship, commerce, and navigation between the United States of America and Israel, together with a protocol and an exchange of notes, relating thereto, signed at Washington on August 23, 1951.

I transmit also, for the information of the Senate, the report by the Secretary of State with respect to the treaty.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 18, 1951.*

(Enclosures: (1) Report of the Secretary of State; (2) treaty of friendship, commerce, and navigation, with protocol and exchange of notes, signed at Washington on August 23, 1951.)

RECESS

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until tomorrow, at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, October 19, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate October 18 (legislative day of October 1), 1951:

DEPUTY DIRECTOR FOR MUTUAL SECURITY

Richard M. Bissell, Jr., of Massachusetts, to be Deputy Director for Mutual Security.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Ernest A. Tolin, of California, to be United States district judge for the southern district of California, vice Paul J. McCormick, retired.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Edward C. Boyle, of Pennsylvania, to be United States attorney for the western district of Pennsylvania, vice Owen McIntosh Burns, elevated.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Sidney J. Thompson, of Alaska, to be United States marshal for division No. 1, district of Alaska, vice William T. Mahoney, deceased.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 18, 1951

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Almighty God, who art the joy of those who know Thee and the strength of all who hope and aspire and struggle for better todays and better tomorrows, grant that daily we may surrender ourselves faithfully to the sovereignty of Thy wise and holy will.

Inspire us with courage to make a more sincere and daring trial of the Master's spirit and way of life; His faith and love; His humility and obedience; His limitless mercy and forgiveness; His consideration and compassion; His friendship and kindness.

We beseech Thee that in these confused and critical days we may be guided and directed by His spirit to new insights, new ventures of faith, new vistas of outlook, new attitudes, a new sense of social obligation and responsibility, and a new obedience to the God of the Universe.

Hear us in His name. Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Landers, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 341. Joint resolution making appropriations for rehabilitation of flood-stricken areas for the fiscal year 1952, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1912. An act to provide for conveyance of certain land to the city of New Orleans.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 3669, an act to amend the Railroad Retirement Act, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. HILL, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. MORSE, and Mr. IVES to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1335) entitled "An act to readjust size and weight limitations on fourth-class (parcel post) mail."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4386) entitled "An act making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. LANGER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 52–9.

FLOOD REHABILITATION LEGISLATION

Mr. BOLLING. 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 Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, on July 13 the crest of the most disastrous flood in American history, having devastated much of the State of Kansas, smashed into Kansas City on its way to wreak havoc across the State of Missouri. Yesterday the Senate cleared for the President grossly inadequate flood rehabilitation legislation which fell far short of the measure urged by the President on August 20, and contained in my bill, H. R. 5259.

On last Monday every Member of the House and the Senate received from one of America's most distinguished artists, Thomas Hart Benton, a signed lithograph vividly depicting the incredible human suffering that followed the flood. In the past few days I have salvaged from the trash heap of the House of Representatives more than a dozen of these lithographs. A number of Members have kindly given me their copies. I now appeal to all Members who can or will to forward their Benton lithographs to my office so that these as well as those which I already have may be sold to the highest bidder in an auction at Kansas City—the total proceeds to go to relieve the suffering of flood victims.

The Congress as a whole has not seen fit to pass a measure adequate to the needs of the flood disaster. Through this auction of the Benton lithographs perhaps at least an infinitesimal fraction of the needs of thousands of suffering people can be met.

Just this morning I received the following telegram from Mr. Benton:

DEAR DICK: Well, I failed. But remind your conferees of the Eighty-second Congress that when they adjourn and go home to their clean houses and lay down in their clean beds where no rotting stinks tighten their nostrils that a lot of poor flood-wrecked Americans out here are not blessing their luck. Billions to spend but not a cent for a humane precedent should be the motto of the Eighty-second.

THOMAS H. BENTON.

TEXTILE INDUSTRY UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. BRYSON. 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 South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, through the press it appears that the United Textile Workers Union of America, an affiliate of the CIO, has filed a protest with the National Production Authority against the erection of new textile plants in the South. It is contended that there is widespread unemployment in the textile industry. Attached hereto is a clipping from a recent issue of my home town paper denying such a charge.

While it is true that there has been an unprecedented growth in the textile industry in our section of the country, we are continuing to welcome industries calculated to give more and better employment to our people.

The expansion of this industry in South Carolina and our neighboring States is based on a sound foundation—nearness to raw materials, lower construction and other costs, and, not least, available willing workers released from agriculture and where there had been underemployment in the past.

It seems strange that the spokesman for the Textile Workers Union of America should be presumptuous enough to speak for our greatest industry. Strange, indeed, and regrettable is the fact that a legitimate industry, furnishing gainful employment to so large a number of American citizens as does the textile industry, should have to consult any labor union as to when and where it would invest its money and construct its plants.

To be sure, if scarce essential materials are required for the construction of defense plants anywhere in the country, scrupulous consideration should be given thereto to the end that our defense program is given first claim on such materials.

As in the past, we of the South shall continue to welcome new and additional industries.

SOUTH CAROLINA LEADS IN TEXTILE GAIN

South Carolina today is leading 8 southeastern States in textile employment gains so far this year with a 3,700 worker increase, Brunswick A. Bragdon of Atlanta, regional director of labor statistics, said today.

However, employment in the textile industry in the southeast declined approximately 1,100 in August as compared to July of this year.

Mr. Bragdon said principal reasons for the continued declining employment are lack of orders resulting in the temporary closing of some mills and heavy inventories. North Carolina and Virginia reported the largest declines—1,100 each.

Over-all factory employment in this State during August was 215,300—a 1,900 increase over July. Average number of hours worked per week was 38.5 at an average of $1.18 per hour. Average weekly wages during the

period was $45.39 as compared to $46.18 during July.

Workers put in 39 hours per week in July at a $1.10 per hour.

FILING OF CONFERENCE REPORTS ON S. 1046, S. 355, AND S. 622

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight tonight to file conference reports on the bills S. 1046, to readjust postal rates; S. 355, to adjust the salaries of postmasters, supervisors, and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department; and S. 622, to increase the basic rates of compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

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

There was no objection.

MOISANT AIRPORT, NEW ORLEANS

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 4979) to provide for the conveyance of certain land to the city of New Orleans and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

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

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. Mr. Speaker, in 1944 and 1945, it was necessary for the Government to obtain some land adjacent to the International Moisant Airport at New Orleans. The Government needed to acquire this land and to develop it because of certain flight hazards, which existed at the airport. The Government made an agreement with the city of New Orleans that if they would furnish $300,000 for the purchase price of this land, the Government would convey title to the city of New Orleans, and the city of New Orleans would lease the property back to the Government. The city of New Orleans has paid the money. The deed from the Government has never been executed to the city of New Orleans. This bill is to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to execute a deed to the City of New Orleans, in conformity with the agreement and moral obligation which the Government owes the city of New Orleans.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Why would special legislation be necessary?

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. According to the report, if a deed were made by the Secretary of the Air Force to the city of New Orleans without authorization from the Congress, under existing law it would have to be made with certain restrictions, which was not a part of the agreement with the city of New Orleans. The city of New Orleans is entitled to a fee simple deed, under the agreement made with the Government at the time this land was acquired.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. They put in all the money?

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. They put in all the money.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusets. And this bill has a unanimous report from the gentleman's committee?

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. It has a unanimous report from the Armed Services Committee of the House.

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

Mr. BROOKS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, this bill completes an agreement that has already been set up. It does require authorization by the Congress. An identical bill was passed yesterday by the Senate.

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

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Defense is authorized and directed to convey to the city of New Orleans, without consideration, all of the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to all land acquired by the United States, with funds made available by the city of New Orleans, for the purposes of expansion of and removal of flight hazards at Moisant International Airport, consisting of 376$\frac{3}{100}$ acres more or less.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 3, strike out "Secretary of Defense" and insert "Secretary of the Air Force."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1912) to provide for conveyance of certain land to the city of New Orleans, which is exactly similar to the bill just passed, H. R. 4979, and that it be substituted therefor.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the Senate bill?

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Air Force is authorized and directed to convey to the city of New Orleans, without consideration, all of the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to all land acquired by the United States, with funds made available by the city of New Orleans, for the purpose of expansion of and removal of flight hazards at Moisant International Airport, consisting of three hundred and seventy-six and three one-hundredths acres, more or less:

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

By unanimous consent, the proceedings by which the bill H. R. 4979 was passed were vacated and that bill laid on the table.

WEAR A HAT

Mr. MORANO. 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 Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of National Hat Week, being observed from October 13 to October 20, I would like to say a few words in support of a grand old custom, the wearing of hats. I represent the district of Fairfield County, Conn., including the towns of Norwalk and Danbury—the hat centers of the world, where the bareheaded male traversing the streets commands the disdain reserved in other towns for the absent-minded gentleman who boards the streetcar minus his trousers. To support this great and ancient industry, I particularly urge my fellow Members of Congress to wear a hat.

The hat has become an important item in America today. Band Leader Ted Lewis, whose trade-mark is an old topper, has this battered chapeau insured for $50,000. The other night Mr. Lewis, whose slogan is "Is everybody happy?" was considerably saddened when his old topper disappeared and he was forced to perform without it for the first time in 17 years. I am happy that subsequently Mr. Lewis recovered his hat atop a night-club chandelier, where, possibly it became lodged while floating on air over the distinction of the Nation's week-long dedication. However, I do believe that Mr. Lewis, in keeping his old topper for some 17 years, is setting a bad example and is indirectly the cause of much consternation in American homes, and threatens the future of the hatting industry.

Imagine the annual autumn scene in homes throughout the country. That inevitable day when the summer breeze gives way to the brisk gusts of autumn and the head of the house takes out his old fedora. There is a shrill scream from the kitchen, and while the breakfast eggs go up in smoke the flabbergasted wife utters her annual, "Darling, you can't wear that old mangy hat another day. Go down to the store today and get yourself a nice, new gray fedora."

In previous years the husband, following the tradition set as far back as the Garden of Eden, acquiesced. Everybody—including the wife, the storekeeper, and the Danbury hatters—was happy. The economy of the Nation received a shot in the arm. The husband received a surge of confidence from his new dashing appearance. The wife had grounds for purchasing a new fall hat of her own. The result, to paraphrase Mr. Lewis' slogan, everybody was happy.

Now when exhortations are made to trade in the battered but comfortable fedora for the new fall chapeau, friend husband can point to Ted Lewis and say, "Look at him. A famous band leader making all kinds of money, and he's been wearing the same old battered top hat for the past 17 years."

I am sure the Danbury and Norwalk hatters will be pleased to provide Mr. Lewis with a brand new hat. Even a top hat.

UNETHICAL PRACTICES

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, a Senate committee took steps yesterday toward stopping the practice of Government employees from engaging in unethical activities to get headlines and for personal gain. Such action is timely, for only last Monday night Downey Rice, a senatorial staff member, spoke in Reading, Pa., under conditions which give rise to suspicion and distrust of his work during the crime probe in that city.

The political rally at which Rice spoke was sponsored by a so-called citizens' committee which is financed by special interests which are far more concerned about destroying liberal legislation than they are about wiping out organized crime.

Organized crime is a serious threat and an evil that should be destroyed, but probes that are nothing more than smokescreens to cover unethical and immoral activities of selfish interests cannot be effective in fighting crime syndicates.

Mr. Rice is the second member of the Reading crime probe staff to come under suspicion. Mr. R. P. S. McDonnell, who headed the Reading investigation, also committed acts which have thrown suspicion on the probers. McDonnell was recently arrested in Washington on a charge of threatening a woman telephone operator and he now awaits a mental test. According to a Washington newspaper report, McDonnell was released as a mental patient in 1950 even before he was selected to head the Reading probe. Evidently he was out long enough to head a crime probe in my city.

There are many reasons to believe that McDonnell was influenced by local elements in a manner which was not only unethical and immoral but which gives encouragement to the crime syndicates to continue their corrupt practices.

Mr. Speaker, I am making a report on the probe in the Appendix of the RECORD which I hope all Members of the House will take time to read.

It appears to me that we are reaching the point of immorality where it becomes necessary to start probing the probers.

STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS OF REFUGEES AND EXPELLEES

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 469) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas the Committee on the Judiciary under the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 has been given jurisdiction as a standing committee over legislation pertaining to immigration and naturalization; and

Whereas in the course of activities conducted in pursuance of section 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, it has been ascertained by the committee that the continuing influx of new refugees tends to aggravate the problem of Europe's surplus population; and

Whereas the presence of over 10,000,000 refugees and "expellees" in the western zones of occupation in Germany and Austria, in addition to the problem of the surplus of population in Italy and in Greece, is resulting in continuous pressure upon the very foundations of the United States immigration system; and

Whereas the International Refugee Organization is to terminate its operations on December 31, 1951; and

Whereas the above-outlined problems, in addition to considerable expense for the American taxpayer, involve a heavy burden for the devastated countries of Europe which the United States is assisting to rehabilitate, and a deterrent to a peaceful solution to Europe's economic and social difficulties; and

Whereas there is, therefore, an obvious need for a broad plan of international cooperation which would provide for a satisfactory solution of this emergency and for relieving the American economy of the expenditures involved: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, acting by duly authorized subcommittee or subcommittees appointed by the chairman of the said Committee on the Judiciary, is authorized and directed to conduct such studies and investigations relating to matters coming within the purview of the preamble of this resolution as will be deemed appropriate by the committee.

SEC. 2. That upon the completion of such studies and investigations as provided for in section 1 of this resolution, but not later than on April 1, 1952, it shall be the duty of the committee to submit to the House of Representatives a report for appropriate legislative action with such recommendations as may be deemed desirable by the committee.

SEC. 3. That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any subcommittee or subcommittees thereof as designated by its chairman, may sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within or without the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings and to conduct such investigations as it deems necessary.

SEC. 4. That in making such studies and investigations and in holding such hearings as provided for in section 3 of this resolution, the committee is authorized to include the services and travel of the requisite staff to accompany the committee or its subdivisions on such study missions, investigations, and hearings within the United States or abroad; and to procure the advice and assistance of such officials of the Federal Government as deemed necessary by its chairman.

Mr. WALTER (interrupting the reading of the resolution). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the resolution be dispensed with and that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, for the benefit of the House I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania should make an explanation of just what this resolution is.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, this resolution provides for the continuation of authority given by the House during the last Congress to investigate the problem of the resettlement of Europe's surplus populations, particularly of the 8,000,000 expellees and refugees that are now in the British and American zones of Germany.

On about the 10th of November an international conference will be held in France, attended by the immigrant-receiving countries and the countries affected by this problem for the purpose of trying to find places throughout the world for the resettlement of these people. The United States, of course, cannot and will not receive any appreciable number of them, and our immigration quotas will not be increased. But, for the purpose of reporting to the Congress the need for legislation enabling an international solution of the surplus population problem, the Committee on the Judiciary feels that its members should attend this conference.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will this conference take in the Arabs who were driven out of their homeland?

Mr. WALTER. No. This new special and temporary organization will consist of 21 countries, countries, for example, like Australia, which had indicated a willingness to accept 400,000 European people within the next 2 years, and Canada, which will take a very large number of them, as well as several Latin-American countries willing to receive additional manpower and new settlers. Our participation in this movement will consist chiefly in the furnishing of surplus shipping. The immigrant-receiving and emigrating-sending countries are the ones that are going to meet for the purpose of trying to find a place for at least 5,000,000 of these people, and work out operational arrangements.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Then it will not take in the refugees that have come into Turkey from Bulgaria or the Arab refugees, of which there are a million?

Mr. WALTER. I do not know whether the agenda will include those people or not. According to my information, it will not.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. MARTIN or Massachusetts. I understand this committee will be a subcommittee of a regular committee of the House that handles these problems?

Mr. WALTER. Yes.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. How many is it proposed to send to this conference?

Mr. WALTER. There will be five members of the subcommitee of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. GROSS. What is the need for the United States attending this conference and spending money to send a delegation over to Paris to attend this conference? Cannot these countries tell the United States how many people they can take without the United States expending more thousands of dollars to send people all over the world?

Mr. WALTER. As a matter of fact, the United States Congress has already appropriated $10,000,000 for the purpose of continuing the displaced-persons program, the program with respect to the expellees and for the purpose of participating in the new resettlement venture

for 1 year. At the expiration of 1 year the taxpayers of the United States will be relieved of at least a part of the burden imposed on them now in the British and American zones of Germany where we are feeding these helpless victims of Communist persecution.

Mr. GROSS. But I renew my question: Why cannot these countries tell us how many they can take and go ahead and take them?

Mr. WALTER. Of course, it is necessary for those 21 nations to sit down together and work out the entire program. It is not as simple as that. We had hoped that the conference would be held in Washington, but it is going to be held in France, because it will be at the same time that the United Nations Assembly will meet in Paris, and commitments can be made for that reason by high-ranking representatives of the governments that concern themselves with an attempt to work out a solution of this problem.

Mr. GROSS. May I ask the gentleman why the State Department cannot handle this with our constituted authorities already in France?

Mr. WALTER. Well, the State Department, of course, will be represented. I think Mr. George Warren has already been designated as one of the representatives of our Government, and it is the hope of the State Department that the Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization will participate, because we have done much work on the displaced-persons program and many phases of that program, as you know, have not expired, and it will actually fit into this other program.

Mr. GROSS. I will say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that it seems to me it is about time, if we are interested in saving the taxpayers of this country any money, that we stop sending people all over the world, on all kinds of trips, and for all purposes. I do not know how we are ever going to save the taxpayers of this country any money if we are going to continue to spend thousands and hundreds of thousands of dollars on various trips, some of them purely junkets. It is about time it is stopped.

Mr. WALTER. It seems to me that this will result in an eventual saving, because the few thousand dollars required for this trip will be well expended if we can point the way toward getting rid of those thousands and millions of people who have been expelled from behind the iron curtain.

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

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

Mr. GRAHAM. As a matter of fact, in the last analysis, this means that those countries, like Australia and others who are willing to take a large number, will relieve us, and therefore our quotas will not be encroached upon to that extent. Secondly, it means that we will be able to protect those people who have been driven out, and the little expense which is attendant upon the four or five men who will attend that conference will be almost infinitesimal as contrasted with the tremendous sum we will save.

Mr. WALTER. There is no question about that. I think the gentleman has in mind the case of the Mennonites from my State who have resettled 500 Mennonite families in Uruguay at no cost to the United States, except shipping expenses. Until they were sent to Uruguay, those 500 people were on the relief rolls in Germany, supported by the taxpayers of the United States.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, why cannot the State Department handle that sort of thing?

Mr. WALTER. Of course they want our participation since we will have to legislate.

Mr. GROSS. That is what I was afraid of.

Mr. WALTER. And it may well be that the program ought to be continued and expanded if it is without much expense to the United States and without bringing any appreciable number of immigrants to the United States.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RHODA AKIKO NISHIYAMA

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1236) for the relief of Rhoda Akiko Nishiyama, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Line 6, strike out all after "States," down to and including "laws" in line 7, and insert "may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if otherwise admissible under the immigration laws."

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

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is this one that comes in under the regular quota?

Mr. WALTER. The Senate amended the House bill by changing the status of a 3-year old immigrant from a quota immigrant to that of a nonquota immigrant.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. What are the extenuating circumstances?

Mr. WALTER. The child is the daughter of an American mother and an alien father, who is in the United States under student status. We passed the bill authorizing the admission of the child as a quota immigrant and the Senate amended it by changing its status from quota to nonquota immigrant.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT OF FLOOD CONTROL ACT OF 1946

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 4450) to amend section 10 of the Flood Control Act of 1946.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

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

Mr. TRIMBLE. This bill is identical with Senate bill 1622, which has for its purpose the plugging of the gap in the levees that are already built on the White River.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subparagraph (q) under the subtitle Lower Mississippi River in section 10 of the Flood Control Act of 1946 (Public Law 526, 79th Cong.) is hereby amended by inserting after the words "St. Francis River Basin" a comma and the words "the White River backwater area."

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

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1622) to amend section 10 of the Flood Control Act of 1946, which is identical with the bill just passed.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subparagraph (q) under the subtitle "Lower Mississippi River" in section 10 of the Flood Control Act of 1946 (Public Law 526, 79th Cong.), is hereby amended by inserting after the words "Saint Francis River Basin" a comma and the words "the White River Backwater Area."

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

The proceedings by which the bill H. R. 4450 was passed were vacated, and the bill was laid on the table.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Private Calendar.

ROBERT E. VIGUS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3219) to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Robert E. Vigus.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas, to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Robert E. Vigus, of Wichita Falls, Tex., for alleged personal injuries sustained as a result of an injection of 25 percent silver nitrate instead of a one-fourth of 1 percent in the Tokyo Army Hospital, Tokyo, Japan, on June 2, 1950.

SEC. 2. Suit upon such claim may be instituted at any time within 1 year after the enactment of this act, notwithstanding the

lapse of time or any statute of limitation. Proceedings for the determination of such claim, appeals therefrom, and payment of any judgment thereon, shall be in the same manner as in the cases over which such court has jurisdiction under the provisions of section 1346 of title 28 of the United States Code.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 8, strike out "Tokyo Army" and insert "One Hundred and Seventy-second Station."

Page 1, line 10, strike out "Tokyo" and insert "Sendai."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

MAUDE S. BURMAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2962) for the relief of the widow of Frank Winfield Burman, lieutenant, United States Naval Reserve.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That Lt. Frank Winfield Burman, United States Naval Reserve, shall, prior to his death on July 14, 1942, be deemed to have applied for and been granted national service life insurance in the sum of $10,000, payable upon death to his widow, Maude S. Burman, in the manner provided for in title I, section 601, subsection (h), of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 (54 Stat. 1008), as amended (38 U. S. C., sec. 802h): *Provided*, That no part of an amount appropriated for the purpose of this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Maude S. Burman."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ERTOGROUL OSMAN AND MEHMED FAHREDDIN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 57) for the relief of Ertogroul Osman and Mehmed Fahreddin.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Ertogroul Osman and Mehmed Fahreddin 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-control officer to deduct two numbers from the appropriate quotas for the first year that such quotas are available.

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

NOUHAD ANN KHOURY

The Clerk called the bill (S. 118) for the relief of Nouhad Ann Khoury.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws Nouhad Ann Khoury 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 fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

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

JESUS JUAN LLANDERAL

The Clerk called the bill (S. 210) authorizing the naturalization of Jesus Juan Llanderal.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Jesus Juan Llanderal 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 fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "An act for the relief of Jesus Juan Llanderal."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MOY CHIN SHEE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 519) for the relief of Moy Chin Shee.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, Moy Chin Shee, a former resident of the United States and the mother of seven United States citizen children, shall be deemed to be a returning resident under the provisions of section 4 (b) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, if otherwise admissible to the United States.

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

ROBERT JOSE TORIBIO

The Clerk called the bill (S. 575) for the relief of Robert Jose Toribio.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, the minor child, Robert Jose Toribio, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Zacarias Toribio, citizens of the United States.

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

EMMA BURR

The Clerk called the bill (S. 582) for the relief of Emma Burr.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of the eleventh category, section 3, of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended, Emma Burr may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws.

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

HANS LENK

The Clerk called the bill (S. 635) for the relief of Hans Lenk.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Hans Lenk 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: *Provided*, That there be given a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, in such amount and containing such conditions as he may prescribe, to the United States and to all States, Territories, counties, towns, municipalities, and districts thereof holding the United States and all States, Territories, counties, towns, municipalities, and districts thereof harmless against Hans Lenk becoming a public charge.

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

DR. ANTHONY M. OPISSO

The Clerk called the bill (S. 775) for the relief of Dr. Anthony M. Opisso.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Dr. Anthony M. Opisso 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 fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

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

DR. CHARLES GORDON RENNICK SELL

The Clerk called the bill (S. 954) for the relief of Dr. Charles Gordon Rennick Sell.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Dr. Charles Gordon Rennick Sell, who was born in India of British parents, shall be deemed to have been born in Great Britain.

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

MYRTLE HARDING

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1048) for the relief of Myrtle Harding.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the eleventh category of section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended, Myrtle Harding may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws.

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

VERA OUMANCOFF

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1274) for the relief of Vera Oumancoff.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Vera Oumancoff 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 fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

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

MRS. MARIE Y. MUELLER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1436) for the relief of Mrs. Marie Y. Mueller.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General is authorized and directed to discontinue any deportation proceedings and to cancel any outstanding order and warrant of deportation, warrant of arrest, and bond, which may have been issued in the case of Mrs. Marie Y. Mueller, of Spokane, Wash. The said Mrs. Marie Y. Mueller, who has resided in the United States since 1933, shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or such warrants and order have issued.

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding any provision of the immigration laws, the said Mrs. Marie Y. Mueller shall be considered as having been lawfully admitted into the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act upon the payment by her of the visa fee of $10 and the head tax of $8.

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

CATHY DANA BESSER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1640) for the relief of Cathy Dana Besser.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, and notwithstanding any provisions of law excluding persons of races ineligible to citizenship from admission to the United States, the minor child, Cathy Dana Besser, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Staff Sgt. and Mrs. Gerald D. Besser, citizens of the United States.

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

SHARON A. GATES

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2007) for the relief of Sharon A. Gates.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, the minor child, Sharon A. Gates, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Maj. and Mrs. William M. Gates, citizens of the United States.

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

LEO KIEVE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2027) for the relief of Leo Kieve.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That Leo Kieve, a United States citizen veteran of World War II, shall not be held to have lost United States citizenship under any of the provisions of the Nationality Act of 1940 providing for loss of citizenship through continuous residence in a foreign state: *Provided*, That the said Leo Kieve returns to the United States for permanent residence within a period of 1 year following the effective date of this act.

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

CINDY EBERHARDT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 800) for the relief of Cindy Eberhardt.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, solely for the purpose of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, and notwithstanding any provisions excluding from admission to the United States persons of races ineligible to citizenship, Cindy Eberhardt, a minor Japanese child, shall be considered the alien natural-born daughter of Marjorie M. Eberhardt.

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

DR. MANUEL J. CASAS AND MRS. JULIA NAKPIL CASAS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 827) for the relief of Dr. Manuel J. Casas and Mrs. Julia Nakpil Casas.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Dr. Manuel J. Casas and Mrs. Julia Nakpil Casas, who entered the United States for a temporary period, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of their last entry. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quoa control officer to make appropriate deduction of two numbers from the proper immigration quota or quotas.

With the following committee amendment:

Page, 1, line 3, strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Dr. Manuel J. Casas and Mrs. Julia Nakpil Casas 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-control officer to deduct two numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

MARIA SZENTGYORGI MAYER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1828) for the relief of Maria Szentgyorgi Mayer.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Maria Szentgyorgyi Mayer shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

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

JAMES YAO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1857) for the relief of James Yao.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, James Yao 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 the payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the number of displaced persons who shall be granted the status of permanent residence pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act, as amended (62 Stat. 1011; 64 Stat. 219; 50 U. S. C. App. 1953).

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

LOUIS E. GABEL

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1970) for the relief of Louis E. Gabel.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not

otherwise appropriated, to Louis E. Gabel, an individual trading as Gabel Construction Co., of Orlando, Fla., the sum of $24,916.71 in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for uncompensated losses sustained by him under contract No. NOY-9336, for the construction of a water-softening plant at Florida City, Fla., for the Navy yard at Key West, Fla., as a result of a delay in receiving materials and equipment provided for in said contract: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

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

KENNETH McRIGHT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1161) for the relief of Kenneth McRight.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Kenneth McRight, Henryetta, Okla., the sum of $10,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Kenneth McRight against the United States arising out of the permanent injuries sustained by him in Dallas, Tex., on April 13, 1950, when he was shot by an insane member of the United States Army: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

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

STAMEY CONSTRUCTION CO. AND/OR THE OKLAHOMA PAVING CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1267) to reimburse the Stamey Construction Co. and/or the Oklahoma Paving Co., as their interests appear.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the District Court of the Western District of Oklahoma to hear, determine, and render findings of fact as to the amount of loss, if any, sustained by Stamey Construction Co., Hutchinson, Kans., and/or Oklahoma Paving Co., Oklahoma City, Okla., as their interests appear, Reclamation Bureau contract under Schedule of Specifications No. 1374, Altus project, Oklahoma, arising out of or attributable to the alleged failure of the Government to supply materials as provided for in said contract, and to render judgment upon the merits of such claim: *Provided*, That the passage of this act shall not be construed as an inference of liability on the part of the Government of the United States. Such judgment shall be subject to appeal by either party pursuant to title 28, United States Code, section 1291, and action thereon by the court of appeals may be reviewed pursuant to title 28, United States Code, section 1254.

SEC. 2. If the court shall enter a final judgment in favor of the claimant, the court shall cause such findings and judgment to be certified to the Secretary of the Treasury, who is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money not otherwise appropriated, the amount set forth in said findings and judgment to the Stamey Construction Co. and the Oklahoma Paving Co., as their interests may appear.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "findings of fact as to the amount of loss" and insert in lieu thereof "judgment according to law with respect to the loss."

Page 1, line 9, after the word "appear" insert "under."

Page 1, line 10, strike out "under."

Page 2, line 2, strike out the words "and to render judgment upon the merits of such claim."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

MRS. THELMA A. NOLEN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2662) for the relief of Mrs. Thelma A. Nolen.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Thelma A. Nolen the sum of $10,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Mrs. Thelma A. Nolen against the United States on account of personal injuries sustained by her when the automobile in which she was riding was struck by a Government vehicle in Fuerth, Bavaria, May 29, 1950: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$10,000" and insert "$5,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

MRS. ORINDA JOSEPHINE QUIGLEY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3375) for the relief of Mrs. Orinda Josephine Quigley.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated to Mrs. Orinda Josephine Quigley, Dayton, Ohio, the sum of $5,000. Payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Mrs. Orinda Josephine Quigley against the United States for payment of United States Government life insurance benefits. The late husband of the said Mrs. Orinda Josephine Quigley, Lt. Robert Harry Quigley, applied for such insurance on April 4, 1940, and paid premiums therefor, but no benefits have been paid on such insurance: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

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

MRS. ALBERTA S. ROZANSKI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4558) for the relief of Mrs. Alberta S. Rozanski.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the national service life insurance (FV 121 71 65, V 124 19 85) granted in the amount of $10,000 to the late Dr. Frank S. Rozanski, effective January 26, 1951, shall be held and considered to have been in full force and effect at the time of his death on March 5, 1951, and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized and directed to pay such insurance to Mrs. Alberta S. Rozanski, widow of the said Dr. Frank S. Rozanski and designated beneficiary of such insurance.

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

MARY GEMMA KAWAMURA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1974) for the relief of Mary Gemma Kawamura.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That Mary Gemma Kawamura, of Minneapolis, Minn., if found otherwise admissible to citizenship, may be naturalized under this act upon compliance with all the requirements of the naturalization laws, except that—

(a) The provisions of section 303 of the Nationality Act of 1940 (U. S. C., title 8, sec. 703), relating to racial limitations, shall not apply to the said Mary Gemma Kawamura; and

(b) The petition for citizenship shall be filed with any court having naturalization jurisdiction prior to the expiration of 4 months immediately following the date of enactment of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That, in the administration of the naturalization laws, section 303 of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended (8 U. S. C., sec. 703), shall not apply to Mary Gemma Kawamura, who was born in Japan on January 7, 1918, and brought to the United States on July 20, 1920."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALICE IBRAHIM HANNAN IBRAHIM ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2593) for the relief of Alice Ibrahim Hannan Ibrahim, Yacoub Mayouf Muhammad Elliyan, Afifeh Michail Jiries Issa Matar, Ellen Issa Zakaria, Ruth Naomi Schut, and Roseileen Schut.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate bill (S. 839) for the relief of Alice Ibrahim Hannan Ibrahim, Ellen Issa Zakaria, Ruth Naomi Schut, and Roseileen Schut, be substitued for the House bill.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Alice Ibrahim Hannan Ibrahim, 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-control officer to deduct the required number from the appropriate quota or quotas for the first year that such quota or quotas are available: *Provided*, That there be given a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, in such amount and containing such conditions as he may prescribe, to the United States and to all States, Territories, counties, towns, municipalities, and districts thereof holding the United States and all States, Territories, counties, towns, municipalities, and districts thereof harmless against Alice Ibrahim Hannan Ibrahim, Ellen Issa Zakaria, Ruth Naomi Schut, and Roseileen Schut becoming public charges.

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

ANNELIESE BARBARA VOLLRATH AND MRS. MARGARETE ELISE VOLLRATH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2775) for the relief of Anneliese Barbara Vollrath and Mrs. Margarete Elise Vollrath.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Anneliese Barbara Vollrath and Mrs. Margarete Elise Vollrath 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 the payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the number of displaced persons who shall be granted the status of permanent residence pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act, as amended (62 Stat. 1011; 64 Stat. 219; 50 U. S. C. 1953).

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

RUDOLF BING AND NINA BING

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2833) for the relief of Rudolf Bing and Nina Bing.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Rudolf Bing and his wife, Nina Bing, 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-control officer to deduct two numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

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

LOUIS CAMPBELL BOYD

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3569) for the relief of Louis Campbell Boyd.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purpose of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, the minor child, Louis Campbell Boyd, shall be held and considered to be the natural born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Cecil H. Boyd, citizens of the United States.

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

DR. ALEXANDER SYMEONIDIS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3600) for the relief of Dr. Alexander Symeonidis.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the laws relating to immigration and naturalization the alien, Dr. Alexander Symeonidis, a lawful resident of the United States, shall be held and considered to have resided in the United States for 5 years prior to the date of the enactment of this act.

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

DAVID YEH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3668) for the relief of David Yeh.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, the provisions of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, shall be held to be applicable to the alien David Yeh, the minor, unmarried child of Jun Sun and Chang Shang Wen Yeh, permanent residents of the United States.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That notwithstanding the provisions of section 2 of the Act of December 17, 1923, as amended (8 U. S. C. 212 (a)), David Yeh, the minor, unmarried child of Jun Sun and Chang Shang Wen Yeh may be admitted to the United States as a preferential quota immigrant in accordance with section 6 (a) (2) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, if he is otherwise admissible to the United States."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

ERLINDA MARIA BOWERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3877) for the relief of Erlinda Maria Bowers.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of section 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, the minor child, Erlinda Maria Bowers, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Corporal Roy G. Bowers, a citizen of the United States.

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

ESTHER PARK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3971) for the relief of Esther Park.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and nationality laws, section 303 of the Nationality Act of 1940 shall not be held applicable to Esther Park, who was born in Korea on October 18, 1902, and brought to the United States in 1904.

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

HAI SOON LEE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3985) for the relief of Hai Soon Lee.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the naturalization laws, section 303 of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended (8 U. S. C., sec. 703), shall not apply to Hai Soon Lee, wife of Han Ken Lee, a citizen of the United States.

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

CAROLINE WU

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4130) for the relief of Caroline Wu.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, the provisions of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, shall be held to be applicable to the alien, Caroline Wu, the minor, unmarried child of Mrs. Lonn Gay Wu, a citizen of the United States.

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

time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRANCESCO FRATALIA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4876) for the relief of Francesco Fratalia.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of the eleventh category of section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended, Francesco Fratalia may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws.

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

MARGHERITA CAROLI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4877) for the relief of Mrs. Margherita Caroli.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That Mrs. Margherita Caroli, who lost United States citizenship under the provisions of section 401 (a) of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended, may be naturalized by taking, prior to 1 year after the effective date of this act, before any diplomatic or consular officer of the United States abroad, the oaths prescribed by section 335 of the said act. From and after naturalization under this act, the said Mrs. Margherita Caroli shall have the same citizenship status as that which existed immediately prior to its loss.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That in the administration of the immigration laws, Mrs. Margherita Caroli may be admitted to the United States as a nonquota immigrant in accordance with section 4 (b) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, if otherwise admissible to the United States."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

MRS. DORA TROOST

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5397) for the relief of Mrs. Dora Troost.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That Mrs. Dora Troost, a former naturalized citizen of the United States, who lost her United States citizenship under section 404 (b) of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended, may be naturalized as a citizen of the United States by taking, not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this act, before any court referred to in section 301 (a) of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended, or before any diplomatic or consular officer of the United States abroad, the oaths prescribed by section 335 of such act. From and after naturalization under this act, the said Mrs. Dora Troost shall have the same citizenship status as that which existed immediately prior to its loss.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That Mrs. Dora Troost, shall not be held to have lost United States citizenship under any of the provisions of the Nationality Act of 1940 providing for loss of citizenship through continuous residence in a foreign state: *Provided*, That the said Mrs. Dora Troost returns to the United States for permanent residence within a period of 1 year following the effective date of this act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

KEDDIE RESORT, INC.

The Clerk called House Resolution 461, providing for sending to the United States Court of Claims the bill (H. R. 4290) for the relief of Keddie Resort, Inc.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the House resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the bill (H. R. 4290) entitled "A bill for the relief of Keddie Resort, Inc.," together with all accompanying papers, is hereby referred to the United States Court of Claims pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code; and said court shall proceed expeditiously with the same in accordance with the provisions of said sections and report to the House, at the earliest practicable date, giving such findings of fact and conclusions thereon as shall be sufficient to inform the Congress of the nature and character of the demand, as a claim legal or equitable, against the United States, and the amount, if any, legally or equitably due from the United States to the claimant.

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

REVENUE ACT OF 1951

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill H. R. 4473, the Revenue Act of 1951.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and of course I shall not, can the gentleman tell us when it is expected to bring the report up?

The SPEAKER. Tomorrow.

Mr. COOPER. My understanding is that it will be brought up tomorrow. The purpose of getting this consent request is so that it may be in order tomorrow.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Has the report been agreed upon?

Mr. COOPER. The conference report has been completed and the report has been signed.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I wonder if the gentleman would care to tell us if there were any changes made in the bill?

Mr. COOPER. Yes; there were several changes made, and we will try to cover that by the time the conference report is filed.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Would the gentleman care to say what they were at this time?

Mr. COOPER. I would not be prepared to list all of them at this time.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I did not know but what the gentleman might give us some of the high lights.

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

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING OCTOBER 19 AND PROGRAM

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet tomorrow at 11 o'clock.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will that enable us to get through Saturday night by 12 o'clock?

Mr. McCORMACK. The hope that I expressed day before yesterday with the assurance that I would do everything I could to have it carried into effect has increased materially. I cannot make a definite statement except that it is strengthened; and if the tax conference report is agreed to tomorrow, it looks very, very good.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I understand, then, that the tax conference report will be before the House tomorrow; is that right?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes, tomorrow we will consider the conference report on the tax bill.

Then there are three other conference reports, the postal rate readjustment bill, the postal employees, postmasters, and supervisors' salary bill; and the salary bill for the Federal classified employees.

There is also a possibility of the supplemental bill that is in conference being agreed to. There may be others besides those, but I can definitely say there will be four conference reports.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. But the gentleman is not programing anything beyond the conference reports at this time?

Mr. McCORMACK. There is nothing else.

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

There was no objection.

UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY SESQUICENTENNIAL

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 463, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 285) to authorize appropriate participation by the United States in commemoration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the establishment of the United States Military Academy. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the joint resolution and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the joint resolution shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the joint resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the joint resolution to the House

with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution makes in order the consideration of House Joint Resolution 285 which would authorize appropriate participation by the United States in commemoration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the establishment of the United States Military Academy. The Committee on Rules considered this resolution and reported the rule to the House for its consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH].

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I think that the Members of the House ought to know a little bit about this particular resolution. We are now considering a resolution making in order the consideration of House Joint Resolution 285. House Joint Resolution 285 authorizes an appropriation of $95,000 for the purpose of putting on a sesquicentennial celebration at West Point Military Academy, N. Y. The original bill was on the Consent Calendar. I objected to the consideration of the legislation on the Consent Calendar. Subsequently, it was stricken from the calendar by three objections. It is now before us, or will shortly be before us, in the form of House Joint Resolution 285.

Mr. Speaker, my only question in reference to this particular authorization is whether or not it is desirable to spend even $95,000 at this time for some fanfare up at the Military Academy. I think it might be well to have the membership look at what House Joint Resolution 285 proposes. There was no warning that this particular proposal was coming before the House, so, frankly, I have not had a chance to go over it in detail, and I do not know any more about it than what I can recall at the time it was on the Consent Calendar. But I can remember this, they want $95,000 to put on a show up at the Military Academy, a show that has no direct reference to our military effort. They want $95,000 to dress up West Point and have some people up there, dignitaries of one sort or another, or alleged dignitaries, and spend some time and effort and the taxpayers' money to just create some fancy show.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield.

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, who does the gentleman mean by the word "they"? Who is taking on the responsibility for spending this $95,000? Is it a commission to be appointed, or a body or group of men, to take on this responsibility, or who will have the authority to expend this money and put on this celebration?

Mr. FORD. According to House Joint Resolution 285, on pages 2, 4, and 5 they set out who are to be members of the commission. They are all distinguished leaders.

Mr. JONAS. It is already provided who the commission shall be?

Mr. FORD. That is right.

Mr. JONAS. That commission will be clothed with the power to expend this $95,000 and determine the nature and character of the celebration to be put on?

Mr. FORD. There is some very fancy language in here as to what is needed and why, but it does not make much sense to me.

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

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HILLINGS. I might say to the gentleman from Michigan that the subcommittee of which I am a member held hearings on this resolution. We had testimony on it, and explored into the very thing the gentleman has raised by way of question here this morning. The committee unanimously was satisfied that this was for a good and worth-while purpose, that would be of some benefit not only to the educational system but to our military program.

Mr. FORD. Just how will it help the educational system.

Mr. HILLINGS. One of the things this resolution is going to result in is the Conference on Education to be held at West Point for 3 days. It will be attended by approximately 125 representatives of educational institutions, the military, Government, and industry throughout the country.

Mr. FORD. What will they do?

Mr. HILLINGS. This body not so long ago passed a bill appropriating $56,900,000,000 for military defense purposes. At this very time we are concerned about military defense and about the education of the young men in this country as it affects the military, and vice versa. We ought to give a little bit of attention to the operation of our great military academy on its one hundred and fiftieth anniversary. On that one hundred and fiftieth anniversary we should not only commemorate it, but we should take time to discuss and study our entire system of education at West Point and other military institutions.

Mr. FORD. I think that is a nice explanation, but I should like to know just what they are going to do specifically to solve the educational problems of West Point.

Mr. HILLINGS. I do not believe it is the intention of the resolution to solve the problems of the military educational program in 3 days. Certainly we are not anticipating that the $56,900,000,000 we spend is going to solve all the military and diplomatic problems of the world. But I do think this is going to help us in not only commemorating the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of this institution but by giving our educators at West Point and other institutions of similar kind throughout the country a chance to sit down and study the operation of that educational institution. Perhaps as a result of such a study it can be improved. Certainly the recent scandal at West Point has raised in the minds of many people in this country some questions as to the operation of that educational institution. Perhaps this might help toward meeting some of those problems.

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

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

Mr. CELLER. I offered this bill at the behest of the Department of Defense. It has been approved by the Bureau of the Budget and by practically all the executive departments of the Government. Every university that has been in existence for 150 years has had conferences and celebrations of the type that is envisaged by this bill. Certainly it is not going to be a mere show or a jubilee or anything of that sort. There are three or four series of important conferences that will be held, to which will be invited educators, college presidents, and professors from all over the country, so as to spread the good gospel of military training kept within proper channels. Goodness knows we need to spread that good gospel of military training if we are to be the preeminent military nation of the world. I do not believe the gentleman should have any fear that it is going to dwindle into a mere circus or show. The gentleman has only to look at the Members who have been appointed on the commission to be assured that that will not happen.

Mr. FORD. I should like to say that maybe that convinced me it will be a show with fanfare rather than a constructive educational conference.

Mr. CELLER. You have the Chief Justice of the United States and six members to be appointed by him. You have the Speaker of the House and six Members of the House of Representatives. You also have the Governor of New York State, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of the Air Force, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Chief of Staff, United States Army, and so forth. I am sure the gentleman can have confidence in the integrity of purpose of those men. They are not going to let this be a mere circus.

Mr. FORD. I might say to the very distinguished chairman of this committee that I have faith generally in the people he mentions, but they will not be actually managing the show. But that does not tie in with what the gentleman from California said. Certainly, this list of people that you read off are not going up there for 3 days to help develop the educational system of West Point.

Mr. CELLAR. They will determine the agenda and the program. It is contemplated that you will have a conference on military education and training. It is contemplated to have a conference on general education to be attended by 125 representatives of educational institutions, government, industry, the military, the press, and the professional foundations, and other groups. There is to be an athletic meeting, which would indicate or help to indicate the prowess of our athletes in this country. I think something like that is quite essential. The cost is practically inconsequential.

Mr. FORD. I would like to say to the gentleman from New York that the cost is not inconsequential. Ninety-five thousand dollars, as I recall, will buy quite a bit of military equipment.

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

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. JONAS. I want to say at the outset, I admire the gentleman from Michigan for the vigilant stand that he takes from the standpoint of economy. It is most commendable. I was inclined to go along with the gentleman in this picture. But is this not true, now? Here is an institution which is traditional with the American people. We are celebrating its one hundred and fiftieth anniversary. Having in mind what transpired there recently, and I merely mention it with reference to the cadets there, I have no proof as to who is right or who is wrong—I think this would be the most propitious time to celebrate this one hundred and fiftieth anniversary in the tradition of America to alert the people as to the high ideals and traditions that go with that institution. This is the way it can be done. There is no other way except through the channels we have here, do you not see?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman.

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

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. As a member of the Committee on Appropriations, I want to associate myself with the remarks and sentiments expressed by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD]. We, of the Committee on Appropriations, cannot cut down on appropriations if the legislative committees of the Congress continue to authorize more and more expenditures. The celebration may be all right, but I see no reason why it cannot be postponed until after this emergency. Furthermore, all these generals who will go up there to celebrate, have something else more important to do right now.

Mr. FORD. I think the gentleman from New Mexico has made a very excellent point. In fact, the gentleman has made two excellent points. This celebration could well be postponed. We are at war. It seems to me that our generals and military personnel could be better used in the field or in the Pentagon, or at other military stations in order to expedite and promote the successful prosecution of the war.

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

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. HILLINGS. I certainly differ with the opinions expressed by the gentleman from New Mexico. I think we are getting to the point in our Congress, and certainly in this session of the Eighty-second Congress where we have appropriated billions and billions of dollars to help the military organizations of foreign countries. Here we are celebrating the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of our own great military institution, the United States Military Academy at West Point, and we are so concerned about whether or not it is a good thing to reaffirm our faith in that fine institution which has done so much to give us military leadership so vitally necessary throughout the world, including men like Gen. Dwight Eisenhower, and General MacArthur. We apparently are not too interested in celebrating this occasion, and doing something for our own academy, but we spend billions of dollars to help supply and honor foreign military organizations.

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

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. I commend the gentleman for the stand he is taking. I think by appropriating this $95,000, we will be establishing a precedent of underwriting educational meetings and athletic events all over the country.

We well remember 2 years ago that we appropriated—I say we qualifiedly because I voted against it—but there was appropriated by the House of Representatives and by the Congress $3,000,000 for the sesquicentennial celebration in Washington, which money, of course, came out of the pocketbooks of the taxpayers of this country. I am wondering just how much the people of the State of Michigan and the State of Iowa got out of that $3,000,000 which was expended here in the sesquicentennial celebration. It is high time we put the brake on this kind of spending.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman from Michigan will recall that the other day I joined with him in objecting to this particular bill. I did so for a variety of reasons. First of all, I am of the opinion that until the cloud that today is above West Point is dissipated, it would be far better if we did not have such an observance as this, and especially when we take into consideration the fact that we are at war and that we need all the money we have available to buy munitions of war. Everything taken into consideration I think the viewpoint of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] should be upheld and this resolution should be defeated.

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

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

Mr. LANE. May I say to the gentleman, in reply to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. FERNANDEZ] who stated he was a member of the Committee on Appropriations and that it was about time we should stop spending money for such purposes, that on September 14 of this year we had before the House H. R. 5054, a bill making appropriations for the National Security Council, the National Resources Board for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952. May I call attention to page 29 of that bill, in which we, here in the House, appropriated the $95,000 that is now being talked about in this debate, for this sesquicentennial to be held at the Military Academy. The House passed that appropriation, and there was no opposition to that item of $95,000. It went to the other body and it was passed there, and it has now become legislation. In other words, may I say to my colleague that this bill is simply an authorization bill. The money has been appropriated. It was approved by the Bureau of the Budget. Previously the amount asked for was $140,000. It was reduced by the Bureau of the Budget to $95,000. Your Committee on Appropriations went over this item, and there was no opposition to it and it has now become the law. We simply seek to have this authorization passed today, because the money has already been appropriated.

THE SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] has again expired.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. FORD. I would like to say to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] that the point he makes is one that all of us should remember. We approved a $56,000,000,000 appropriation bill. We could not see the trees because of the woods. I think that points out a weakness in the procedure of having a $56,000,000,000 appropriation bill under consideration when you do not have the time or the facilities for knowing all that is in it. If we had had that opportunity, I, for one, would have objected to this item. This is the most direct way in which I can object to the inclusion of that item.

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

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. If we did appropriate it we certainly made a mistake and it is high time we corrected it by not authorizing the expenditure.

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

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HILLINGS. Is not the gentleman from Michigan a member of the Committee on Appropriations? Did the gentleman raise objection to this item in the appropriation bill?

Mr. FORD. I am a member of the Committee on Appropriations, but at the time the military appropriation bill was approved, I had objected previously on the Consent Calendar to the consideration of the sesquicentennial bill which preceded this resolution. Consequently I did voice my objection in the proper way. In the second place, the Committee on Appropriations should not include unauthorized projects. I was objecting to the authorization legislation then and I am objecting to it now.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I wonder if the gentleman from California [Mr. HILLINGS] expects you to look after the business of the whole House and all the Members? There are some folks who do all the spending and never object. I know the gentleman from Michigan has done a remarkably fine job on that committee.

Mr. FORD. I thank the gentleman.

In conclusion, I want to say that this proposed fanfare which includes educators meeting for 3 days, and a track meet on one of the days, with the West Point boys against some other institutions of higher learning, is not, in my judgment, the way to spend $95,000 during the present emergency. Certainly, it is a small item, a mighty small item; but, just the same, I would prefer to see the expenditure of $95,000 for whatever military equipment can be purchased with that amount of money.

The Romans in the old days, you know, used to put on fantastic celebrations; they had their gladiators running up, down, and around the arenas. We may be doing the same thing in a small way by approving $95,000 for this celebration. In my estimation this rule ought to be disapproved.

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

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I would like to ask where the Romans are now.

Mr. FORD. I assume everybody knows where they are; certainly that nation fell by the wayside.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCULLOCH.]

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule, although I find myself a bit unhappy to be in opposition to the gentleman from Michigan and some of the other Members of the House. As has been indicated before, this is an authorization bill. The great Committee on Appropriations of the House has already appropriated the funds which would be necessary under this bill. The rule makes in order for consideration the basic legislation to authorize it.

To have this celebration is in accordance with custom and tradition that has been long in effect in America. I am sure that when the University of Michigan reached its one hundredth anniversary there was a great celebration there; I am sure that when the University of Iowa reaches its one hundredth anniversary there will likewise be a celebration there; and the same is true of the great university in New Mexico, and I am hopeful that that will be the case when the Ohio State University reaches its one hundredth anniversary. Harvard, Yale, all those great institutions of higher learning which have furnished us with leaders all through our years have established this fine custom and tradition. At this celebration will be the educational leaders from all over America.

It seems to me that in view of the thousands, millions, and billions of dollars being expended for other purposes, that the $95,000 which has already been appropriated by the Committee on Appropriations will, by comparison, be well spent, indeed. I hope every Member of the House will support the rule and finally the resolution.

I want to make just one more comment: For a century and a half the Military Academy not only has furnished the military leaders of the Nation but has also furnished many of the business and professional leaders of the Nation. I think this celebration, a review of the Academy's history and a projection of that which is to come, is justified.

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

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

Mr. LECOMPTE. Why did the gentleman say that when the University of Iowa reaches 100 years? It is more than a hundred years old.

Mr. McCULLOCH. When it reaches 150 years. I am sorry for the error.

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

Mr. McCULLOCH. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. JONAS. There are already precedents for the gentleman's argument. As I recall, when the West Point Academy was 100 years old there was something done from a national standpoint to impress that very significant event upon the people of the United States by congressional act.

Mr. McCULLOCH. I have a recollection that that was the testimony before the committee.

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

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN) there were—ayes 44, noes 8.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant-at-Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 179, nays 149, not voting 100, as follows:

[Roll No. 207]

YEAS—179

Albert
Anderson, Calif.
Arends
Aspinall
Ayres
Bailey
Barden
Beckworth
Bender
Bennett, Mich.
Bentsen
Blatnik
Bolton
Bonner
Boykin
Brehm
Brown, Ga.
Bryson
Buchanan
Burleson
Burnside
Burton
Byrne, N. Y.
Cannon
Carlyle
Carnahan
Celler
Chatham
Chelf
Chenoweth
Clemente
Colmer
Cooley
Cooper
Corbett
Cox
Crosser
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
DeGraffenried
Denton
Dollinger
Dolliver
Donohue
Doughton
Doyle
Durham
Eaton
Eberharter
Ellsworth
Elston
Evins
Feighan
Fenton
Fine
Flood
Forand
Forrester
Frazier
Fugate
Furcolo
Gamble
Gary
Gathings
Gordon
Graham
Greenwood
Gregory
Hagen
Hale
Hall, Edwin Arthur
Hall, Leonard W.
Harris
Harrison, Va.
Havenner
Heller
Hillings
Hoffman, Ill.
Holifield
Holmes
Horan
Howell
Hunter
Ikard
Jackson, Wash.
James
Jarman
Jenkins
Jonas
Jones, Hamilton C.
Jones, Woodrow W.
Karsten, Mo.
Kee
Kelly, N. Y.
Kerr
Kilday
Kirwan
Klein
Kluczynski
Lane
Lanham
Larcade
Lesinski
Lind
McCarthy
McCormack
McCulloch
McGregor
Machrowicz
Madden
Mahon
Mansfield
Martin, Mass.
Merrow
Miller, N. Y.
Mills
Mitchell
Morano
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Morton
Multer
Murdock
Nicholson
Norrell
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, Mich.
O'Neill
O'Toole
Patman
Patten
Philbin
Pickett
Poage
Preston
Price
Priest
Rabaut
Radwan
Rains
Ramsay
Reed, Ill.
Rhodes
Richards
Riley
Rivers
Roberts
Robeson
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Mass.
Rogers, Tex.
Sadlak
St. George
Sasscer
Secrest
Sheppard
Sieminski
Smith, Va.
Springer
Staggers
Steed
Stigler
Tackett
Teague
Tollefson
Trimble
Van Zandt
Vorys
Walter
Weichel
Wickersham
Wier
Willis
Withrow
Wolverton
Yates
Zablocki

NAYS—149

Abernethy
Adair
Addonizio
Allen, Ill.
Andersen, H. Carl
Andresen, August H.
Andrews
Anfuso
Auchincloss
Baker
Bakewell
Bates, Mass.
Battle
Beamer
Belcher
Bennett, Fla.
Berry
Betts
Bishop
Boggs, Del.
Bow
Brownson
Budge
Buffett
Burdick
Bush
Butler
Camp
Canfield
Chiperfield
Church
Clevenger
Cole, Kans.
Cotton
Crumpacker
Cunningham
Curtis, Mo.
Curtis, Nebr.
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Devereux
Dondero
Elliott
Fallon
Fernandez
Fisher
Ford
Fulton
George
Goodwin
Gore
Granahan
Grant
Green
Gross
Halleck
Hand
Harden
Harvey
Hays, Ohio
Hedrick
Herter
Heselton
Hill
Hinshaw
Hoeven
Hoffman, Mich.
Hope
Hull
Jenison
Jensen
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Kean
Kearns
Keating
Kersten, Wis.
Kilburn
Lantaff
LeCompte
Lovre
McConnell
McGuire
McKinnon
McMillan
McMullen
McVey
Mack, Wash.
Magee
Marshall
Mason
Meader
Miller, Md.
Miller, Nebr.
Moulder
Mumma
Murray, Tenn.
Nelson
Norblad
O'Hara
O'Konski
Ostertag
Patterson
Polk
Potter
Poulson
Rankin
Reams
Reece, Tenn.
Reed, N. Y.
Rees, Kans.
Riehlman
Saylor
Schwabe
Scrivner
Scudder
Seely-Brown
Shafer
Sheehan
Simpson, Ill.
Simpson, Pa.
Sittler
Smith, Kans.
Smith, Miss.
Smith, Wis.
Stanley
Sutton
Taber
Talle
Taylor
Thomas
Thompson, Mich.
Vail
Van Pelt
Velde
Vursell
Welch
Wharton
Wheeler
Whitten
Widnall
Wigglesworth
Williams, Miss.
Williams, N. Y.
Wilson, Ind.
Wolcott
Wood, Idaho
Woodruff
Yorty

NOT VOTING—100

Aandahl
Abbitt
Allen, Calif.
Allen, La.
Angell
Armstrong
Baring
Barrett
Bates, Ky.
Beall
Blackney
Boggs, La.
Bolling
Bosone
Bramblett
Bray
Brooks
Brown, Ohio
Buckley
Busbey
Byrnes, Wis.
Case
Chudoff
Cole, N. Y.
Combs
Coudert
Crawford
Dague
Deane
Delaney
Dempsey
Denny
D'Ewart
Dingell
Donovan
Dorn
Engle
Fogarty
Garmatz
Gavin
Golden
Granger
Gwinn
Hardy
Harrison, Wyo.
Hart
Hays, Ark.
Hébert
Heffernan
Herlong
Hess
Irving
Jackson, Calif.
Javits
Johnson
Judd
Kearney
Kelley, Pa.
Kennedy
Keogh
King
Latham
Lucas
Lyle
McDonough
McGrath
Mack, Ill.
Martin, Iowa
Miller, Calif.

Murphy	Rogers, Fla.	Stockman
Murray, Wis.	Rooney	Thompson, Tex.
Passman	Roosevelt	Thornberry
Perkins	Sabath	Vinson
Phillips	Scott, Hardie	Watts
Powell	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.	Werdel
Prouty	Shelley	Whitaker
Quinn	Short	Wilson, Tex.
Redden	Sikes	Winstead
Regan	Spence	Wood, Ga.
Ribicoff		

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Vinson for, with Mr. Herlong against.

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Rogers of Florida against.

Mr. McGrath for, with Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Quinn with Mr. Cole of New York.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Case.
Mr. Regan with Mr. Coudert.
Mr. Redden with Mr. Crawford.
Mr. Keogh with Mr. Johnson.
Mr. Heffernan with Mr. Kearney.
Mr. Whitaker with Mr. Short.
Mr. Bates of Kentucky with Mr. Stockman.
Mr. Watts with Mr. Bramblett.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Bray.
Mr. Hart with Mr. Brown of Ohio.
Mr. Hays of Arkansas with Mr. Busbey.
Mr. Deane with Mr. Gavin.
Mr. Baring with Mr. Dague.
Mr. Dempsey with Mr. Denny.
Mr. Murphy with Mr. D'Ewart.
Mr. Engle with Mr. Golden.
Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Hugh D. Scott, Jr.
Mr. Donovan with Mr. Judd.
Mr. Passman with Mr. Latham.
Mr. Perkins with Mr. Hardie Scott.
Mr. Garmatz with Mr. Phillips.
Mr. Granger with Mr. McDonough.
Mr. Dorn with Mr. Prouty.
Mrs. Bosone with Mr. Murray of Wisconsin.
Mr. Boggs of Louisiana with Mr. Gwinn.
Mr. Sikes with Mr. Harrison of Wyoming.
Mr. Shelley with Mr. Jackson of California.
Mr. Rooney with Mr. Martin of Iowa.
Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Javits.
Mr. Madden with Mr. Angell.
Mr. Mack of Illinois with Mr. Beall.
Mr. King with Mr. Blackney.
Mr. Hardy with Mr. Armstrong.
Mr. Abbitt with Mr. Allen of California.
Mr. Barrett with Mr. Aandahl.

Mr. BENDER, Mr. AYRES, and Mr. RODINO changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. BUFFETT and Mr. MCKINNON changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 285, to authorize appropriate participation by the United States in commemoration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the establishment of the United States Military Academy.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 285, with Mr. YATES in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. LANE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 8 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the resolution that is before us is one which seeks authorization from the Congress to hold appropriate ceremonies in commemoration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the establishment of the United States Military Academy. It is nothing different from that which was offered to the Congress at the one hundredth anniversary of the Military Academy at West Point. On the one hundredth anniversary the Congress passed legislation to properly observe that anniversary. This was also true in the case of the Naval Academy. On the occasion of the one hundredth anniversary of the Naval Academy the Congress passed similar legislation.

Mr. Chairman, this bill comes before us at the recommendation of the Assistant Secretary of Defense. She was heard by a Subcommittee on the Judiciary and the bill was reported unanimously by that committee. This is merely an authorization bill.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to call the attention of the House to the fact that on September 14 of the present year we passed here in the House an act making appropriations for the National Security Council, National Security Resources Board, and for military functions administered by the Department of Defense. On page 29 of that bill, a military appropriation bill considered by the House, there was an item of $95,000 to carry out the commemoration which the bill before the House today would authorize.

That bill, with the $95,000 referred to in it, was not objected to at that time and, as I understand it, was not objected to when before the Appropriations Committee. I understand that the Secretary of Defense originally sought $140,000, but the Bureau of the Budget cut this amount to $95,000, which amount was submitted to the Committee on Appropriations and without objection was passed. That appropriation bill, which included that item, was passed by the House and by the other body and has now become law. We simply seek an authorization here today in accordance with that appropriation.

Mr. Chairman, this matter was gone into thoroughly by the subcommittee and the subcommittee very carefully scrutinized the amount of money to be appropriated. All of the members of the subcommittee have in the past, both on the floor of the House and by their votes in committee, shown that they are interested in economy. The members of the subcommittee who voted in favor of this resolution consist of the following: The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WOODROW W. JONES], the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FORRESTER], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCCULLOCH], the gentlewoman from Michigan [Miss THOMPSON], and the gentleman from California [Mr. HILLINGS]. Each one of those Members, the House well knows, has voted on several occasions here to cut appropriations and economize in every way, shape, and manner, and I am satisfied that they would not have voted out this bill unless they felt that it would inure to the benefit of the United States at large.

Let me see, Mr. Chairman, exactly what this proposal does:

This would authorize the Government, the people of the United States, to join with the United States Military Academy at West Point, N. Y., in a fitting and appropriate observance of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of its founding. The proposed plan for the sesquicentennial celebration in 1952 is to follow the general ideas and customs employed by other leading educational institutions for similar occasions.

Mr. Chairman, this plan includes the following: First, in the matter of education; a conference on education to be held at West Point, N. Y., for 3 days during January 1952, to be attended by approximately 125 representatives of the educational institutions, government, industry, military, press, and professional foundations and groups.

For that item, I notice, Mr. Chairman, and much has been said under the rule about it, on education, the only amount to be spent is $6,000. Secondly, it calls for a conference on military education and training to be held at West Point, N. Y., on April 21 to 25 to be attended by 140 people, mostly representatives of the various military departments. Thirdly, there is to be a jubilee held at West Point for 1 day only, to include, of course, a luncheon and a dinner and a convocation in the mess hall. Fourth, there is a conference to be held there on March 16 between representatives of the New York Historical Association and the United States Military Academy on the history of West Point and the Hudson Highlands. Then there will be an athletic event and conference to be held at West Point in the spring of next year. Then there is to be a history conference dealing with the history of the United States Military Academy to be prepared under the guidance of Dr. Forman, Sesquicentennial Historical Librarian of the United States Military Academy.

The purpose of this proposed legislation is to authorize appropriate participation by the United States in the observance of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the establishment of the United States Military Academy. In order to facilitate such a commemoration, it is proposed to establish the United States Military Academy Sesquicentennial Commission, to be composed of the following-named persons:

The President of the United States of America and 16 members to be appointed by him.

The Vice President of the United States of America, and six Senators to be appointed by him.

The Chief Justice of the United States of America, and six members to be appointed by him.

The Speaker of the House of Representatives, and six Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by him.

The governor of New York State.

The Secretary of Defense.

The Secretary of the Army.

The Secretary of the Navy.

The Secretary of the Air Force.

The Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff.

The Chief of Staff, United States Army.

The Chief of Naval Operations, United States Air Force.

The Commandant of the United States Marine Corps.

The Commandant of the United States Coast Guard.

The Vice Chief of Staff, United States Army.

The Vice Chief of Staff, United States Air Force.

The Superintendent, United States Military Academy.

The Superintendent, United States Naval Academy.

The Superintendent, United States Coast Guard Academy.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me the opposition to this bill today is based not so much on the fact that West Point is going to hold a celebration of its one hundred and fiftieth anniversary but the fact that this joint resolution calls for the appropriation of $95,000.

In order that the House may have some information in reference to the $95,000, may I read a statement submitted to the subcommittee that may be of some help in breaking down this amount. This is a support statement for the conduct of the United States Military Academy sesquicentennial activities.

The following major events will take place during the period from January 1 to January 30, 1952:

Sesquicentennial Exhibition and Static Display. That is $30,000.

Conference on History of West Point and the Hudson Highlands, $2,000. That has already been mentioned by me as one of the items to be considered at that time.

The Conference on Education, that so much was said about when we were discussing the rule. That is merely $6,000. To that conference, as I stated previously, all the educational institutions of the country will be invited.

The Conference on Military Education will cost only $5,000.

Then there is the visit of the Boy Scouts of America, to give them the opportunity to see how we carry on our activities and our education and our learning at West Point. In order to allow those Boy Scouts to come from all over the United States, only $4,000 is appropriated.

Conference on Athletics, only $2,000. The Jubilee Convocation, $10,000. That is the item I mentioned previously, to take place in the mess hall. It will take a period of time because I expect they are going to have various dignitaries from all over not only the United States but the entire world there.

The administrative expenses are $19,900.

In conclusion, I know that this was gone into rather thoroughly under the rule, but I repeat it is something of a historical nature. It is something that has been done in the past. It was done on the one hundredth anniversary of the Military Academy. The military seek to carry out the same procedure at this time by observing the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the Military Academy at West Point. In view of the fact that the Committee on Appropriations went over this matter I assume rather thoroughly, and felt that it was worthy of the approval and the sanction of that committee in appropriating $95,000, we simply at this time ask for this authorization of the House in order that this matter may take its course.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, we will have to start some time to hold down appropriations if we are to save any money. That tax bill rejection the other day indicated that the folks at home, while they make little if any protest when appropriation bills are up, certainly come awake when they discover that we are trying to take a little money out of their pockets to meet an increase in taxation.

I was advised a while ago that the tax bill will come back with a slight reduction on the income-tax rate, and that the War Stabilization Board and the administration under the contracts which have been made with industry on wages would be agreeable to including as a cost of living any increase in tax that was put on men who are in the unions or working in some of these industries. Being interpreted, that means that the workers, the union men, anyway, and others perhaps who are in the factory who are not unionized will not pay any tax because they are to have an increase in their wages on the basis of the cost-of-living formula equal to the amount of the tax. That is a nice situation, and perhaps it will get enough votes to put the bill over. But, here is this bill. It is not much, it provides but $95,000. For what purpose? To celebrate something. We had a celebration at West Point not so long ago—the one hundredth anniversary. Now here are 50 more years, and someone wants another celebration. I have been wondering perhaps if this celebration is not for the purpose of calling attention to what happened there so recently to some of the students; maybe not. I do not blame the students so much; of course, they should not have cheated. We all know that. But how can you take boys of school age, of high-school age, or just out of high school—how can you take young men and send them down there and hold before them the honor—and it is an honor—to be on the football team, and then compel them, if they are to be on that team, to go out and practice and do a man's work in that part of the job, and at the same time carry on their studies which is another man's work. That is to say that while we have a wage-and-hour law for people in industry, on the other hand for the boys down at West Point and at Annapolis, what happens? They have to do 2 days' work in 1 if they are to be on the football team. I do not think it is fair. Then the boys are fired but the coach remains—he holds his job. Is he not as guilty as the cadets? I should think in the interest of economy and because of the principle involved it would be better to let this thing die down; it might be just as well if we did not celebrate anything at West Point until the second 100 years have rolled around. Certainly it is not necessary to take the President, the Cabinet members down to show them what West Point is or means. If the money was to send the boys home for Christmas I would consider it, but to spend $95,000 to send a lot of brass and big shots to West Point, call the students out to parade for them, that does not seem desirable.

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

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. HALE. They might want to celebrate the fact that they received the $95,000. If we give them the $95,000 then they could have another celebration to celebrate the fact that they got the money.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I think there is some merit in that argument. For this reason—it is so seldom that any institution here in America gets any money, or any group of people here in America get any money, maybe we should celebrate every time an American organization and every time an American citizen gets an opportunity to draw back part of the taxes that they pay. Usually the money goes abroad. I think that the gentleman from Maine has something there. The other people across the seas get our funds automatically—or not quite automatically, sometimes they have a representative come here when the House meets and shake hands with the Representatives, and sometimes we have a joint session. I do not know whether they bring a basket, a freight car or a truck to take what they get back with them, but we always give them something. What the gentleman says may be a good reason for expending $95,000. It is the only argument that I can think of which would tend to justify this appropriation—but even that does not convince me I should vote for it.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, this bill has the unanimous consent of the Committee on the Judiciary. I am sure the Members would not in a light and transient way consider a bill of this character. The committee felt it was most appropriate to celebrate the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the founding of this very famous, and very important institution—highly important to the military as well as to the industry of the Nation, and the culture of the Nation. We have had celebrations before. There is nothing new in a celebration of this character. Harvard, Yale, my own alma mater, Columbia, have all celebrated the one hundred and fiftieth and two hundredth year of their founding. You have celebrations in the State of Michigan, and in every State. You have fairs. They are celebrations and they are devised to sell products. A celebration of this character is devised to sell ideas, the idea of the efficacy and of the worthiness of West Point. I am sure that you can place faith and confidence in the names that have been read

to you of those who will constitute this Commission. There will be Members of this Chamber and of the other body, the Speaker of the House, the Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court, the President, and the Vice President, and the various members of the Cabinet. You know that the motto of West Point is "Duty, honor, and country." I think it would be well for us to rededicate the whole Nation to the idea of "duty, honor, and country." One of the very purposes of this celebration would be for the general rededication of those great principles.

It is well to remind the Nation of the great names that came from West Point, names of graduates like Grant, Lee, Pershing, MacArthur, Arnold, Eisenhower, and hosts of other illustrious personages who have done so much for our Nation.

In the bill itself we find such names as Bonneville, Marcy, Comstock, Bache, and Wheeler, men who carried out systematic and extensive surveys in mapping the topography and resources of the Nation and its coasts. Graduates like Whistler, McNeil, Parke, and Warren, who, at the suggestion and behest of this very House, pioneered the work in covering the Nation with a network of rail lines and canals; planned for flood control; did all and sundry to conserve our water resources, to improve our harbors and inland waterways; who helped in the construction of the Panama Canal, particularly Goethals—all graduates of West Point. Every Member of this House has a definite stake in West Point. You make your appointment to West Point. You give to West Point men who will eventually become as illustrious and great as those names that I have just mentioned.

This celebration is going to be a historic one. It will involve a conclave of many of the most important educators of the country. They will go into the question of education in general. More specifically they will go into the question of military education. We have to infuse into the hearts and minds of the people in the far-flung regions of this Nation the needs for some sane ideas of the military. There is an insufficient amount of knowledge concerning the military. This convocation will high light and dramatize our military needs, procurements, logistics, and our status as a Nation in this changed and changing world. We are no longer in our swaddling clothes when it comes to being a member of the family of nations. We are preeminent in the family of nations. We have got to assume and will have to assume the role that was England's during the last two centuries, namely, to hold the balance of power so that thereby we can maintain peace. It is well to know that England for over a hundred years was able to keep the peace in Europe and the world, from the time of the Napoleonic wars up to the First World War, because of her naval and military strength. We, because of our naval and military strength, beyond peradventure of doubt, will be able to hold that balance of power and to maintain peace.

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

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

Mr. WALTER. Is not this resolution under consideration almost identical with that which was drafted by the Congress about 50 years ago?

Mr. CELLER. Of course, I was not in the House at that time. I take it for granted the gentleman is correct. I presume that is the case. If I get to be 150 years old, and the gentleman also, we would like to have a celebration.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Were we at war 50 years ago? I do not think we were. That is the whole point.

Mr. CELLER. We may be at war 50 years from now, unless we are able to hold the balance of power by virtue of our naval and military strength. West Point helps us in that direction. I think we will have peace and we will not have an outbreak of hostilities anywhere. We will be able to stem it before it starts if we know whither we are going from a military standpoint.

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

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman says we are preeminent in the family of nations; are we not likewise preeminent in the national debt of the world?

Mr. CELLER. I presume you have to incur some obligations to become preeminent in anything. I am concerned about the national debt, but when I consider men like the gentleman from Iowa and 150,000,000 other splendid people in these United States; when I consider such very valuable assets, valuable human assets, and then consider our debt, large as it is, I am not so much concerned. Those assets, plus our vast resources, more than offset the debt.

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

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. LANE. May I say to the gentleman from New York in reply to the question of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] that during the hearings on this bill I asked the witness who was testifying, Brig. Gen. Chauncey L. Fenton, the following question:

Mr. LANE. I assume, General Fenton, you perhaps had a like celebration at the one hundredth anniversary?

General FENTON. Yes; a like celebration was held. The President of the United States, Theodore Roosevelt, and the Secretary of War, Mr. Elihu Root, were in attendance at that time.

The Naval Academy also had its centennial celebration in 1945.

Mr. LANE. And this celebration is planned along the same line as the one hundredth anniversary you had back some years ago at West Point?

General FENTON. Yes; and I might indicate that a similar celebration is held by universities, such as Princeton University had its bicentennial, and a commission was authorized by Congress at that time. It was held 2 or 3 years ago.

Colonel MCKENNEY. A similar joint resolution was passed by the Congress for the Princeton bicentennial.

Mr. CELLER. Here is one last point, this conclave to be held will arrange for a definitive history of the United States Military Academy. There is no real history that has been developed and compiled with reference to the Academy. Not so long ago I wanted to get certain information concerning the Academy, and I could not adequately procure it. That alone would be valuable. Such a history will emanate from that convocation and be a very important historical document concerning the United States Military Academy.

Finally, I am sure there will be a definite guarantee of freedom from abuse and freedom from any waste of funds because of the appointment of men of the highest integrity to become members of this Commission.

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

Mr. CELLER. I always yield to my good friend from Ohio.

Mr. BENDER. I appreciate the comments of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary. I wonder if he would object to an amendment that I propose to suggest that on page 4, after line 24, we insert language to include on this Commission all living generals of the Army?

Mr. CELLER. I have no objection to that; why not? How many are there?

Mr. BENDER. I have one in mind particularly, General MacArthur.

Mr. CELLER. I certainly would have no objection to the inclusion of General MacArthur.

Mr. BENDER. He was Superintendent of the Academy and he had the highest grade of anybody who ever graduated from the Academy.

Mr. CELLER. I personally would have no objection whatsoever; as a matter of fact, MacArthur is named in the resolution. You will see on page 2 there is set forth names of men of great military distinction; the name of MacArthur is bracketed with Grant, Lee, Pershing, MacArthur, in that order.

Mr. BENDER. I know that. Under the circumstances I am sure there could be no objection.

Mr. CELLER. I can see no objection whatsoever to that; as a matter of fact, on second thought, I think it would be very praiseworthy.

Mr. MCCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, certainly none of us want to take away from West Point in any way the great glory that belongs to this institution in the years gone by. But, as was said here on the floor the other day, the timing of this bill is wrong. None of us but approve of the one hundredth anniversary celebration which occurred 50 years ago. But, let us remember at the same time, that was a celebration during an era of peace. We were not at that time faced with the tremendous financial obligations that we as a Nation are faced with today. All of the lieutenants who have recently graduated from West Point, and who have given their lives in Korea, have dedicated themselves to their country and they have proven the glory of West Point far

more than we are able to do so by this resolution.

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

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] has referred several times to the appropriation made for the one hundredth anniversary celebration. We did not at that time have a debt of $260,000,000,000, did we?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. No. We had little, if any, debt.

Mr. GROSS. And the highest spending program and the highest tax burden confronting the people of the country.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I do not think we appropriated on that occasion a fraction of $95,000.

The gentleman from Maine [Mr. HALE] has informed me that back in 1944 Bowdoin College celebrated its one hundred and fiftieth anniversary, but the cost did not amount to more than $2,500 and that came out of the institution and interested participants, not out of the pockets of the taxpayers of the United States. Why should we spend $95,000 here during wartime when this money is desperately needed now and may be desperately needed in the future for such essentials as backing up the boys in Korea? I see smiles on the faces of such gentlemen as Mr. WALTER, of Pennsylvania, to whom perhaps a saving of this $95,000 does not represent very much.

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

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. In a moment. This $95,000 represents a comparatively small amount, but if we save enough of those particular small items I feel we will be showing a far greater consideration for these boys who died in Korea and in World War II, including the graduates of West Point, in respect to their memory than we would by spending $95,000.

I want to reiterate, Mr. Chairman, I do not want to take away from that great school the least bit of credit that is due it. But let us remember that we do have a debt of $257,000,000,000. Let us try to save a little money if we can.

Reverting to the remarks of the chairman of the subcommittee with reference to the appropriation already made, may I say that this comparatively small amount was part and parcel of many hundreds of items in a large military appropriation bill. Had it been known on the floor of the House that it was there, I think a point of order would have been lodged against it and this item would have been stricken. But we members on the Appropriations Committee who do not serve on that particular subcommittee cannot know all of such items contained in the bill unless brought to our attention. However, unless we do O. K. today the expenditure of this $95,000, that money will not be permitted to be expended. Let us save this amount.

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

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman, who may not have been smiling at the remark I made about trying to save $95,000. I may have been in error as to the reason for his smiling.

Mr. WALTER. Yes; I actually was smiling because the gentleman stated that the $95,000 meant so much to the boys in Korea. Being a member of the Appropriations Committee, as the distinguished gentleman is, I am sure he will realize better than anyone that $95,000 does not mean very much to the boys in Korea.

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

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Ninety-five thousand dollars certainly in itself, may I say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, means comparatively little, but if you will put together enough of these $95,000 items, perhaps the new tax bill would not have been necessary.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SIEMINSKI].

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 285, especially if it serves to enlighten our future military leaders, the cadets and faculty of West Point, on world affairs.

Earlier a gentleman referred to the bicentennial of Princeton University, endorsed by this House. I attended the ceremonies which rededicated Princeton's ideals of service in the Nation's interest. General Marshall was present. I am sure that those who heard the distinguished general appreciated an expression of his views.

Reference has been made to the fact that America was at peace and its financial obligations not as great when West Point celebrated its centennial 50 years ago. The world is troubled today. Commitments are heavy. It would appear that now is the time that the students and faculty of West Point would most appreciate an orientation on world affairs such as the passage of House Joint Resolution 285 could make possible.

I recall with mixed feelings that dark moment in North Korea last December when the Supreme Commander of U. N. forces in the Far East stated in effect that the conflict had reached such proportions as to require disposition of the chancellories of the world. It was to be resolved by higher authorities. Yet when negotiations on a diplomatic level were proceeding, as urged by this commander, exception was taken.

I think it would be a wonderful thing for the faculty and cadets at West Point to benefit by the passage of House Joint Resolution 285 at this time.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I question the advisability of a West Point celebration.

According to statements that have been made on the floor of the House, it is to be a great military celebration. I have just as high respect as anyone on the floor of the House for West Point and its achievements, but I think a celebration at this particular time is not quite in order.

I am thinking of the many West Point graduates, together with the other boys, who are fighting in Korea, giving their lives, in what is described as a police action, but which, after all, is war at its worst.

I just cannot think the military department of our Government would want to carry on a celebration now. To do so does not favorably impress me at this time.

I have recently received a message from the Department of the Army that a young man I nominated to West Point, and who was graduated last spring, has made the supreme sacrifice in Korea. I hardly think the family of this young man, or the families of other young men fighting and dying in Korea, would feel that a celebration is in order at the present hour.

If this Congress wants to approve a celebration and spend approximately $100,000 in doing so, the least you should do is to wait until the war in Korea has been brought to a conclusion. In other words, if you deem such celebration worth while, and if you think you ought to spend $95,000 of the taxpayers' money in carrying on such celebration, the least you can do is to put it off until a more propitious time. This is not the time to celebrate. It should be a time of commemoration, not celebration.

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

Mr. REES of Kansas. I will be glad to yield to my distinguished friend from Ohio, whom I respect greatly.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Unquestionably the gentleman from Kansas knows that this authorization, with the appropriation which would implement it, provides for far more than a celebration; that it actually provides for a convocation and a conference, which will review the magnificent history of the Military Academy and will project for the future the course of study and the course of action which will affect the young men that we are sending, and those who will come after us, will send there. It is more than an empty celebration.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I do not charge it is an empty celebration, but from the description that I have heard on the floor of the House thus far, excepting a few words from the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee. I know, as the gentleman has so well stated, the Military Academy has a great record. That record speaks for itself. I know that convocations with educators from other institutions of learning will be most helpful in the improvement of the educational program at the institution. We have some of that now. We should have more. In fact, I think the Academy would do well to seek more advice and consultation from other great institutions of learning in this country. I agree with the gentleman that the courses taught in West Point and its management can be improved, and they should be, but that is hardly cause for celebration or the expenditure of these funds.

I really believe this is not the time to put on the program described by the chairman of this great committee. As I

said a few moments ago, the celebration should be postponed until the war situation, in which our country is now involved, is brighter than it is today.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HILLINGS].

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the joint resolution. I think its purposes are worth while. This resolution can help make a definite contribution to our country and our national defense effort at a very serious time in American history.

There are probably three basic reasons why the resolution is worthy of support. First, it is to commemorate the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the founding of the United States Military Academy. The Academy has given our country its finest leaders on the battlefield, including some of the greatest men in public life today. It commemorates the anniversary of an Academy in which the Congress is particularly interested, because the vast majority of the cadets of that Academy are appointed by Members of Congress. We have consistently sought to seek out the very finest young men in the Nation so that they can be appointed to the West Point Academy and later serve as leaders in our Armed Forces.

I think it is particularly important that we remember that at this time we are at war. We are at war in Korea. We may be in other actions, the world situation being what it is.

The second reason why the joint resolution should be supported is that it is important that we instill in the minds of all the people in our country a great respect and understanding of this institution, particularly so in view of the fact that we have always maintained civilian control of the military in this country. At this particular time when we are drafting millions of young men, when we have young men fighting at this very moment in Korea, when more and more young men are going into the Armed Forces in the next few months, it is important that we do have more respect and understanding of the educational institution which supplies those young men with their leadership. It is important that we keep that in mind.

For many years various organizations in this country, the Communist Party and others, have endeavored to destroy faith in the Military Academy. It might be well if we turned our thoughts toward this fine institution and learn more of its great contribution to a strong America.

The third reason is that this resolution will help to set up an educational conference, where leaders from around the country can exchange ideas not only on the conduct of the United States Military Academy but as to the conduct of other institutions of higher education, particularly military institutions.

Those are the three purposes which I think make this joint resolution worth while.

Many Members have spoken of economy, of the need to reduce expenditures. I have voted time after time with many of my colleagues who have voted against large appropriations that could have been reduced. Personally, I feel that the $56,900,000,000 which we turned over in many ways with a blank check to the military authorities could have been reduced and still not have impaired the national defense efforts. I think there were all kinds of places where we could have reduced the military appropriations and other national defense appropriations. Unfortunately, we did not think too much about that. But now, when we have an appropriation for $95,000, which has already been appropriated and for which this is the authorization, we are giving a great deal of attention and concern to it, even though this money would honor our great Military Academy. I think the reason for this situation is that so many of us can understand what $95,000 looks like but we have no comprehension of what a billion dollars looks like. We in this Congress seem in many cases to vote the billions of dollars with less question than we are raising on the legislation before us today.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is important and worth while that this joint resolution be approved.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILLINGS. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. There is merit to the proposition that the gentleman makes that the people should know more about West Point. We can all agree with that. But who is going on this commission? The President of the United States, the members of the Supreme Court, Members of Congress, and the Secretaries of Navy and War. They ought to know all about it now. If you would send somebody down there to learn something, that would be all right.

Mr. HILLINGS. By way of answer to the gentleman from Michigan and to supplement the names he mentions, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] has already given indication that he will offer an amendment at the appropriate time which will allow certain others to attend that celebration and participate in it. Through the attention given to their participation many people around the country will come to understand it more. I am referring to the amendment which would allow the generals of the Army to attend. Of course that would include General MacArthur.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Why send all of them there? They have been there, at least most of them have. Why not send the parents of some of these boys who have just gone from West Point and been killed in Korea, and let them find out all about it.

Mr. HILLINGS. I think the persons that the gentleman from Michigan mentions will participate, and as result of their participation, will help to inform many of the people for whom the gentleman has expressed concern.

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

Mr. HILLINGS. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I just wonder if the Department of Defense for which we are appropriating such huge funds could not find $95,000 to finance this project?

Mr. HILLINGS. I think that might have been a good way to handle it, but unfortunately I am not a member of the Committee on Appropriations so I do not know what the attitude of the Department of Defense would be on that.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require to answer the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. Chairman, I think those in the armed services of our country, who have suggested this authorization, should be complimented for their forthright honesty rather than resorting to the use of funds appropriated to them by some subterfuge. This has been brought out into the open, and we hope the full story is being told.

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

Mr. HILLINGS. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Was there any evidence, either before the subcommittee or the Committee on Appropriations with reference to the need for $95,000 for the purpose of having this celebration?

Mr. HILLINGS. As I recall, General, one of the witnesses broke down the various proposed expenditures. I think, perhaps, the gentleman from Massachusetts has that breakdown.

Mr. KEATING. I would appreciate hearing it. It seems to me that it is quite possible that this celebration might be held with a considerably less sum than $95,000, and if it can be, while it is not a large figure as Washington figures go, it seems to me we ought to consider that possibility. I would be happy to hear any evidence on either side with regard to the need for this precise sum of money—or will $9,500 or some lesser sum do just as well as $95,000?

Mr. HILLINGS. I repeat, as I recall, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] has the breakdown on that budget, or at least a part of the budget, making up the entire $95,000.

Mr. KEATING. Would the gentleman from Massachusetts enlighten us on that?

Mr. LANE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute to answer the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING]. May I say to the gentleman from New York that this amount has already been mentioned during debate. It calls for the sesquicentennial exhibition in static display, and that item will require $30,000 of the $95,000. The conference on the history of West Point and the Hudson Highlands, $2,000. The conference on education, $6,000. The conference on military education, $5,000. The visit of the Boy Scouts of America from the various districts and areas throughout the country, $4,000. Conference on athletics, $2,000. Jubilee convocation, $10,000. Administrative expenses, publication, commemorative items, and minor events, $19,900. Pay of six civilian employees, $16,035.

Mr. Chairman, West Point never surrenders to dishonor.

In a confused and troubled world where individuals and nations lose heart and trade their character for the tempting tinsel of money, power, or athletic glory, it is time to speak up for the real and enduring values.

The United States Military Academy, on the heights above the Hudson, will observe, beginning January 1, 1952, 150 years of distinguished service above and beyond the call of duty.

Its high standard of integrity is uncompromising.

It does not hide or condone moral weakness under the thin excuse of expediency.

The West Point tradition, based on experience, has never lost sight of this fundamental fact, that acquired skills are a shallow accomplishment unless they are rooted in truth, honesty, and courage.

The training of youth to become a man is first and all-important.

He must learn to obey before he can lead.

His ideals must never be tarnished by deals.

This dedication to honorable service merits a salute from all Americans for its own sake, and in the hope that it will serve as a stimulating example for young men and women on the threshold of careers in business, in the professions, in the labor movement, and particularly in government.

In 1802, Thomas Jefferson, following the advice of George Washington, John Adams, Alexander Hamilton, and others, recommended the establishment of a National Military Academy on the Hudson River at West Point. It was authorized by an act of Congress, dated March 16, 1802. The picturesque setting is rich in memory and inspiration. It was here that the tattered Revolutionaries defeated the enemy's attempt to isolate New England from the rest of the Thirteen Colonies.

Only the cream of American youth can qualify for the Point.

Its scholastic standards are unexcelled. Its discipline transforms good youngsters into better men.

As the Nation grew, so did the Military Academy, training the cadets to meet a more complex and ever-widening area of responsibility. The sound preparation and experience of its graduates proved decisive in handling the problems of organization, mobilization, supply, and leadership. The names of Grant, Lee, Pershing, MacArthur, Arnold, Eisenhower, and a host of others, bear testimony to the high caliber of its educational system.

The 19th of January is the birthday of that great and gallant soldier, Gen. Robert E. Lee. At West Point, today, you can see a portrait of this famous alumnus, dressed in blue. The full tribute due him will become complete when, on the 1952 anniversary of his birth, a new portrait of him will be dedicated, this time in the gray uniform of the Confederacy that he loved and served so well.

I single out this one event, in a series of jubilee observances, because it symbolizes the unique quality of West Point. To be ready for any eventuality, to fight hard if need be, to be generous in victory and noble in defeat, but above all, to do one's level best.

West Point trains its graduates not only for military careers, but for other public service as well; for its graduates have served with distinction as Federal judges, as Members of the United States Congress, as ambassadors, as cabinet officers, and as President of the United States.

It was one of the first technical institutions to be established in the United States, and during the first half century of its existence advanced engineering education, providing teachers and textbooks to many newly founded scientific schools of the period.

Graduates like Bonneville, Marcy, Comstock, Bache, and Wheeler, carried out systematic surveys, mapping the topography and resources of the entire Nation and its coasts, and helping to further the extraordinary expansion of our Republic.

Whistler, McNeil, Parke, and Warren, at the behest of Congress, led the work of covering the Nation with a network of rail lines and canals; planned and supervised flood control, the conservation of water, the improvement of harbors and inland waterways, and numerous other engineering projects, including the construction of the Panama Canal under the direction of George Goethals.

The Academy educates men to be faithful to the trust that is reposed in them. No letdown in the code is tolerated by the cadet body itself.

The 1951 Academy catalog says:

> Honor, as it is understood by the corps of cadets, is a fundamental attribute of character. The honor system is merely straightforward honesty of thought and of action.

Some educational institutions concentrate on the training of the mind alone.

West Point develops the mind and the character.

Judged by the brilliant record of its graduates, who put service to the Nation before personal ambition, and who have built such efficient staffs for the United States Army and the United States Air Force that our military security is in the most competent hands, it appears that the West Point system, reinforcing skill with integrity, builds men who are physically, mentally, and morally strong.

The theme chosen for the celebration of the Academy's one hundred and fiftieth birthday is: "Furthering our national security."

It will be developed through study and conference, amplifying the relationship between civilian and military education in the winning of peace through security. Participants will be distinguished scholars and representatives of higher education from the United States and abroad, personnel of government, representatives of business and industry and of the Armed Forces, cadets, and midshipmen of West Point and Annapolis, student representatives of ROTC units, and of officer candidate schools.

There will be other major events during the period from January 1, 1952, until June 1, 1952. These will include an exhibition and State display, a conference on the history of West Point and the Hudson Highlands, a visit by the Boy Scouts of America, a conference on athletics, and the jubilee convocation.

An invitation to participate in the observance will be extended to representatives of the signatories of the North Atlantic Treaty, the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance and other friendly foreign nations. Such action will promote good will, enhance common ties, demonstrate our training methods, and foster an understanding of cultural differences between the United States and these nations. The result of such a joint participation will therefore serve to cement more fully the amicable relationships with these important foreign powers.

West Point is mindful and proud of its share in our Nation's long struggle through peace and war to hold to the ideal of Government by the people. And we believe that from the studies and conferences of this program will come a strengthened devotion to that ideal.

I speak for Joint Resolution 285, to authorize appropriate participation by the United States in commemoration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the establishment of the United States Military Academy.

In order to facilitate such a commemoration, a commission to be known as the United States Military Academy Sesquicentennial Commission, composed of members designated in the joint resolution, and to serve without compensation, is recommended. The Commission is authorized to make such expenditures for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this joint resolution not to exceed $95,000 as it may deem advisable.

This is a small sum to ask for such a well-merited tribute.

This cost is subject to the availability of funds included for this purpose in the appropriation for the operation of the United States Military Academy.

The Committee on the Judiciary recommend that the joint resolution do pass.

As the flags of the States are presented to the Academy we will be reminded, individually and collectively, of the superior ethics and performance demanded of all Americans to promote the moral tone and vitality of our Nation.

We are mobilizing our material strength.

That is not enough.

To further our national security, we must activate our faith, our character, and our will.

The impressive ceremonies attending the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the founding of West Point will call upon American citizens, without exception, to rededicate themselves to the high purpose of "duty, honor, country" which is the sublime motto of the United States Military Academy.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak out of order.

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

There was no objection.

TO BRING MONEY INTO THE PUBLIC TREASURY IS A NOVELTY

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, my purpose in addressing the House at this time is not to discuss these distressing situations that confront us such as Korea and the high cost of living and dishonesty in Government. You are very familiar with all of these. I want to bring to the House some good tidings. You will remember the Biblical story of the old patriarch who sent his trusted servant into a far country on an important mission. He waited long and anxiously for his return and one day as he was keeping his vigil and sitting against the wall of his house by the front door, he saw his servant running down the distant mountain returning from the long trip. Confident that the mission was successful, he said:

Beautiful upon the mountain are the feet of him that bringeth good tidings.

Now if you please, let me bring you some tidings. I shall tell you a story of legislation that Congress passed 2 years ago this week, October 19, 1949. That legislation, contrary to the rule these days, has brought large amounts of money into the treasuries of many of the States without calling upon the people to pay any taxes of any kind. I think this is an accomplishment of national importance. I refer to the cigarette law, commonly known in the trade as the Jenkins Act.

At the time of the passage of this act all but about six of the States had laws taxing cigarettes. The tax in most of the States was 2 or 3 cents a pack. In some cases the tax was as high as 7 cents. This would be in addition to the Federal tax which is now 7 cents. This State tax is vital to the revenues of these States. Sharp traders in States which did not levy a State tax soon saw a chance to get rich by bootlegging cigarettes to customers in those States which levied a tax. These bootleggers soon built up a great business by which they cheated the State taxing authorities out of an estimated thirty or forty millions of dollars a year. Great quantities of cigarettes without a tax stamp on them were shipped and mailed into these States. The postmasters in some of the large cities of these States handled more cigarettes than the largest legitimate cigarette dealer in that city.

To prevent this Nation-wide thievery, I introduced a bill in Congress that provided:

That any person selling or disposing of cigarettes in interstate commerce, whereby the cigarettes are shipped to other than a distributor licensed by or located in a State taxing the sale or use of cigarettes, shall each month forward to the tobacco tax administrator of the State into which such shipment is made certain information, including the name and address of the person to whom the shipment was made and the brand and the quality of the cigarettes shipped. Violation of the act is a misdemeanor punishable by fine of not more than $1,000 or imprisonment of not more than 6 months.

Some bootleggers fought the enactment of this law with high-priced lawyers. They attended the hearings before the Ways and Means Committee but the committee recommended the passage of the bill which in due time was passed by the House. These same high-powered groups appeared before the Finance Committee of the Senate. The bill passed both Houses of Congress and was signed by the President.

At the hearings some of the bootleggers stated that if the bill became a law they would go out of business. I think some of them kept their word but some of the most daring tried to continue but the United States enforcing officers soon took them to trial before the United States courts. I think there are some criminal cases still pending. I hope that the State taxing authorities will not relax their vigilance but will keep after these law violators.

There was a civil suit filed in the United States Court for the District of Columbia on November 30, 1950. The style of this case is as follows:

United States District Court for the District of Columbia, Civil Action No. 1560-50:

Consumer Mail Order Association of America et al., plaintiffs, v. J. Howard McGrath, individually and as Attorney General of the United States, defendant.

In this case the district court sustained the constitutionality of the Jenkins Act. This case went to the Supreme Court of the United States and the Supreme Court approved the decision of the district court without a written opinion on February 26, 1951. And the Jenkins Act then became a valid effective law of the land.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let me discuss the financial advantages that have come to the State treasuries by reason of the enactment of the Jenkins Act. It is practically impossible to ascertain just exactly how much money the State treasuries have received by reason of this law. This law did not bring in any direct tax. It prevented money escaping from State treasuries which rightfully belonged there. In other words, it permitted money to get into the State treasuries that otherwise would have been kept out.

I have contacted the official finance officers in many of the States in an effort to find out what would be a fair estimate as to how much their respective State treasuries have benefited by reason of the enactment of this law. Many have responded and I have gotten some estimates from other sources. I shall not attempt to quote directly any of my informants but I shall give figures that will, I think, be fair in each case that I cite. The States with the heaviest cigarette tax and the greatest volume of cigarette sales will profit the most, such as Louisiana and Oklahoma, each of which has a heavy tax.

Here are some of my estimates as to how much these States will benefit annually:

Ohio	$600,000
Texas	1,000,000
Michigan	1,500,000
Oregon	500,000
West Virginia	300,000
South Carolina	500,000
Georgia	300,000
Oklahoma	1,100,000
Arkansas	225,000
Wisconsin	300,000
New Jersey	500,000
Washington	500,000

I have attempted to cite States from different parts of the country. States with large populations such as New York, Pennsylvania, and California have profited immensely. I do not have complete estimates from all of the States but I feel sure that the total savings will be between twenty-five and thirty million dollars per year.

Letters to me from many of the State taxing authorities have indicated that they appreciate the benefits that have come to their respective States from the enactment of the Jenkins Act. Here is a paragraph from one letter that is a fair sample:

Virtually every State and hundreds of thousands of retailers owe you a debt of gratitude, and you have every right to be proud of your achievement.

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

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

Mr. BECKWORTH. Does the gentleman have the figures with reference to Missouri?

Mr. JENKINS. No. I am sorry to say that Missouri even up to this time is a bootlegging State. That is one State that violates the law. Strange as it may seem, there were about six of them, and with the passage of this law it has given them religion, apparently, and I think they are all in but Missouri and one other State.

Mr. BECKWORTH. The gentleman mentioned Texas. I remember specifically some conversations we had with reference to Texas. I am glad it has come out as the gentleman has indicated, and I want to commend the gentleman on the very fine job he has done and the insistent interest he has taken in this matter.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, diagnosing the benefits that might come to the people of my State of Ohio by reason of this $600,000 that will be added annually to the budget of that State without any cost to the State, let me say that $600,000 would, if applied to that purpose, add greatly to the relief of many widows and dependent children now receiving insufficient aid in that great State. It would go a long way toward paying a little more money for the aged and blind if it were applied that way. Or it would repair many miles of bad roads resulting from the wear and tear of last winter, which was terrifically bad in Ohio.

And it will give encouragement to the thousands of law-abiding cigarette dealers who felt the competition that they were suffering from the illegal sales of cigarettes by these competitors, who did not pay any State cigarette tax.

And, Mr. Chairman, it will give encouragement to the various State taxing authorities who have a difficult job administering their State tax laws even without hunting up bootleggers who did this bootlegging through the mails and through interstate commerce.

I congratulate the Congress of the United States for having passed the Jenkins Act that brings great amounts of money into the State treasuries annually and without the levying of taxes.

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

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York, General KEATING.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, this commemoration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the founding of West Point is a commendable objective. This is a great event in the history of our country. It is entirely proper that we should celebrate this significant occasion in an appropriate, dignified manner.

It is the provision for an appropriation, however, that bothers me, and it is that feature which makes it difficult for me to support this bill in its present form. It has been suggested that the appropriation should be stricken out, that there are funds available to have a proper and appropriate and dignified celebration without this appropriation. Certainly whether the appropriation paragraph is eliminated or not, at the very least the figure should in my judgment be substantially reduced. It now appears that there is ample justification for that action arising out of the figures given by the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Massachusetts. I am not convinced by the itemization which he gave us that $95,000 is necessary. This Commission, like all others—it is the same old story—they want to have six civilian employees. That is what we encounter all the time, this effort to pad the Federal payroll. That takes up some $15,000 or $20,000, as I remember the figures. There are a lot of items in this $95,000 that it does not seem to me should be there. Unless in the amendment stage this figure is substantially reduced, and I mean substantially, I shall not be able to support the measure. It might be pleasant if we could spend money recklessly on any project suggested to us, but the financial condition of our Federal Treasury simply demands that we conduct ourselves responsibly and not authorize expenditures of large or even small sums on such meager evidence as has been presented here today.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, while I have not been a Member of this distinguished body as long as some other Members who are here today, it seems to me that this is a significant day in the recent history of America. I think there has been more concern today over the way we spend our money than at any time in all my days here, and I am hopeful that the people of this country will be able to call it blessed. I really hope, that in the days that are ahead, those members of the Appropriations Committee and the rest of us who are not on that committee will be as careful about the money that we spend in those bills that carry appropriations of millions and billions of dollars as we are about this $95,000.

The facts have been covered by others, but before concluding I want to say again that this is more than a celebration; it is a convocation; it is a conference. There is not a man or woman here today who attended a university which has attained maturity which has not held such a conference or celebration. The past of this great institution will be reviewed, and I am sure that those educators from every institution in America who will be in attendance will bring with them suggestions and recommendations that will be of lasting benefit to that great Academy and to all the people in America. I hope that those of you who voted against the rule will consider this matter in a proper light, not with a knife out for $95,000, but in view of what has been done at the Academy and the great good that will be accomplished in this conference and in this celebration. I hope you will support the resolution.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired; all time has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas there are to be held at West Point, N. Y., during the period beginning January 1, 1952, and ending June 3, 1952, suitable conferences, convocations, and a jubilee ceremony in celebrating the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the founding of the United States Military Academy, and

Whereas such conferences, convocations, and jubilee ceremony will be devoted to applying, in discussion with prominent educators and military leaders throughout the world, our common knowledge and experience to the consideration of the theme which has been chosen for the celebration of the Military Academy's sesquicentiennial—"Furthering our national security"; and

Whereas the United States Military Academy, upon the recommendations of Washington, Adams, Hamilton, and Knox, was founded by an act of the United States Congress; and

Whereas the Military Academy was established at West Point, N. Y., a site already identified in the hearts of the American people as the citadel which during the American Revolutionary War was instrumental in preventing the enemy attempt to isolate New England from the rest of the Thirteen Colonies; and

Whereas in succeeding wars, the graduates of the Military Academy have won ever increasing acclaim, their military training and experience having proved decisive in handling the problems of organization, mobilization, supply, and leadership; and the whole world today acknowledges with respect and esteem the names of Grant and Lee, Pershing, MacArthur, Arnold, Eisenhower, and a host of others; and

Whereas West Point has become a keystone in the structure of our national defense; and

Whereas West Point has trained its graduates not only for military service to the Nation, but for other public service as well; for West Point graduates have served with distinction as Federal judges, as members of the United States Congress, as ambassadors, as cabinet officers, and as President of the United States, namely Ulysses S. Grant; and

Whereas the United States Military Academy was one of the first technical institutions to be established in the United States, and during the first half century of its existence significantly advanced engineering education in America and provided teachers and textbooks to many newly founded scientific schools of the period; and

Whereas West Point graduates such as Bonneville, Marcy, Comstock, Bache, and Wheeler, who carried out systematic and extensive surveys and mapping of the topography and resources of the entire Nation and its coasts, have made outstanding contributions to the extraordinary expansion of our Republic; and

Whereas graduates of the United States Military Academy such as Whistler, McNeil, Parke, and Warren, at the behest of Congress, pioneered the work of covering the Nation with a network of rail lines and canals; and planned and supervised flood control; conservation of water, the improvement of harbors and inland waterways, and numerous other national engineering projects, including the construction of the Panama Canal under the direction of George Goethals; and

Whereas, since its founding West Point has dedicated itself to the ideals of its motto, "Duty, Honor, Country"; and

Whereas, at its approaching sesquicentennial, the United States Military Academy, through its Superintendent, its faculty, its graduates, and the Corps of Cadets, drawn from every State and Territory of the Union, will rededicate itself to these ideals: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the Government and the people of the United States join with the United States Military Academy in a fitting and appropriate observance of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of its founding, and, in order to facilitate such a commemoration, there is hereby established a commission to be known as the United States Military Academy Sesquicentennial Commission (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission"), to be composed of the following-named persons:

The President of the United States of America and 16 members to be appointed by him;

The Vice President of the United States of America, and six Senators to be appointed by him;

The Chief Justice of the United States of America and six members to be appointed by him;

The Speaker of the House of Representatives, and six Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by him;

The Governor of New York State;

The Secretary of Defense;

The Secretary of the Army;

The Secretary of the Navy;

The Secretary of the Air Force;

The Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff;

The Chief of Staff, United States Army;

The Chief of Naval Operations, United States Navy;

The Chief of Staff, United States Air Force;

The Commandant of the United States Marine Corps;

The Commandant of the United States Coast Guard;

The Vice Chief of Staff, United States Army;

The Vice Chief of Staff, United States Air Force;

The Superintendent, United States Military Academy;

The Superintendent, United States Naval Academy;

The Superintendent, United States Coast Guard Academy.

The President of the United States of America shall be Honorary Chairman of the Commission. The Secretary of Defense shall be Chairman of the Commission. The Superintendent, United States Military Academy shall appoint, subject to the approval of the Chairman of the Commission, a Secretary for the Commission; any vacancies shall be filled in the manner provided for in the original appointment. The authority of the Commission under this joint resolution shall cease and terminate on June 30, 1953.

SEC. 2. It shall be the duty of the Commission to formulate plans for the appropriate participation by the United States in the sesquicentennial celebration at West Point. The Commission is authorized in performing its functions under this section to utilize the services and facilities of various agencies and instrumentalities of the United States, with the consent of such agencies and instrumentalities.

SEC. 3. The Commission is authorized to make such expenditures for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this joint resolution not to exceed $95,000 as it may deem advisable. Expenditures of the Commission

shall be paid upon the presentation of vouchers approved by the Secretary of the Commission subject to the availability of funds included for this purpose in the appropriation for the operation of the United States Military Academy.

SEC. 4. The members of the Commission shall serve without compensation, but shall be reimbursed for actual expenses incurred in the performance of their duties as members of the Commission.

Mr. LANE (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the resolution be dispensed with, that it be printed in the RECORD and that it be open for amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FORD: On page 5, line 24, after the word "exceed", strike out "$95,000" and insert "$5,000."

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, this amendment should be approved, but first, I would like to make several general comments. A number of speakers have tried to justify this expenditure of $95,000 on the basis that the Military Academy should be honored at its sesquicentennial. In justification they have stated a number of State institutions of higher learning, have had sesquicentennial and centennial celebrations, therefore the Military Academy should do likewise.

There are several reasons why that argument is not valid. In the first place, you will find that most State institutions when they have had these various celebrations, either centennial or sesquicentennial, the respective State treasuries have been solvent. There has been no comparable deficit like Uncle Sam is operating under at the present time. Those States had no deficit or debt such as the Federal Government has at the present time.

Someone has mentioned that we had a centennial celebration for the Military Academy, which is true, but in 1901 and 1902 we were not at war. The Federal budget at that time, I think, was in balance and we certainly did not have a debt of $257,000,000,000.

Let us take the figures and be specific as to why this particular amendment should be approved. The justification says that the sesquicentennial exhibition and static display will cost $30,000. Just where can they spend $30,000 on a static display at West Point? They have already all kinds of military equipment up there. How much more equipment do they have to lug in at a cost of $30,000?

They want a conference on the history of West Point at Hudson Highlands, N. Y. And I can see where they might want to have a conference on the history of West Point, but why do they have to bring in $2,000 for Hudson Highlands?

They have an item of $6,000 for a conference on education; then they want $5,000 for a conference on military education; they want $4,000 for a visit of the Boy Scouts. Then they want, and this is the most unjustifiable item of all, $2,000 for a conference on athletics and I notice here they have an athletic event and conference to be held at West Point, N. Y., in the spring of 1952. It is anticipated that the heptagonal track meet at West Point, N. Y., will be designated as the athletic event. I suspect that track meet has been scheduled for a number of years, at least for 12 months. I am sure they will have that track meet regardless and that the cost will be paid by the West Point Athletic Association whether or not this appropriation and authorization are made. That is the most ridiculous justification I ever heard of. How stupid do they think Members of Congress are? They are insulting the intelligence of Members of Congress when they say they are not going to have that track meet up there unless we authorize $2,000 of the $95,000 for it.

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

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

Mr. KEATING. The gentleman did not include in his figures the amount which they propose to use to hire six civilian employees.

Mr. FORD. I am coming to that.

Mr. KEATING. Before the gentleman comes to that, there is one figure in there I think I am in hearty accord with. That is a provision for bringing the Boy Scouts of America to West Point. I think that is a commendable purpose and it will do a lot of good; it is a great organization. But your amendment would still permit them to do that and have a little left over.

Mr. FORD. It should be brought out, and the gentleman from New York has done so, that they want to hire six civilian employees, I presume for half a year, because it certainly will not take any more than that, at a cost of $16,035. That is not bad pay for the kind of work that is visualized.

I want to make this point: I happen to know how much it costs to put on a track meet, and I know the Military Academy officials will have this heptagonal athletic event whether this authorization goes through or not. The funds for that track meet can and should come from the athletic association. Those funds will be there and the track meet will go on whether we do anything or not. The proceeds from the various football games will take care of that.

I say to you that if the other items of this $95,000 proposal are no more justifiable than the $2,000 for the track meet, it is not worth the paper it is written on.

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

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

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I wonder if there is an item in that list that you have seen which would provide a memorial service to honor the memory of those boys who gave their lives in that undeclared war in Korea.

Mr. FORD. In response to the gentleman from Wisconsin, as I look over the letter from Mr. Daniel K. Edwards to the Speaker, they do say they are going to have a convocation, and so forth and so on. I certainly hope that appropriate services will be held at the Academy for those who have lost their lives in this war.

I repeat again in conclusion, I certainly believe that this amendment, which cuts it from $95,000 down to $5,000, if approved, will permit the Academy officials to do certain things which will be worth while and desirable. I am sure this $95,000 is just another example of the Pentagon coming in here asking for about 10 times what they actually need and what they can spend judiciously.

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

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

Mr. GAMBLE. From my experience I happen to know that each college pays its own expenses. They had a heptagonal athletic meet at West Point 3 years ago, and there was not any Federal appropriation at that time. Each college pays its own expenses, and whatever expense there is for the university the meet is paid out of the association funds.

Mr. FORD. It is my recollection that the gentleman from New York is a former member of the Olympic team, and he knows something about track meets. He is absolutely right. The track meet will go on as it did 3 years ago and the schools that participate this year will pay their own expenses. I cannot, under any circumstances, visualize what they will spend $2,000 for. It just does not make sense.

Mr. GAMBLE. A meet was held at Annapolis 2 years ago and there was no appropriation. The respective universities paid their own expenses. I know, because I was there.

Mr. FORD. And the gentleman probably donated his time as an official.

Mr. GAMBLE. I did not get my expenses, I know that.

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

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

Mr. KEATING. It should be noted at this point in the RECORD that the gentleman from New York who just spoke was one of the greatest figures that ever hit the cinder paths of this country.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, if this amendment prevails it would destroy utterly the efficiency of the resolution. It is an attempt to sabotage this resolution under the guise of so-called economy.

In a matter of this sort, particularly because of its importance, I do not think we must be pinch-penny or parsimonious. There is a proper time to be pinch-penny, but I do not think that in the celebration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of this great institution which has done so much for America, we should attempt to strike down the appropriations from $95,000 to $5,000. It is ridiculous to do that. We have already cut down the original appropriation from $140,000 to $95,000 at the behest of the Bureau of the Budget.

Something has been mentioned about Hudson Highlands. I should like to take the gentleman from Michigan to Hudson Highlands and show him the scenes of

bloody conflict during the Revolutionary War along the Hudson Highlands. I do not think he knows anything about the Hudson Highlands. One of the very purposes of this celebration, of this convocation of educators, is to make known to the people something of what happened around and about West Point. I should like to take the gentleman up there and show him exactly what happened at Hudson Highlands. He speaks from a lack of knowledge of what happened up there. I do not want to leave the Nation in the same ignorance in which the gentleman from Michigan finds himself on this subject. I want the Nation to be enlightened on these facts.

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

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

Mr. FORD. I appreciate the comments made by the distinguished chairman of the committee, but I should like to sit down some time with him and total up the number of hours he has spent at West Point and the total number of hours I have spent there. I would say to the gentleman from New York that I have been at West Point more times individually and spent more hours there than he has.

Mr. CELLER. I question that. I would like the gentleman to have some knowledge of what happened around and about West Point. That is one of the purposes of this celebration, to make known to the people of this Nation something of what happened during the Revolutionary War which emphasized what the war of the Revolution stood for, and also, as I said before, to rededicate the Nation within the purview of those great principles expressed in the motto prominently displayed at West Point "Duty, honor, country." That is another reason for this celebration.

To cut down the appropriation to $5,000 would utterly destroy the resolution. Anybody who supports the amendment is voting to destroy the very purpose of the resolution.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. Chairman, it certainly had not been my intention to speak on this resolution but I have become very much interested in the course of the debate. It seems to me that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan, so far from sabotaging the purpose of the resolution, will assure the Military Academy at West Point a more dignified and more appropriate kind of sesquicentennial observance than is contemplated by the $95,000 appropriation.

I may say that if the motto of the United States Military Academy is, as I understand it is, "Duty, honor, country," an appropriate method of displaying its loyalty to that motto would be not to raid the Treasury of the United States.

I happen to have graduated from a college in my State, Bowdoin College, which is not as big as the United States Military Academy at West Point but still I think it is a very good college. In 1944 we had a sesquicentennial celebration that was a very dignified and fine sesquicentennial celebration. I remember Lord Halifax came down from Washington. There were people from all over the world who attended that celebration. I just called the president of the college on the telephone and he tells me that the college appropriated for that celebration two or three thousand dollars, he was not sure of the exact figure. I wonder whether the gentleman from New York can inform me whether the committee, in approving this resolution, got any figures for the tercentenary celebration, for example, of Harvard or the two hundred and fiftieth celebration of Yale or Princeton, or whatever those celebrations were.

Mr. CELLER. I was not on the subcommittee that made the investigation, but I can assure you it would be utterly and woefully impossible for Harvard or any of these institutions adequately to conduct a worthwhile celebration with only $5,000.

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

Mr. HALE. I yield.

Mr. GAMBLE. I introduced a resolution for the two hundredth celebration at Princeton University. We did not ask for any money. Similar resolutions have been passed for Yale, Harvard, and the University of Pennsylvania here in Congress. Resolutions have been passed for several other colleges. This is the first time any Federal funds have ever been requested to my knowledge.

Mr. CELLER. Princeton, Yale, and Harvard are not national institutions supported by the Government. This happens to be a Federal institution.

Mr. HALE. I quite appreciate that, but what I am talking about is the scale on which those famous institutions spend money to celebrate important anniversaries in their own history. I am sure it is on a much more modest scale.

For example, look at the statement in this report:

> A conference on education to be held at West Point for 3 days during January 1952, to be attended by approximately 125 representatives of educational institutions.

That should not cost a great deal of money. The representatives of these educational insitutions will come to West Point on appropriations made by the institutions which they represent. Then there is to be a conference on military education and training to be held at West Point. The professional military men who attend this conference will already be on the Government payroll. You can hold conferences pretty cheaply. You do not have to spend very large sums of money on a conference. The track meet has been pretty well covered by other gentlemen who have spoken. Then there is the jubilee to be held at West Point during one day in May, including a luncheon, an academic procession, convocation and a dinner. Well, you can have a luncheon and a dinner, and, of course, it will cost some money to be sure. But, you can do it with much less money than the amount that has been suggested.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] suggested that $95,000 would not mean very much to the boys in Korea. I readily admit that it would not build an aircraft carrier but it would carry quite a few letters to the boys in Korea. It might be well to apply that money to the purchase of some K rations, which I am sure the boys would enjoy. The money could be used to buy quite a few pints of ice cream. I do not see any occasion for an extravagant celebration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of West Point. I think the celebration would be a great deal more dignified if it were a great deal less extravagant.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Tennessee that the amendment is not proper for the purpose for which it is offered. The pending matter is a perfecting amendment and the gentlemen's amendment seeks to strike the paragraph.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, will it be in order after the pending amendment is disposed of?

The CHAIRMAN. That is the opinion of the Chair.

Mr. SUTTON. I will not offer the amendment at this time then.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. Does the gentleman from Tennessee withdraw his amendment?

Mr. SUTTON. That is for the time being.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Tennessee rise?

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Ford amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I might say for the information of the gentleman from New York that my amendment, which is not in order at this time, provides for the striking out of section 3 and section 4. It does away with the entire $95,000. Personally, I believe in commemorating the sesquicentennial of West Point, Princeton, the University of Tennessee, Vanderbilt, the University of Texas, SMU, and other schools throughout the country when they have their anniversaries. But why come in here and ask for $95,000 to do it?

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] says that $95,000 would not amount to much to the boys in Korea. I can say to him as a combat veteran, and my friend, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. POTTER], and my friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE], will join me in saying that $95,000 would mean a lot to them. K rations? Yes. They mean a lot to the boys over there. It will buy a lot of K rations. It is true it would buy but half a tank, but sometimes that half a tank will save the lives of a lot of boys. That gun still may be in action.

Let us look through this $95,000, as the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] did, and see what it is for.

Thirty thousand dollars for exhibition and display. Have you ever been to West Point or Annapolis? You see there every type of gun, every type of missile that is used in the Army or the Navy on display there. Why they want to spend $30,000 to put more weapons there I cannot understand.

A definitive history of West Point, $2,000. In the office of every Member of Congress you will find pamphlets on the history of West Point, which we send out to cadets. Why do they need $2,000?

Conference on education. Why gather these professors to talk about West Point to them? I presume they know as much as my commandant at West Point, who was my commanding officer in the war.

Conference on military education. Are we going militaristic in this country? Try to teach them all military history? We need to teach them peace, love, and religion instead of militarism.

Visiting Boy Scouts of America. Yes. I would like to see the Boy Scouts go anywhere, but heaven forbid that they be trained about militarism. Let us send them to some of these church schools. I would vote for $4,000 for that.

Conference on athletics. We have just had a conference throughout all the newspapers recently on athletics.

A jubilee convention, $10,000. I do not know what kind of a convocation it would take to spend $10,000.

Administrative expenses, publications. What do they want? Another political book to send out for the campaign next year at the taxpayer's expense?

Pay of six civilian employees, $16,035. That is pretty good pay for six of them.

This is asinine, in my opinion.

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

Mr. SUTTON. I yield.

Mr. LANE. I am wondering if the gentleman from Tennessee, since he is objecting to any money at all for this celebration participation by the United States at West Point, would object to appropriating any money for this particular observance that is going to be held on the 19th of January 1952, when General Lee's portrait in southern gray uniform will be dedicated at West Point—the 19th of January is General Lee's birthday.

Mr. SUTTON. Yes. I will tell the gentleman I am a great admirer of General Lee, but I still do not think we should appropriate Federal money for it. To me, there is no such thing as sectionalism. I am one southerner who is an American first. I do not think we should appropriate this $95,000, and after the Ford amendment, whether it is passed or defeated, I shall offer my amendment to strike out the entire $95,000.

Above all, I would like to say this: That I would like to go to West Point for their celebration, and if I am here I plan to go. But I will pay my own expenses to go there. I hope that West Point will pay its own expenses instead of asking for $95,000.

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

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. LANE) there were—ayes 98, noes 47.

So the amendment was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SUTTON: On page 5, line 22, strike out section 3 and section 4.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to take up the time of the Committee. All I would like to say is that this is not an economy drive. Certainly, I would like to save $95,000, but this is just another one of those things in which there is no justice. If we are going to appropriate $95,000 for West Point let us do the same for all the universities throughout the United States, or whether it be $5,000 or even $1,000.

I hope the amendment is adopted.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I had no intention of rising during the course of this debate, but I think we are overlooking one very important thing. It is all right to talk about private universities and their raising and spending money on their commemorative functions, but bear in mind that they have the right to spend their own money and, in addition, they all solicit funds; they have the right to solicit funds; their alumni as well as others participate in the fund raising.

West Point is an American institution; it is part of our Government. Under the law it has no right to solicit funds for anything, and if you do not appropriate the money for these events, West Point cannot spend $1. We Members can spend our own money to go there as visitors or participants if we want to, but West Point has no money except Government money. It cannot spend a dollar of that money unless this Congress authorizes the appropriation and appropriates the money.

I hope the amendment will be defeated.

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

Mr. MULTER. I yield.

Mr. SUTTON. West Point has an alumni; they have an alumni association.

Mr. MULTER. But they cannot use their money for this purpose and they cannot go out and solicit funds for any West Point event.

Mr. SUTTON. But they do.

Mr. MULTER. They have no right to do it under the law, and surely you do not want them to violate the law.

Mr. SUTTON. They do do it.

Mr. MULTER. This is an opportunity to aid in demonstrating to the world how we build our armed services, not for war but for peace. If ever there was a time when West Point needed a vote of confidence, it is now. Let us give that vote of confidence by rejecting this amendment and by adopting the resolution.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee.

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the Committee divided, and there were—ayes 58, noes 35.

So the amendment was rejected.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BENDER: On page 4, after line 24, insert "All living generals of the Armies."

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, we will accept that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. YATES, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration House Joint Resolution 285 to authorize appropriate participation by the United States in commemoration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the establishment of the United States Military Academy, pursuant to House Resolution 463, he reported the House joint resolution back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the House joint resolution.

The House joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the House joint resolution.

The House joint resolution was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on tomorrow, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

CONSULTATIVE ASSEMBLY OF THE COUNCIL OF EUROPE

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up Senate Concurrent Resolution 36 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

Whereas the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe adopted on May 12, 1951, a resolution reading as follows:

"The Assembly,

"Considering that the free peoples of Europe and of the United States have many vital problems in common,

"considering that the solidarity between them arises not only from the common dangers they have to face, but is also the reflection of their common origin, and of their community of thought and civilization,

"taking note that the Committee of Ministers in their message to the Assembly has declared that it would welcome any initiative of the Assembly designed to establish links with the Congress of the United States,

"believing that it would be of the greatest interest for public opinion in the democracies if these problems of common interest were to be discussed by delegations from the two Houses of Congress of the United States and from the Consultative Assembly,

"Instructs its Bureau

"To approach the Congress of the United States through the Speakers of both Houses

for the purpose of arranging such a discussion to take place in public, preferably in Strasbourg, or, if for any reason circumstances make it desirable, in Washington, at a date mutually convenient, and in accordance with an agenda drawn up in advance by agreement between the officers of the Congress of the United States and the Bureau of the Consultative Assembly"; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States has formally declared it "to be the policy of the people of the United States to encourage the further unification of Europe"; and

Whereas it is in the interest of the United States to encourage consultation between the Congress of the United States and the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States welcomes this invitation and expresses its appreciation of the unanimous action of the Consultative Assembly in extending it: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That not to exceed 14 Members of Congress shall be appointed to meet jointly with the representatives appointed by the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe for public discussion of problems of common interest, as envisioned by the resolution of the Consultative Assembly of May 12, 1951. Of the Members of the Congress to be appointed for the purposes of this resolution, half shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House from Members of the House, and half shall be appointed by the President of the Senate from Members of the Senate. Not more than four of the appointees from the respective Houses shall be of the same political party.

The expenses incurred by Members of the Senate, the House, and by staff members appointed for the purpose of carrying out this concurrent resolution shall not exceed $15,000 for each House, respectively, and shall be paid from the contingent fund of the House of which they are Members. Payment shall be made upon the submission of vouchers approved by the chairman of the respective House or Senate delegation.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois, and I now yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Speaker, this is a concurrent resolution which has already been passed by the Senate, authorizing the appointment of a commission of seven Members of the House and seven Members of the Senate, to accept the invitation of the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe to appear at its next meeting, which takes place in November.

This measure was considered, I believe, by members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. It came to the Committee on Rules because it sets up a special committee, and for that reason that committee had jurisdiction.

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

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Would this committee have any power to make commitments binding the Congress?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. None whatever. The resolution so specifically says.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. What do they discuss, world problems, to make us sort of one worlders and live in peace and harmony? What is the agenda?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I do not know whether that would make a lot of difference as long as they have no authority to do anything about it.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Just sort of conversation?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. No; I think it is really a matter to just show our sympathy and interest in the very worthy while effort of the European nations to try and work out their mutual problems.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. It is more or less unification of Europe or one world, is that the idea?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Well, they have this commission that is discussing their mutual problems.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I guess they ought to talk about that.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. It would not be a bad idea.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I would like to ask the gentleman from Virginia the meaning of the second paragraph on page 2. Does that mean we are still further trying to tell the nations of Europe as to what they shall do or not do? Just what does that particular paragraph have to do with the bill?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. That paragraph is not the language of the Committee on Foreign Affairs or the Senate or the House. It is the language of the resolution adopted by this consultative assembly, which merely precedes the invitation.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Might I suggest that that is one of the whereases on page 2. It seemingly commits this body to state that it is the policy of the people of the United States to encourage the further unification of Europe. Why should we go into that subject in this particular measure?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I will say to the gentleman from Minnesota that perhaps that language should not be in there. In any event, I will, at the proper time, offer an amendment to strike the whereases out of the resolution.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Speaker, the day before yesterday this House voted against a tax bill because they believed that the American people were paying too much in taxes at the present time. With the passage of this bill, I admit it is only $15,000 per house—but with the passage of this bill it merely means this: Do you want your Government to go into the red another $30,000 during this fiscal year? That is the whole proposition. We all admit that even though they are taking confiscatory taxes away from the people now, we are going in the red as it is, and the sole question here is: Do you want them to go into the red another $30,000?

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question or two of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], or the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN], anyone who has the information. This provides, on page 2 that not to exceed 14 Members of Congress shall be appointed to meet jointly with certain representatives of an European organization, the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe, half to be appointed by the Speaker of the House, the others by the President of the Senate.

My question is: Are there any Members of the House who are not committed to some investigation in some foreign country at the present time? Has anyone ascertained whether there are seven Members of the House who are available for this service? I ask someone from the Committee on Foreign Affairs for that information. Can you tell me whether any inquiry was made to ascertain whether Members would be available for the proposed discussion?

Mr. RICHARDS. The Committee on Foreign Affairs as such does not know whether or not Members would be available.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. You do not know?

Mr. RICHARDS. This resolution did not come from the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Where did it come from?

Mr. RICHARDS. The resolution came from the Committee on Rules. It was never considered by the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Then I will ask the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], who is handling the resolution here, Has any effort been made to ascertain whether there were seven Members of the House who would be available for this particular trip or discussion?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. As far as I know, there has been no special select committee set up to make an investigation of the very serious question the gentleman from Michigan raises. I might say, however, that the gentleman is a member of the Committee on Expenditures and it might be a subject for investigation by that committee.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I thank the gentleman. While I value his knowledge and his opinion, I call his attention to the fact that the Committee on Expenditurees in the Executive Departments has authority to investigate expenditures in the executive departments, not expenditures in the legislative department. That committee has no control over the expenditures of Members of Congress or its committees. It is concerned only with the executive branch of the Government. I ask this question in all seriousness because the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments has had some difficulty in finding four Republicans who want to go on this trip around the world that is just starting off Saturday at 10 o'clock and which will be back on the 5th of December. The one thing that to my mind makes it—I will not say worth while—I will say that one thing that might be said to make the trip worth while is that some of the women of Congress are being recognized as qualified to go on that trip abroad. They are going, and no longer can the women claim there is discrimination in at least this committee. But I do not like to vote for a resolution which will authorize the Speaker to appoint Members of Congress

when there might not be any Members available. We might have to have supplemental resolutions coming in here drafting Members of the House, and some of us may have duties elsewhere either on other investigating committees or here on the floor, or explaining to our constituents, even, why it is that the tax rate is so high and why it is, after we have appropriated so much money—and they paid little attention to that at that time—it becomes necessary to levy a tax or to borrow more money.

There are other things here, too, I would like to know about. On the first page it says:

Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe.

Probably had I been doing my homework I would know what that organization is. There are some 80 agencies which deal with foreign problems. Can the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] tell me about that? Just what is this Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe? What are its duties—who pays the bills for its operations? Or the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee [Mr. RICHARDS] may answer, if he prefers. What is it? Who is on it? What are its duties—its authority? There are 80 or more of those organizations, I am advised.

Mr. RICHARDS. If the gentleman will just wait I will tell him the nations in this organization. They are nations which have parliamentary bodies similar to ours. There were 10 nations to start with. There were 3 Scandinavian countries, and Great Britain, France, Italy, Luxemburg, Belgium, and Holland. I may not have named 10, but there were 10. Then, there were two additional nations, Greece and Turkey. The whole idea was to bring about an interchange of opinion on how to improve parliamentary government. They have asked the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives by a formal invitation to send a delegation of Congress over there because we, too, are supposed to be a democratic country. They seem to think, and I believe it, that some good would come out of it for both the European nations and this Nation itself.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. They will have the meat of real effective parliamentary procedure which gives a people peace, prosperity, liberty, and happiness if we send them copies of the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights—and if they follow the principles of those documents. Cannot our representatives on the United Nations discuss that matter with them?

Mr. RICHARDS. No, they have no authority in that capacity at all. This has nothing to do with the United Nations at all. This is the Council of Europe.

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

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH].

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, this resolution was sent to the floor of the House by the Committee on Rules, and the time is in charge of the Committee on Rules. Under the rules, any amendments to this resolution can only be offered if the chairman of the committee yields for that purpose, at which time such person, if anyone is recognized for that purpose, may have 1 hour. I make that explanation for this reason. After careful reading of this resolution, I am strongly of the opinion that it needs some amendment. First of all, let me say that I am very much in favor of the over-all idea expressed, and which is to be implemented by the resolution. I think the more conversations our people can have with the peoples of other governments, the more likely we are to have peace in this world in our time. So I am wholeheartedly in accord with what this resolution tries to do, but I would like to call the attention of the House to some of the problems involved in passing this resolution. In the first place, the resolution is for the purpose of accepting an invitation sent to us by unanimous vote of the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe. It certainly is sent in good faith, and for a good purpose. The invitation says conversations are to take place in public, and the invitation suggests that the conversations be in accordance with an agenda drawn up in advance by agreement between the officers of the Congress of the United States and the Bureau of the Assembly. That is all rather clear and reasonable. But the pending resolution does not confer any power whatever on these 14 Members of the Congress to organize themselves, to delegate the chairman among themselves or to set up an agenda. It does not provide for the keeping of a record, but it does say something about staff members. How many staff members are there to be, and what are they supposed to do? Just what is the function of such a staff, and what will be the result of their going? The meeting is a public meeting. If we pass this resolution, we will be sending 14 Members of the Congress, 7 from the House and 7 from the other body. Are they speaking for themselves or are they speaking for the Congress of the United States? Are they speaking officially or are they speaking unofficially? Will their status be understood by the public who will be in attendance at these meetings since they are to be public meetings? What will be the over-all effect of a meeting of this kind under these circumstances with no more proscription regarding the voice of these people who go there than is specified in this resolution? I submit, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this resolution is exceedingly serious in these times. I recommend to the acting chairman of the Rules Committee, and the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs that steps be taken to amend this resolution so as in some way to give it a little bit clearer meaning, and place on the people we are sending a little more limitation than this resolution provides. I offer these comments in sincerity, and with my own approval of the idea of the resolution, but unfortunately with disapproval of the wording of it as it now stands.

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

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman know how long this conference is supposed to last?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. No. There is nothing said in the resolution as to how long the conference is expected to last.

Mr. GROSS. So we can expend $2,140 per head at a conference that may last for a week. Is that right?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. That is possible. My criticism is not with the idea of the resolution itself, which does not say anything at all except that we are to send 14 Members to Europe. I do think it is an error to give such a blank check to any 14 individuals officially representing the Congress of the United States.

Mr. GROSS. This does not state whether they are observers or whether they have any official capacity.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. It does not clarify their status as representatives of the United States. It simply says they are from the Congress, but I, as a Member of this body, hesitate to vote to send even my good friends and colleagues in this body to Europe to talk over matters of policy with other nations unless I know what they are going to talk about.

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

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. What can be done by this assembly that could not be done by the Interparliamentary Union, to which we send a delegation each year?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. In answer to the gentleman's question on that point, I think we could reasonably send people in response to this invitation, since the invitation has been made. I feel as I said in the beginning that all the consultation we can have with officials of other countries is a good thing, because it is only by full and free discussion of our mutual problems that we will have peace. So I am heartily in favor of the idea, but I took this time simply to explain some of the things that I feel are defective in this resolution. Perhaps the ensuing debate will be sufficient to clarify the responsibilities of the delegation we send. I hope so.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Oregon has again expired.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I might add to what I said a while ago, that this resolution has already passed the Senate. The Senate, in addition to that, has passed a Senate resolution, so that whatever this body may do, nevertheless this country is going to be represented at this occasion, either solely by Members of the Senate or by Members of both the House and the Senate. They have already passed two resolutions, so that they can catch it one way or the other. I am sure there will be a better understanding after we have heard from the chairman of the Committee on For-

eign Affairs, and I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS] 10 minutes.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I am taking this time as chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee to explain that my committee did not consider this resolution. It was very properly referred to and considered by the Committee on Rules. Nevertheless the Foreign Affairs Committee has a strong indirect interest in this resolution. As a matter of fact, identical resolutions were introduced in both the House and Senate. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] has just said this resolution has unanimously passed the Senate. A similar simple resolution was also adopted by the Senate, which makes it possible for Members of the Senate to go regardless of whether any Members of the House are appointed to go.

The gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH] said something about our not knowing what the duties of this delegation would be. As a matter of fact, the invitation from the Council, signed by the president of the Council and also by the vice president, states that they have issued a formal invitation to the House and to the Senate for this delegation to come over there and consult with them before their regular session begins. Something was said about not knowing how long the committee would be there. I do not know of anybody on the Foreign Affairs Committee who is scheduled to go. But the plan is that the Members who will be designated should go there for 5 or 6 days. They would be there not longer than a week to consult on democratic processes of government with the 125 members of the Consultative Assembly.

Fifteen thousand dollars is involved in this. There is no question about that, but when you think of the great sum that we have spent in military aid in Europe I feel that it would be well spent. This $15,000 might be well spent if this delegation does not do anything but impress upon the Council of Europe what the United States has tried to do in its fight against Communist influence throughout the world.

We have plenty of military men over there to give them military advice, and we have diplomats galore, but so far we have not had an official committee from the Congress of the United States to tell these people what we are up against and what they are up against. Frankly, I think this sum of $15,000 would be spent to our best advantage. Those people over there have given us a courteous invitation; they want advice from our side of the picture. The question is whether it will be worth while to the United States to accept. Frankly, I think it would be.

There will be 7 Members of the House, not from the Foreign Affairs Committee or any particular committee, plus 7 from the Senate, not from the Foreign Relations Committee or any particular committee of that body, but 14 in all who would meet and advise with these people, learn from them. At the same time they would learn from us some of the problems each is up against, and particularly the problems we are up against in this country from particularly the economic and financial standpoint.

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

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. What are we to tell them from our side? That the Treasury of the United States is busted, but that we will continue to shovel out money by the scoop shovelful and further burden our people?

Mr. RICHARDS. I do not know what is going to be told to them. I do not know what the gentleman would say if he should go. Even granting that the gentleman is against all of the things that we have done to help the democracies of Europe in this common front against communism; granting all that, I cannot see why the gentleman does not agree that this meeting might not be helpful.

Mr. GROSS. I know how I would spend my $15,000.

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

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. Is it not a fact that in the laws passed by Congress we have insisted on, first, the encouragement of unification, the next year further unification, and this year by a law passed by this House upon economic unification and political federation of Europe as a condition of aid that we have already voted? The formal expressions of the Congress to which I have referred shows that that is our belief, that they have got to get together or there is no hope for them? And, therefore, based upon those statements we have already written into law it might be extremely helpful for Members of Congress to call that to their attention as they make their points.

Mr. RICHARDS. The gentleman has hit the heart and core of this thing.

I referred a while ago to the language on page 2 to which the gentleman referred, which is included in the second paragraph:

> Whereas the Congress of the United States has formally declared it to be the policy of the United States to encourage the further unification of Europe—

That wording and the wording to which the gentleman referred are to be found in both the Economic Cooperation Act and also the Mutual Security Act. We laid down the pattern; we admonished them that they should do these things, and now they ask us to go over there and further advise them.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. That particular paragraph is distasteful to some of us who feel we ought not to continue to stick our nose into Europe's business at every opportunity.

Mr. RICHARDS. I have not any particular pride in that phraseology, but it is a fact; those words have been used by the Congress in two great pieces of legislation which have been passed here. I do not want to argue with the gentleman about the matter.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I have already stated that at the proper time I shall move to strike out all of the preamble of the resolution.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Yes; I understood the gentleman to say that, but I am fearful that the parliamentary situation might prevent the gentleman's doing that.

Mr. RAYBURN. The gentleman has control of the time.

Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the distinguished Speaker of the House.

Mr. RAYBURN. Representatives of these organizations came to see me, and I am sure they came to see other Members of the House. As is stated in the report on this resolution, it commits the United States of America to nothing. These people already have this organization and they simply want Representatives of the Congress of the United States to come and sit in with them on this one meeting without any commitment, or any obligation or anything of the kind. I think it is a gesture of friendship that the Congress of the United States should certainly be willing to accord to these people who are trying to go in the same direction that I trust we are going in an endeavor to strengthen the democracies of the world against totalitarian states.

Mr. RICHARDS. I thank the distinguished Speaker.

Mr. GROSS. Can there be any question of the friendship of the United States to the nations of the world?

Mr. RICHARDS. I would not think so. Some people might think so.

Mr. GROSS. Why, the gesture?

Mr. RICHARDS. That is not the only question involved here.

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

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. This Congress is pretty free in appropriating money for other people to go over and represent this country. Here is an opportunity to appropriate or to authorize an appropriation for a little amount for some of our Members, most of them outside of the Foreign Affairs Committee, to see at first hand what the problems are and what we can do. As a matter of fact, I think that this committee will come back with recommendations to the effect that will in the long run save us millions and millions of dollars.

Mr. RICHARDS. I thank the gentleman. Remember, whether you like this resolution or not, let me emphasize what has just been said, there will be a delegation from the Congress going over there. Seven Members of the Senate will go. If the Congress is to be represented in consultation with this organization I want this body to be represented, too.

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

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

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Of course, I love every member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. RICHARDS. Please remember that this resolution did not come from the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. There are only three or four of its members who represent my views. The gentleman cannot represent my views on foreign affairs, and I refer to the gentleman speaking, although I think a lot of him, his integrity and character, and do not impugn his motives at all. But we in the Midwest have a different philosophy in thinking about what our Government should do in sticking its nose into the business of every country in the world. I hope we will have men on there who will think my way.

Mr. RICHARDS. I do not expect the gentleman to adopt my views and I hope I will never adopt his as he has expressed them.

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

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I might explain to the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee that one purpose I had in objecting to the resolution was so there would be these things discussed on the floor today to make a record on the House side for this resolution since there is no report, which is generally considered as part of the legislative history of a bill. I am glad that the gentleman is making the statement he is making. I want to ask a question for the purpose of the record. The activities and the discussions of these Members that we send over there is unofficial. It does not bind the Congress of the United States, it does not bind any Member; it is merely for the purpose of a full and free discussion of the problems; in other words, a round-table get-together and talking of things over. Is that the general idea?

Mr. RICHARDS. That is the general idea. It binds nobody to anything.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 208]

Abbitt	Bramblett	Dague
Allen, Calif.	Brown, Ohio	Dawson
Allen, La.	Brownson	Deane
Anderson, Calif.	Buckley	Delaney
Angell	Busbey	Dempsey
Armstrong	Byrnes, Wis.	Denny
Auchincloss	Case	D'Ewart
Baring	Celler	Dingell
Barrett	Chudoff	Engle
Bates, Ky.	Cole, N. Y.	Fallon
Beall	Combs	Fulton
Blackney	Coudert	Garmatz
Boggs, La.	Crawford	Gavin
Bosone	Crosser	Golden
Granger	McCarthy	Rooney
Green	McConnell	Roosevelt
Gwinn	McDonough	Sabath
Harrison, Va.	McGrath	St. George
Hart	McKinnon	Scott, Hardie
Hays, Ark.	Mack, Ill.	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Hébert	Martin, Iowa	Shelley
Herlong	Miller, Calif.	Sikes
Hess	Morrison	Sittler
Holifield	Murphy	Stockman
Irving	Murray, Wis.	Teague
Jackson, Calif.	Passman	Thompson, Tex.
Javits	Perkins	Thornberry
Johnson	Phillips	Vinson
Judd	Powell	Watts
Kearney	Prouty	Werdel
Kelley, Pa.	Quinn	Whitaker
Kennedy	Rabaut	Whitten
Keogh	Ramsay	Winstead
Larcade	Redden	Wood, Ga.
Latham	Regan	
Lucas	Ribicoff	
Lyle	Rogers, Fla.	

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and twenty Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

CONSULTATIVE ASSEMBLY OF THE COUNCIL OF EUROPE

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

(Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, this matter I bring before the House I bring with sorrow. It does not have to do with our foreign policy; it is a veto message from the President of the United States of the so-called automobile bill for amputees, the hand and leg amputees, paraplegics, and the blind.

I did not dream that the President would veto this bill, but he has; and why, I do not know. These boys were sent into war in Korea; our other boys were sent into war, into World War II. Many of these boys were wounded in World War II. Many of these fine men were sent to Korea ill-equipped; they did not have the proper clothing; they did not have the proper arms or ammunition; they were fighting under green officers, and many of them were wounded by the material that we had given or sold to other countries. England has sold or given to the Chinese and Russians many guns and much munitions of war. The United States also did so. Many of these boys now lying out at Walter Reed Hospital, the Naval Center at Bethesda, and hospitals all over the country were wounded by our own gunfire, injured by missiles made in the United States. Many of the amputees lost their arms and legs because of inadequate clothing for cold weather.

Mr. Speaker, three times the House has passed this bill and the Senate has passed the provisions of this bill. It was vetoed 2 years ago but some of the things to which the President objected were taken out of the bill and the Congress passed the bill again and it was sent to the White House.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, no one will want to go home until the veto has been overridden. How can any one of you go back to your district and tell your amputees and your blind, your paraplegics, that you did not stay to override a veto? Billions for foreign aid and billions for military defense—recommended by the President and passed by the Congress, and a mere pittance for the maimed. I know you will do it when the veto message comes over tomorrow. Override. It has to be acted upon by the Senate first to override—they will override then we will override.

Under the foreign-aid bill for $8,000,000,000 automobiles will go over there to foreign countries, to foreigners. Many automobiles are being sent to Latin American countries. Think of hundreds of persons in our Government, at home and abroad, rolling around in automobiles, able-bodied men.

The membership of the Senate and House will override, I am sure. The Congress will not adjourn until this bill is passed.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON].

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I am particularly happy to have a few moments in which to discuss this Senate Concurrent Resolution 36 which the House is presently considering. My distinguished chairman the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS] has made it clear that the Foreign Affairs Committee had nothing to do with the introduction of the resolution, but that it has come to us through the Rules Committee. However, the Foreign Affairs Committee is deeply interested as it would seem to be an excellent way to build better understanding on the parliamentary level. I have taken great interest in this valiant effort by the nations of free Europe to reverse history and would like to refer you to a report that I made to this body on my return from Europe in 1949.

The first meeting of the Council of Europe was held at Strasbourg in 1949 following the signing of the statute in London on May 5, 1949, was a meeting of delegates from 12 countries who had an expressed aim "to achieve a greater unity between its members." As I studied it and talked with the people who were there, as I followed in detail everything that had been done, it was to be one of the most exciting things that the world has seen since our own constitutional convention. Granted, the delegates had no power, but they faced the realities of the complex problem of attempting to unite nations which for centuries had fought, which for centuries had hated each other, which for centuries had been suspicious of each other.

What they have been trying to do in these all too few years has been to turn the wheels of history right around. In the first meeting they set up committees, one of which was a committee to examine the various constitutions to see what would have to be changed in each separate constitution in order to make it possible for them to join in a federation of states of Europe and become united in order to fight the menace from the East.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. BOLTON. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. On the desirability of unifying Western Europe for the common good, we made that decision long ago.

Mrs. BOLTON. I have only 1 minute left.

Mr. COX. I thank the gentlewoman.

Mrs. BOLTON. The second committee was created to discover what were the common denominators of possible agreement.

Now, they have come to us—not we to them, they to us—saying to us: We feel it would be exceedingly helpful and constructive if there might be informal discussions between us and a group of your Congress on our parliamentary level, of the problems that we are facing in our effort to unite the free countries of Europe.

It seems to me that nothing could be more gracious on their part and nothing more constructive on ours. Members of the Senate are going. The seven Members mentioned for House participation are not mandatory. However, the Speaker will appoint them from the membership, and he will make good appointments. I have confidence in his judgment.

Then we will have the opportunity of having reported back to us the point of view of the people over there. Mr. Spaak, President of the Council; Lord Layton, the Vice President; and Mr. Paris, the Secretary General, serving both Council and Assembly, were over here several months ago. There was a meeting with a few Members of the Senate and a few Members of the House. An agenda was drawn up, torn apart, and put together again. From what I have seen of it, Mr. Speaker, I think there need not be any fear about the agenda for this meeting. It will be wholesome, it will be constructive, and it will be a very good thing for this country to be able to talk with people of these other countries on such a basis.

I hope that in the wisdom of this House there will be no question with reference to the passage of this resolution.

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

Mrs. BOLTON. I yield gladly to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. This is a simple resolution. The Senate has passed it, so if we do not pass it there will be representatives from the Senate present and none from the House. We all have pride in the House, and in the stability of the House, and in the ability of the House. Futhermore, there has been an invitation extended to the Members of the Congress to attend and participate, and it would be most unfortunate if the invitation were rejected.

Mrs. BOLTON. May I remind our majority leader, the very distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, and modestly suggest that the House did have the first record of this Strasbourg meeting; that some of us have followed its courageous work with a considerable amount of care, and that it would indeed be most unfortunate, as the gentleman states, if some of the House membership were not present at this Strasbourg meeting.

Mr. McCORMACK. I agree with the gentlewoman.

Mrs. BOLTON. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WOOD].

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, one of the clearest things that has ever happened in my life and perhaps left the greatest impression is when I stood in front of the Speaker's desk here and took the oath of office; when I swore to maintain and support the Constitution of the United States against all enemies from without and from within. I meant every word I said.

Mr. Speaker, there has grown up within this country in the past 4 or 5 years one of the greatest subversive plots of all history, to take our constitutional Republic and merge it within a one-world body, which has been formed without the slightest authorization, within the body of the United Nations. Each of these aggressions came in with a simple resolution committing us to nothing. We were merely there to talk, but from the first one developed the United Nations and from its self-propagating womb have sprung up hundreds of organizations which are costing us millions of dollars yearly, and perhaps one world war. Then after that came the Atlantic Pact, which started as a simple resolution, which committed us to nothing except discussion, which plainly stated that it could take no funds from us. It could call no men over into Europe or any other place unless there was an actual act of aggression. It has and is taking funds from us. It now has somewhere in the neighborhood of 1,500,000 or 2,000,000 men illegally over in Europe, but there has been no aggression and no war declared, and no order of any Atlantic Pact or any other group except our military government here in the United States has sent those men abroad. Will this Congress not wake up to the fact that a treasonable plot is well-nigh completed to seize this Government and turn it over into a hybrid, mongrel world state, 51 percent of which is even now Communist, and if Communist China is admitted, it will be 69 percent Communist?

Mr. Speaker, I have nothing against Europe; I have nothing against talks, I have nothing against leagues or organizations in which we can meet for the discussion of helpful ideas and the development of mutual help, but when that breeds and develops into an organization which seeks to steal from us our Government and to merge it into a world state, I am very much against it, and I hope the time will never come, as long as God gives me breath, when I shall stand on the floor of this House and not speak against it. I earnestly hope and desire that all Members of this Congress will please read over your oaths tonight again, and make very sure that in these simple resolutions you are not carrying things one step farther toward our becoming the smallest member, so far as votes are concerned, in this world group.

We are supposed to meet with the democracies. What common ground have we with democracies? The democracies crucified Christ. Democracy is mob law. It has always been wrong. We are not a democracy, we are a constitutional republic.

The gentlewoman from Ohio just spoke about overhauling the constitutions of those European nations. I submit to her there are none. Even Great Britain, which at one time took precedence over the other governments of Europe, and who was largely the cradle of our liberties, never had a constitution which was ever submitted to writing. These peoples have little in common with our constitutional republic except to seek and complete the mulcting of our savings of 200 years in a vain and foolish attempt, on our part, to send freedom abroad in a paper bag as a merchantable commodity. Freedom cannot be bought or sent to anyone. It must be implanted within the hearts of men by Almighty God. And if so implanted, it can never be destroyed except by the glory of the Lord God being desecrated by our own acts within the Shekinah of our liberty.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, when Benjamin Franklin came out of Constitution Hall where they were having a struggle to write the Constitution of the United States, and there was a long and hard struggle with a lot of difference of opinion, someone said to him, "Ben, what kind of government did you give us?"

Old Ben without hesitation at all said, "I have given you a republic, if you can keep it." I am wondering if we have a republic in this country that we are going to continue to keep very long. It seems uncertain.

Regarding this resolution, I have no objection to the folks sitting down to a sort of sewing bee and discussing the problems of the day, but I am wondering just how much they may commit the United States to do. Under the Democratic leadership on this side you have put us into the Marshall plan. From a little, obscure speech by a man by the name of Marshall up in one of the colleges we got the Marshall plan, that has drained from this country billions of dollars. Yes, it has done some good, but I submit to you that we do not have a single country on the face of the earth that is our friend today. Listen to the political speeches in England. When Aneurin Bevan is making a speech about this country, what does he say? He points the finger of scorn at the United States and says, "Sure, you people of the United States have brought us down to the position we are in today." And he means it, and the people believe him.

It was said on the floor of the House here that we have demanded of Europe unification, we have demanded that they do something about their tax laws, about their political problems. We have put our nose into every country's business, until we are the hated nation of the world.

Go over to Egypt today. The mobs there chant their hate of this country. Its amazing how we are hated. Your life would not be worth much if you went over there in Egypt today, yet we have poured billions of dollars all over the world, including Egypt, in an effort to buy friends. Have we bought friends? Not at all.

Somebody says, "Well, the other body is going to go over, we ought to go." They have unlimited debate in the other body, and they like to talk. I do not have any objection to their going. I am not going to object to this country's going, but I do not like them to go there and commit this country. It has been done every time at these conferences. In the Atlantic Pact, a little grain of mustard was planted and what has it amounted to? Billions of American dollars and the lives of many American boys eventually will be wasted in Europe because of a little Atlantic Pact that did not have any authority except to talk. The United Nations is the same way. They have some 50 different organizations within the United Nations. I supported the measure, but I am getting sick at heart and want to vomit when I think about some of the things they are doing in this organization and what they do to our country. They do not represent the views of this country—the U. N. is filled with known Communists. They are permitted to roam this country and show their venom for all to see and hear. That occurs under this new deal group who dictates our foreign policy. As I said to the gentleman from the Carolinas he was not very kind to me about never wanting to represent my views. I do not care whether you do or not. But your administration, young fellow, has brought this Nation to its knees. You are bleeding us white all over the world, and putting cemeteries and graves in every town in the United States because of the damnable foreign policy that your party has imposed upon this Congress and the people of the United States. I am sick and tired of that kind of leadership. If you want to have phoney inflation and phoney prosperity with the blood of American boys, you can have it. But I do not want it. I say to you, it is none of our business to stick our nose into the business of every country in the world. If this committee wants to have a little sewing bee and sit around and do some talking all right, but do not go over there and committ the United States of America to some wild new plans. I say to the Speaker in all earnestness that to interfere in other countries as we are doing brings contempt upon us. I hope those he appoints will not be all the worlders who want to get us into every situation all over the world. These new dealers are spending us into destruction—Its about time for this Congress to represent America.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX].

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, that the attitude of some of the European countries toward the United States is not as friendly as might be desirable, I readily admit, and that the United Nations does not function to my complete satisfaction is likewise true, but on the question of the desirability of unifying Western Europe for the common good—we made that decision long ago. Now to hesitate to go forward with the program that has been made, would, in my judgment, be a mistake. In addition, Mr. Speaker, the failure to adopt this resolution would, in my opinion, be a discourtesy to the Senate. It would constitute an affront to the countries that have asked us to come and sit with them and counsel with them on the state of the free world. I hope that the House will view this whole question in a generous spirt, and will do what I think is the proper thing, that is, to accept the resolution; let the representation of the House go abroad with the representation of the Senate, and make such favorable presentation of the case of the United States and of the free world as it is possible for them to make.

Mr. Speaker, I remind you, sir, I have never too greatly favored the setting up of special committees to do too much traveling abroad, but this is not a committee which is being set up. This is a group of representatives of the House, whom the resolution authorizes the Speaker to appoint to visit abroad with a like representation from the other body in response to an invitation that has been extended. I hope the affront to these friendly people whose cooperation is so important for world peace will not be made by voting down this resolution.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KERSTEN].

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of this resolution because its objective is the unification of Europe. The lack of such unification was the cause of World Wars I and II.

The ultimate objective and ideal for Europe is a United States of Europe. Who can quarrel with that? The economic and political unification of Europe would be a major step toward permanent peace. Certainly the economic and political unification of the United States of America is the strongest guarantee against internecine conflict on our continent.

In this Europe is seeking to emulate the United States. Why should we not encourage them?

In his Farewell Address George Washington said:

> It will be worthy of a free, enlightened, and at no distant period, a great nation to give mankind the magnanimous and too novel example of a people always guided by an exalted justice and benevolence.

Why should not the principle of unity among our people be held up as an example to disunited peoples elsewhere? Those who are not concerned with areas of potential major conflict in Europe should take steps first to do away with all modern communications, transportation, and weapons.

Certainly in discussing and encouraging the unification of Europe we are following Washington's advice when he said:

> Observe good faith and justice towards all nations; cultivate peace and harmony with all. Religion and morality enjoin this conduct, and can it be that good policy does not equally enjoin it?

We cannot cultivate peace and harmony with all by crawling into a shell.

I believe that we should avoid dangerous foreign entanglements. I also know that the world Socialists who dominate the present administration would squander our substance all over the world. But, as the greatest nation in the world today, we cannot play the ostrich.

If we can bring about conditions of permanent peace in Europe we can avoid the attractions which led us into entanglements that brought on the late world wars wherein we took sides in a divided Europe.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike from the resolution the recital beginning with the first "Whereas" on page 1 and ending at the beginning of line 1 on page 2.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Strike out the language beginning on page 1 beginning with the first "Whereas" down to and including the last "Whereas" appearing on page 2.

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

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I agree that it should be stricken out, but I am also informed that when we adopted the ECA policy we adopted the same words that are quoted here, "to be the policy of the people of the United States to encourage the further unification of Europe." That was in the ECA bill. Whether that makes any difference or not, I do not know.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GROSS) there were—ayes 133, noes 31.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is no quorum present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 238, nays 75, answered "present" 1, not voting 114, as follows:

[Roll No. 209]

YEAS—238

Aandahl	Betts	Byrne, N. Y.
Addonizio	Boggs, Del.	Camp
Albert	Bolling	Canfield
Andrews	Bolton	Carlyle
Anfuso	Bonner	Carnahan
Aspinall	Bow	Chatham
Ayres	Boykin	Chelf
Bakewell	Bray	Chenoweth
Barden	Brown, Ga.	Chiperfield
Bates, Mass.	Brownson	Church
Battle	Bryson	Colmer
Beamer	Buchanan	Cooley
Beckworth	Burleson	Cooper
Bender	Burnside	Corbett
Bennett, Fla.	Burton	Cotton

Cox
Crumpacker
Cunningham
Curtis, Mo.
Davis, Tenn.
DeGraffenried
Denton
Dollinger
Dolliver
Donohue
Donovan
Dorn
Doughton
Doyle
Durham
Eaton
Eberharter
Elliott
Ellsworth
Elston
Evins
Feighan
Fenton
Fernandez
Fine
Fisher
Flood
Fogarty
Forand
Ford
Forrester
Frazier
Fugate
Furcolo
Gamble
Gary
Gathings
Goodwin
Gordon
Gore
Graham
Granahan
Grant
Greenwood
Gregory
Hagen
Hale
Halleck
Hand
Harden
Hardy
Harvey
Havenner
Hays, Ohio
Heffernan
Heller
Herter
Heselton
Hill
Hillings
Hinshaw
Holifield
Holmes
Hope
Horan
Howell
Hunter
Ikard
Jackson, Wash.
James
Jarman
Jenkins
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Jones, Hamilton C.
Jones, Woodrow W.
Karsten, Mo.
Kearns
Keating
Kee
Kelly, N. Y.
Kerr
Kersten, Wis.
Kilburn
Kilday
Klein
Kluczynski
Lane
Lanham
Lantaff
LeCompte
Lesinski
Lind
Lovre
McCarthy
McCormack
McCulloch
McGregor
McGuire
McMillan
McMullen
Madden
Magee
Mahon
Mansfield
Marshall
Martin, Mass.
Meader
Merrow
Miller, Md.
Miller, N. Y.
Mills
Mitchell
Morano
Morgan
Morris
Morton
Multer
Murdock
Murray, Tenn.
Nelson
Nicholson
O'Brien, Ill.
O' Brien, Mich.
O'Neill
Ostertag
O'Toole
Passman
Patman
Patterson
Philbin
Poage
Polk
Potter
Preston
Price
Priest
Rabaut
Radwan
Rains
Ramsay
Reams
Reece, Tenn.
Reed, Ill.
Rhodes
Richards
Riehlman
Riley
Rivers
Roberts
Robeson
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Mass.
Rogers, Tex.
Sadlak
Sasscer
Secrest
Seely-Brown
Sieminski
Smith, Miss.
Smith, Va.
Smith, Wis.
Spence
Springer
Staggers
Stanley
Steed
Stigler
Tackett
Talle
Taylor
Teague
Thomas
Thompson, Mich.
Trimble
Van Pelt
Van Zandt
Vorys
Walter
Weichel
Welch
Whitten
Wickersham
Widnall
Wier
Wigglesworth
Willis
Wolcott
Wolverton
Yates
Yorty
Zablocki

NAYS—75

Abernethy
Adair
Allen, Ill.
Andersen, H. Carl
Andresen, August H.
Arends
Belcher
Bennett, Mich.
Berry
Bishop
Brehm
Budge
Buffett
Burdick
Bush
Clevenger
Cole, Kans.
Crosser
Curtis, Nebr.
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Devereux
Dondero
George
Gross
Hall, Edwin Arthur
Hall, Leonard W.
Harris
Harrison, Wyo.
Hedrick
Hoeven
Hoffman, Ill.
Hoffman, Mich.
Hull
Jenison
Jensen
Jonas
Kean
McVey
Mack, Wash.
Mason
Miller, Nebr.
Mumma
Norblad
Norrell
O'Hara
O'Konski
Patten
Pickett
Poulson
Rankin
Reed, N. Y.
Rees, Kans.
St. George
Saylor
Schwabe
Scrivner
Scudder
Shafer
Sheehan
Simpson, Ill.
Smith, Kans.
Taber
Tollefson
Vail
Velde
Vursell
Wharton
Wheeler
Williams, Miss.
Williams, N. Y.
Wilson, Ind.
Winstead
Withrow
Wood, Idaho

ANSWERED PRESENT—1

Butler

NOT VOTING—114

Abbitt
Allen, Calif.
Allen, La.
Anderson, Calif.
Angell
Armstrong
Auchincloss
Bailey
Baker
Baring
Barrett
Bates, Ky.
Beall
Bentsen
Blackney
Blatnik
Boggs, La.
Bosone
Bramblett
Brooks
Brown, Ohio
Buckley
Busbey
Byrnes, Wis.
Cannon
Case
Celler
Chudoff
Clemente
Cole, N. Y.
Combs
Coudert
Crawford
Dague
Dawson
Deane
Delaney
Dempsey
Denny
D'Ewart
Dingell
Engle
Fallon
Fulton
Garmatz
Gavin
Golden
Granger
Green
Gwinn
Harrison, Va.
Hart
Hays, Ark.
Hébert
Herlong
Hess
Irving
Jackson, Calif.
Javits
Johnson
Judd
Kearney
Kelley, Pa.
Kennedy
Keogh
King
Kirwan
Larcade
Latham
Lucas
Lyle
McConnell
McDonald
McGrath
McKinnon
Machrowicz
Mack, Ill.
Martin, Iowa
Miller, Calif.
Morrison
Moulder
Murphy
Murray, Wis.
Perkins
Phillips
Powell
Prouty
Quinn
Redden
Regan
Ribicoff
Rogers, Fla.
Rooney
Roosevelt
Sabath
Scott, Hardie
Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Shelley
Sheppard
Short
Sikes
Simpson, Pa.
Sittler
Stockman
Sutton
Thompson, Tex.
Thornberry
Vinson
Watts
Werdel
Whitaker
Wilson, Tex.
Wood, Ga.
Woodruff

So the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Javits for, with Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin against.

Mr. Vinson for, with Mr. Busbey against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Beall.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Auchincloss.
Mr. Bates of Kentucky with Mr. Kearney.
Mr. Watts with Mr. Martin of Iowa.
Mr. Abbitt with Mr. Prouty.
Mr. Hart with Mr. Hess.
Mr. Redden with Mr. Short.
Mr. Regan with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Keogh with Mr. Armstrong.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Cole of New York.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Dague.
Mr. Rooney with Mr. Fulton.
Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Gavin.
Mr. Rogers of Florida with Mr. Gwinn.
Mr. Herlong with Mr. Baker.
Mr. Baring with Mr. Anderson of California.
Mr. Clemente with Mr. Allen of California.
Mr. Quinn with Mr. Golden.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Case.
Mr. Chudoff with Mr. Coudert.
Mr. Barrett with Mr. Crawford.
Mr. McGrath with Mr. Denny.
Mr. Mack of Illinois with Mr. Angell.
Mr. Perkins with Mr. Jackson of California.
Mr. Murphy with Mr. Johnson.
Mr. Whitaker with Mr. Woodruff.
Mr. Green with Mr. Hardie Scott.
Mr. Granger with Mr. Werdel.
Mr. Garmatz with Mr. Stockman.
Mr. Fallon with Mr. McDonough.
Mr. Engle of California with Mr. McConnell.
Mr. Dempsey with Mr. Brown of Ohio.
Mr. Deane with Mr. Bramblett.
Mrs. Bosone with Mr. Hugh D. Scott, Jr.
Mr. Moulder with Mr. Phillips.
Mr. King with Mr. D'Ewart.
Mr. Thompson of Texas with Mr. Sittler.
Mr. Sutton with Mr. Murray of Wisconsin.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The doors were opened.

THE HEADWATERS ON THE WARRIOR RIVER SYSTEM ABOVE LOCK AND DAM 17, IN ALABAMA, SHOULD BE IMMEDIATELY DEVELOPED FOR FLOOD CONTROL, NAVIGATION, HYDROELECTRIC POWER, AND WATER-CONSEPVATION PURPOSES

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I have just introduced a bill to authorize an examination and survey of that part of the Warrior River and its tributaries above lock and dam 17 in Alabama, for the purposes of flood control, navigation, hydroelectric power, water-conservation and allied purposes. The bill provides for the survey to be made under the direction of the Chief of the Corps of United States engineers, and further authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to make a preliminary examination and survey for retarding the water flow and preventing soil erosion in the drainage area of the Warrior River and its tributaries above lock and dam 17.

I hope this bill will receive early and favorable consideration by the House Committee on Public Works and by the House itself.

I am confident that the Corps of Engineers will find that this headwaters section of the Warrior and its tributaries, which drain an area of some 2,000 square miles of land, has great potentialities from the standpoint of national defense, and great possibilities relating to the future economic and industrial development of the entire area.

The examination and survey envisioned by this bill will cover the Mulberry Fork of the Warrior River, which rises in northeast Cullman County and forms the boundary line between Cullman and Blount Counties in the Seventh Congressional District; the Sipsey Fork of the Mulberry River, which rises in northern Winston and pursues a southeasterly course across Walker County to join the Mulberry River near Empire, Ala.; also, the Locust Fork of the Warrior River, which begins in Marshall County, and which with its tributaries crosses the whole of Blount County to enter Jefferson County near Trafford, Ala., from which point it pursues a southwesterly direction across Jefferson County via Birmingport to join the Mulberry Fork on the boundary betweeen Walker and Jefferson Counties, just a few miles above lock and dam 17.

I predict, Mr. Speaker, that the examination and survey which this bill calls for will result in the finding that it is practical, economical and in the interest of national defense to develop the hydroelectric power inherent in the racing headwaters of these streams, constantly fed by an average rainfall of more than 50 inches per year, over a drainage area of more than 2,000 square miles.

The navigability of the streams embraced within the area covered by this

resolution should be improved, industrial water should be conserved to meet the ever-expanding economy of the great coal, steel, timber and clay region through which these streams flow.

And last, but not least, the implementation of this bill by the construction of justified dams and other public works will have the effect of stopping the ruinous floods which, at periodical intervals, descend upon the towns along the banks of the lower reaches of the Warrior River.

The improvements which must be made on the headwaters section of the Warrior River, should be made in such a manner as to conserve every resource of the area. These resources are many and varied. Full account should be taken of the agricultural and timber resources. I doubt very much whether any stream development can reach its maximum efficiency without adequately evaluating these factors.

YELLOWSTONE RIVER

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill S. 1311, an act granting the consent of Congress to a compact entered into by the States of Montana, North Dakota, and Wyoming relating to the waters of the Yellowstone River.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do so for the purpose of asking the gentleman to explain the bill, if he will.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, the bill has been cleared by the leadership on both sides of the aisle. It has been unanimously reported by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House. A House bill by Congressman D'EWART is identical with the Senate bill. This is the usual form of compact between the States concerning an interstate stream. I am positive there is no objection that has been called to my attention.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JACKSON of Washington). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of the Congress is hereby given to an interstate compact relating to the waters of the Yellowstone River which was signed (after negotiations in which a representative of the United States duly appointed by the President participated) by the Commissioners for the States of Montana, North Dakota, and Wyoming on December 8, 1950, at Billings, Mont., and which was thereafter ratified by the legislatures of each of the States aforesaid as provided by Public Law 83, Eighty-first Congress, approved June 2, 1949, which compact reads as follows:

YELLOWSTONE RIVER COMPACT

The State of Montana, the State of North Dakota, and the State of Wyoming, being moved by consideration of interstate comity, and desiring to remove all causes of present and future controversy between said States and between persons in one and persons in another with respect to the waters of the Yellowstone River and its tributaries, other than waters within or waters which contribute to the flow of streams within the Yellowstone National Park, and desiring to provide for an equitable division and apportionment of such waters, and to encourage the beneficial development and use thereof, acknowledging that in future projects or programs for the regulation, control and use of water in the Yellowstone River Basin the great importance of water for irrigation in the signatory States shall be recognized, have resolved to conclude a Compact as authorized under the Act of Congress of the United States of America, approved June 2, 1949 (Public Law 83, 81st Congress, First Session), for the attainment of these purposes, and to that end, through their respective governments, have named as their respective Commissioners:

For the State of Montana:
Fred E. Buck
A. W. Bradshaw
H. W. Bunston
John Hersog
John M. Jarussi
Ashton Jones
Chris. Josephson
A. Wallace Kingsbury
P. F. Leonard
Walter M. McLaughlin
Dave M. Manning
Joseph Muggli
Chester E. Onstad
Ed F. Parriott
R. R. Renne
Keith W. Trout

For the State of North Dakota:
I. A. Acker
Einar H. Dahl
J. J. Walsh

For the State of Wyoming:
L. C. Bishop
Earl T. Bower
J. Harold Cash
Ben F. Cochrane
Ernest J. Goppert
Richard L. Greene
E. C. Gwillim
E. J. Johnson
Lee E. Keith
N. V. Kurtz
Harry L. Littlefield
R. E. McNally
Will G. Metz
Mark N. Partridge
Alonzo R. Shreve
Charles M. Smith
Leonard F. Thornton
M. B. Walker

who, after negotiations participated in by R. J. Newell, appointed as the representative of the United States of America, have agreed upon the following articles, to-wit:

ARTICLE I

A. Where the name of a State is used in this Compact, as a party thereto, it shall be construed to include the individuals, corporations, partnerships, associations, districts, administrative departments, bureaus, political subdivisions, agencies, persons, permittees, appropriators, and all others using, claiming, or in any manner asserting any right to the use of the waters of the Yellowstone River System under the authority of said State.

B. Any individual, corporation, partnership, association, district, administrative department, bureau, political subdivision, agency, person, permittee, or appropriator authorized by or under the laws of a signatory State, and all others using, claiming, or in any manner asserting any right to the use of the waters of the Yellowstone River System under the authority of said State, shall be subject to the terms of this Compact. Where the singular is used in this article, it shall be construed to include the plural.

ARTICLE II

A. The State of Montana, the State of North Dakota, and the State of Wyoming are hereinafter designated as "Montana," "North Dakota," and "Wyoming," respectively.

B. The terms "Commission" and "Yellowstone River Compact Commission" means the agency created as provided herein for the administration of this compact.

C. The term "Yellowstone River Basin" means areas in Wyoming, Montana, and North Dakota drained by the Yellowstone River and its tributaries, and includes the area in Montana known as Lake Basin, but excludes those lands lying within Yellowstone National Park.

D. The term "Yellowstone River System" means the Yellowstone River and all of its tributaries, including springs and swamps, from their sources to the mouth of the Yellowstone River near Buford, North Dakota, except those portions thereof which are within or contribute to the flow of streams within the Yellowstone National Park.

E. The term "Tributary" means any stream which in a natural state contributes to the flow of the Yellowstone River, including interstate tributaries and tributaries thereof, but excluding those which are within or contribute to the flow of streams within the Yellowstone National Park.

F. The term "Interstate Tributaries" means the Clarks Fork, Yellowstone River; the Bighorn (except Little Bighorn River); the Tongue River; and the Powder River, whose confluences with the Yellowstone River are respectively at or near the city (or town) of Laurel, Big Horn, Miles City, and Terry, all in the State of Montana.

G. The terms "Divert" and "Diversion" mean the taking or removing of water from the Yellowstone River or any tributary thereof when the water so taken or removed is not returned directly into the channel of the Yellowstone River or of the tributary from which it is taken.

H. The term "Beneficial Use" is herein defined to be that use by which the water supply of a drainage basin is depleted when usefully employed by the activities of man.

I. The term "Domestic Use" shall mean the use of water by an individual, or by a family unit or household for drinking, cooking, laundering, sanitation and other personal comforts and necessities; and for the irrigation of a family garden or orchard not exceeding one-half acre in area.

J. The term "Stock Water Use" shall mean the use of water for livestock and poultry.

ARTICLE III

A. It is considered that no Commission or administrative body is necessary to administer this compact or divide the waters of the Yellowstone River Basin as between the States of Montana and North Dakota. The provisions of this Compact, as between the States of Wyoming and Montana, shall be administered by a Commission composed of one representative from the State of Wyoming and one representative from the State of Montana, to be selected by the Governors of said States as such States may choose, and one representative selected by the Director of the United States Geological Survey or whatever Federal agency may succeed to the functions and duties of that agency, to be appointed by him at the request of the States to sit with the Commission and who shall, when present, act as Chairman of the Commission without vote, except as herein provided.

B. The salaries and necessary expenses of each State representative shall be paid by the respective State; all other expenses incident to the administration of this Compact not borne by the United States shall be allocated to and borne one-half by the State of Wyoming and one-half by the State of Montana.

C. In addition to other powers and duties herein conferred upon the Commission and

the members thereof, the jurisdiction of the Commission shall include the collection, correlation, and presentation of factual data, the maintenance of records having a bearing upon the administration of this Compact, and recommendations to such States upon matters connected with the administration of this Compact, and the Commission may employ such services and make such expenditures as reasonable and necessary within the limit of funds provided for that purpose by the respective States, and shall compile a report for each year ending September 30 and transmit it to the Governors of the signatory States on or before December 31 of each year.

D. The Secretary of the Army; the Secretary of the Interior; the Secretary of Agriculture; the Chairman, Federal Power Commission; the Secretary of Commerce, or comparable officers of whatever Federal agencies may succeed to the functions and duties of these agencies, and such other Federal officers and officers of appropriate agencies of the signatory States having services or data useful or necessary to the Compact Commission, shall cooperate, ex-officio, with the Commission in the execution of its duty in the collection, correlation, and publication of records and data necessary for the proper administration of the Compact; and these officers may perform such other services related to the Compact as may be mutually agreed upon with the Commission.

E. The Commission shall have power to formulate rules and regulations and to perform any act which they may find necessary to carry out the provisions of this Compact, and to amend such rules and regulations. All such rules and regulations shall be filed in the office of the State Engineer of each of the signatory States for public inspection.

F. In case of the failure of the representatives of Wyoming and Montana to unanimously agree on any matter necessary to the proper administration of this Compact, then the member selected by the Director of the United States Geological Survey shall have the right to vote upon the matters in disagreement and such points of disagreement shall then be decided by a majority vote of the representatives of the States of Wyoming and Montana and said member selected by the Director of the United States Geological Survey, each being entitled to one vote.

G. The Commission herein authorized shall have power to sue and be sued in its official capacity in any Federal Court of the signatory States, and may adopt and use an official seal which shall be judicially noticed.

ARTICLE IV

The Commission shall itself, or in conjunction with other responsible agencies, cause to be established, maintained, and operated such suitable water gaging and evaporation stations as it finds necessary in connection with its duties.

ARTICLE V

A. Appropriative rights to the beneficial uses of the water of the Yellowstone River System existing in each signatory State as of January 1, 1950, shall continue to be enjoyed in accordance with the laws governing the acquisition and use of water under the doctrine of appropriation.

B. Of the unused and unappropriated waters of the Interstate tributaries of the Yellowstone River as of January 1, 1950, there is allocated to each signatory State such quantity of that water as shall be necessary to provide supplemental water supplies for the rights described in paragraph A of this Article V, such supplemental rights to be acquired and enjoyed in accordance with the laws governing the acquisition and use of water under the doctrine of appropriation, and the remainder of the unused and unappropriated water is allocated to each State for storage or direct diversions for beneficial use on new lands or for other purposes as follows:

1. Clarks Fork, Yellowstone River
   a. To Wyoming 60%
      To Montana 40%
   b. The point of measurement shall be below the last diversion from Clarks Fork above Rock Creek.
2. Bighorn River (Exclusive of Little Bighorn River)
   a. To Wyoming 80%
      To Montana 20%
   b. The point of measurement shall be below the last diversion from the Bighorn River above its junction with the Yellowstone River, and the inflow of the Little Bighorn River shall be excluded from the quantity of water subject to allocation.
3. Tongue River
   a. To Wyoming 40%
      To Montana 60%
   b. The point of measurement shall be below the last diversion from the Tongue River above its junction with the Yellowstone River.
4. Powder River (including the Little Powder River)
   a. To Wyoming 42%
      To Montana 58%
   b. The point of measurement shall be below the last diversion from the Powder River above its junction with the Yellowstone River.

C. The quantity of water subject to the percentage allocations, in Paragraph B 1, 2, 3 and 4 of this Article V, shall be determined on an annual water year basis measured from October 1st of any year through September 30th of the succeeding year. The quantity to which the percentage factors shall be applied through a given date in any water year shall be, in acre-feet, equal to the algebraic sum of:

1. The total diversions, in acre-feet, above the point of measurement, for irrigation, municipal, and industrial uses in Wyoming and Montana developed after January 1, 1950, during the period from October 1st to that given date;

2. The net change in storage, in acre-feet, in all reservoirs in Wyoming and Montana above the point of measurement completed subsequent to January 1, 1950, during the period from October 1st to that given date;

3. The net change in storage, in acre-feet, in existing reservoirs in Wyoming and Montana above the point of measurement, which is used for irrigation, municipal, and industrial purposes developed after January 1, 1950, during the period October 1st to that given date;

4. The quantity of water, in acre-feet, that passed the point of measurement in the stream during the period from October 1 to that given date.

D. All existing rights to the beneficial use of waters of the Yellowstone River in the States of Montana and North Dakota, below Intake, Montana, valid under the laws of these States as of January 1, 1950, are hereby recognized and shall be and remain unimpaired by this compact. During the period May 1 to September 30, inclusive, of each year lands within Montana and North Dakota shall be entitled to the beneficial use of the flow of waters of the Yellowstone River below Intake, Mont., on a proportionate basis of acreage irrigated. Waters of tributary streams, having their origin in either Montana or North Dakota, situated entirely in said respective States and flowing into the Yellowstone River below Intake, Mont., are allotted to the respective States in which situated.

E. There are hereby excluded from the provisions of this compact:

1. Existing and future domestic and stock water uses of water: *Provided,* That the capacity of any reservoir for stock water so excluded shall not exceed 20 acre-feet;

2. Devices and facilities for the control and regulation of surface waters.

F. From time to time the Commission shall reexamine the allocations herein made and upon unanimous agreement may recommend modifications therein as are fair, just, and equitable, giving consideration among other factors to:

Priorities of water rights;
Acreage irrigated;
Acreage irrigable under existing works; and
Potentially irrigable lands.

ARTICLE VI

Nothing contained in this compact shall be so construed or interpreted as to affect adversely any rights to the use of the waters of Yellowstone River and its tributaries owned by or for Indians, Indian tribes, and their reservations.

ARTICLE VII

A. A lower signatory State shall have the right, by compliance with the laws of an upper signatory State, except as to legislative consent, to file application for and receive permits to appropriate and use any waters in the Yellowstone River system not specifically apportioned to or appropriated by such upper State as provided in article V; and to construct or participate in the construction and use of any dam, storage reservoir, or diversion works in such upper State for the purpose of conserving and regulating water that may be apportioned to or appropriated by the lower State: *Provided,* That such right is subject to the rights of the upper State to control, regulate, and use the water apportioned to and appropriated by it: *And provided further,* That should an upper State elect, it may share in the use of any such facilities constructed by a lower State to the extent of its reasonable needs upon assuming or guaranteeing payment of its proportionate share of the cost of the construction, operation, and maintenance. This provision shall apply with equal force and effect to an upper State in the circumstance of the necessity of the acquisition of rights by an upper State in a lower State.

B. Each claim hereafter initiated for an appropriation of water in one signatory State for use in another signatory State shall be filed in the office of the State engineer of the signatory State in which the water is to be diverted, and a duplicate copy of the application or notice shall be filed in the office of the State engineer of the signatory State in which the water is to be used.

C. Appropriations may hereafter be adjudicated in the State in which the water is diverted, and where a portion or all of the lands irrigated are in another signatory State, such adjudications shall be confirmed in that State by the proper authority. Each adjudication is to conform with the laws of the State where the water is diverted and shall be recorded in the county and State where the water is used.

D. The use of water allocated under article V of this compact for projects constructed after the date of this compact by the United States of America or any of its agencies or instrumentalities, shall be charged as a use by the State in which the use is made: *Provided,* That such use incident to the diversion, impounding, or conveyance of water in one State for use in another shall be charged to such latter State.

ARTICLE VIII

A lower signatory State shall have the right to acquire in an upper State by purchase, or through exercise of the power of eminent domain, such lands, easements, and rights-of-way for the construction, operation, and maintenance of pumping plants, storage reservoirs, canals, conduits, and appurtenant works as may be required for the enjoyment of the privileges granted herein to such lower State. This provision shall apply with equal

force and effect to an upper State in the circumstance of the necessity of the acquisition of rights by an upper State in a lower State.

ARTICLE IX

Should any facilities be constructed by a lower signatory State in an upper signatory State under the provisions of article VII, the construction, operation, repairs, and replacements of such facilities shall be subject to the laws of the upper State. This provision shall apply with equal force and effect to an upper State in the circumstance of the necessity of the acquisition of rights by an upper State in a lower State.

ARTICLE X

No water shall be diverted from the Yellowstone River Basin without the unanimous consent of all the signatory States. In the event water from another river basin shall be imported into the Yellowstone River Basin or transferred from one tributary basin to another by the United States of America, Montana, North Dakota, or Wyoming, or any of them jointly, the State having the right to the use of such water shall be given proper credit therefor in determining its share of the water apportioned in accordance with article V herein.

ARTICLE XI

The provisions of this compact shall remain in full force and effect until amended in the same manner as it is required to be ratified to become operative as provided in article XV.

ARTICLE XII

This compact may be terminated at any time by unanimous consent of the signatory States, and upon such termination all rights then established hereunder shall continue unimpaired.

ARTICLE XIII

Nothing in this compact shall be construed to limit or prevent any State from instituting or maintaining any action or proceeding, legal or equitable, in any Federal Court or the United States Supreme Court, for the protection of any right under this compact or the enforcement of any of its provisions.

ARTICLE XIV

The physical and other conditions characteristic of the Yellowstone River and peculiar to the territory drained and served thereby and to the development thereof, have actuated the signatory States in the consummation of this compact, and none of them, nor the United States of America by its consent and approval, concedes thereby the establishment of any general principle or precedent with respect to other interstate streams.

ARTICLE XV

This compact shall become operative when approved by the legislature of each of the signatory States and consented to and approved by the Congress of the United States.

ARTICLE XVI

Nothing in this compact shall be deemed:

(a) To impair or affect the sovereignty or jurisdiction of the United States of America in or over the area of waters affected by such compact, any rights or powers of the United States of America, its agencies, or instrumentalities, in and to the use of the waters of the Yellowstone River Basin nor its capacity to acquire rights in and to the use of said waters;

(b) To subject any property of the United States of America, its agencies, or instrumentalities to taxation by any State or subdivision thereof, nor to create an obligation on the part of the United States of America, its agencies, or instrumentalities, by reason of the acquisition, construction, or operation of any property or works of whatsoever kind, to make any payments to any State or political subdivision thereof, State agency, municipality, or entity whatsoever in reimbursement for the loss of taxes;

(c) To subject any property of the United States of America, its agencies, or instrumentalities, to the laws of any State to an extent other than the extent to which these laws would apply without regard to the Compact.

ARTICLE XVII

Should a Court of competent jurisdiction hold any part of this Compact to be contrary to the constitution of any signatory State or of the United States of America, all other severable provisions of this Compact shall continue in full force and effect.

ARTICLE XVIII

No sentence, phrase, or clause in this Compact or in any provision thereof, shall be construed or interpreted to divest any signatory State or any of the agencies or officers of such States of the jurisdiction of the water of each State as apportioned in this Compact.

In Witness Whereof the Commissioners have signed this Compact in quadruplicate original, one of which shall be filed in the archives of the Department of State of the United States of America and shall be deemed the authoritative original, and of which a duly certified copy shall be forwarded to the Governor of each signatory State.

Done at the City of Billings in the State of Montana, this 8th day of December, in the year of our Lord, One Thousand Nine Hundred and Fifty.

Commissioners for the State of Montana:

Fred E. Buck	/s/ Fred E. Buck
A. W. Bradshaw	/s/ A. W. Bradshaw
H. W. Bunston	/s/ H. W. Bunston
John Herzog	/s/ John Herzog
John M. Jarussi	/s/ John M. Jarussi
Ashton Jones	/s/ Ashton Jones
Christ Josephson	/s/ Chris Josephson
A. Wallace Kingsbury	/s/ A. Wallace Kingsbury
P. F. Leonard	/s/ P. F. Leonard
Walter M. McLaughlin	/s/ Walter M. McLaughlin
Dave M. Manning	/s/ Dave M. Manning
Joseph Muggli	/s/ Joseph Muggli
Chester E. Onstad	/s/ Chester E. Onstad
Ed F. Parriott	/s/ Ed F. Parriott
R. R. Renne	/s/ R. R. Renne
Keith W. Trout	/s/ Keith W. Trout

Commissioners for the State of North Dakota:

I. A. Acker	/s/ I. A. Acker
Einar H. Dahl	/s/ Einar H. Dahl
J. J. Walsh	/s/ J. J. Walsh

Commissioners for the State of Wyoming:

L. C. Bishop	/s/ L. C. Bishop
Earl T. Bower	/s/ Earl T. Bower
J. Harold Cash	/s/ J. Harold Cash
Ben F. Cochrane	/s/ Ben F. Cochrane
Ernest J. Goppert	/s/ Ernest J. Goppert
Richard L. Greene	/s/ Richard L. Greene
E. C. Gwillim	/s/ E. C. Gwillim
E. J. Johnson	/s/ E. J. Johnson
Lee E. Keith	/s/ Lee E. Keith
N. V. Kurtz	/s/ N. V. Kurtz
Harry L. Littlefield	/s/ Harry L. Littlefield
R. E. McNally	/s/ R. E. McNally
Will G. Metz	/s/ Will G. Metz
Mark N. Partridge	/s/ Mark N. Partridge
Alonzo R. Shreve	/s/ Alonzo R. Shreve
Charles M. Smith	/s/ Charles M. Smith
Leonard F. Thornton	/s/ Leonard F. Thornton
M. B. Walker	/s/ M. B. Walker

"I have participated in the negotiation of this Compact and intend to report favorably thereon to the Congress of the United States.

/s/ R. J. Newell
R. J. Newell,

Representative of the United States of America."

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend or repeal section 1 of this Act is expressly reserved. This reservation shall not be construed to prevent the vesting of rights to the use of water pursuant to applicable law and no alteration, amendment, or repeal of section 1 of this Act shall be held to affect rights so vested.

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

A similar House bill (H. R. 3544) was laid on the table.

REPAYMENT CONTRACTS UNDER FEDERAL RECLAMATION LAW

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 5097) to extend the time during which the Secretary of the Interior may enter into amendatory repayment contracts under the Federal reclamation laws, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

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

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, this bill extends existing law permitting the Bureau of Reclamation or the Department of the Interior to negotiate amendatory contracts for those reclamation projects which need rehabilitation. The present law expires on the 31st of December. Several of these contracts have been in progress of renegotiation but not yet completed. This bill would extend the time for a period of 3 years.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. They have been in progress and have not yet been completed. Is that it?

Mr. MURDOCK. That is right.

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

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

Mr. JENSEN. I hardly understand this bill which the gentleman is asking us to pass in the closing days of the session. It is very important and far-reaching legislation. I am wondering why this was not brought up before and why it was not brought before the committee and hearings held. Were there any hearings held on this bill?

Mr. MURDOCK. Yes. Hearings were held. It was unanimously reported by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs after a Subcommittee on Reclamation and Irrigation had previously passed upon it. So it has the unanimous report of both committees.

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

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I would say to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] that I think the bill is all right. It merely gives an opportunity for some of these irrigation projects which need to be rehabilitated for some additional time, up until 1953 or 1954, I believe.

Mr. MURDOCK. Nineteen hundred and fifty-four.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The law under which they are now operating will shortly expire. So they do need some additional time to rehabilitate these projects. It is nothing new in legislation.

Mr. JENSEN. Does your bill give the Bureau of Reclamation additional authority to go into these reclamation projects and do things they have not heretofore been legally entitled to do?

Mr. MURDOCK. No. I am sure I may say that it does not. They have already used this law to rehabilitate a number of projects. The bill has been wholesome and useful during its life. It should be extended because there are still other projects on which amended contracts are being negotiated.

Mr. JENSEN. Of course the gentleman knows there are some 20 projects of this nature which have been carried on year after year after year, and we have appropriated money. In 1946 the Bureau of Reclamation told us if we would furnish a certain amount of money they would clean up 15 projects. To this day none of them is cleaned up. To the contrary, they have asked for and have received twice as much money for those jobs as they said it would take to clean them up, and still they are not cleaned up. Now, how long is this going on?

Mr. MURDOCK. This law provides for rehabilitating projects needing same but not turning them over. The extension of the law would apply to projects that have not yet been rehabilitated. Of course, the gentleman is acquainted with uncompleted projects but this is another matter and I do know that quite a number of old projects that need rehabilitation have been rehabilitated. I think in that sense they have been cleaned up, but there are still some other projects that need some time.

Mr. JENSEN. No; no projects have been cleaned up, not one in the past 10 years; not one has been cleaned up and taken off the books and given back to the people, not one.

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

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. POULSON. I think my colleague from Iowa is right about the fact that they have not been paid out. What this does, however, is to continue the policy, which is a sound policy, of allowing and authorizing rearrangement of the repayment provisions and to set it up on a basis where they can pay out. The mistake was made in the past of authorizing too many projects both through the Appropriations Committee indirectly and directly through the legislative Committees on Public Land and Interior and Insular Affairs; we have authorized too many projects which were not feasible or which were not sound. The fact is the Bureau of Reclamation has given you a story or figures which would not stand up, and then when they get to the point where they cannot pay out on the repayment schedule as made, it is necessary to rearrange that.

This bill helps us rescue some of the projects which should never have been authorized.

The thing for Congress to do is not to authorize infeasible projects as we have in the past.

I think the bill is a very sound bill.

Mr. JENSEN. I am glad to have that explanation. I am sure the gentleman from Arizona knows I have leaned over backward both in committee and on the floor of the House to be liberal to irrigation.

Mr. MURDOCK. Yes. I do know that, and I want to express my appreciation thus publicly for the gentleman's efforts. Replying to the gentleman from California, I must say some of the very best projects have needed rehabilitation and some have been rehabilitated.

Mr. JENSEN. But there has been too much dilly-dallying along and keeping these projects on the books and in operation, and too much administrative expense charged to the people living on the projects, and not enough actual work done to clean them up.

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

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the authority vested in the Secretary of the Interior by sections 3, 4, and 7 of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187, 1188) and by section 3 of the act of April 24, 1945 (59 Stat. 75, 76), is hereby extended through December 31, 1956.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "1956" and insert in lieu thereof "1954."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 28, RONAN, MONT.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 3847) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue to School District No. 28, Ronan, Mont., a patent in fee to certain Indian land.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object and I shall not, because I think this is simply the State giving some land for school purposes, is it not?

Mr. MORRIS. The purpose of the bill, I may say to the distinguished gentleman from Masachusetts, is to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to transfer about 5 acres of land to this school district in Ronan, Mont., School District No. 28.

This land originally was set aside for administrative purposes by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. There is no longer any need of it for administrative purposes, but there is need of it for school purposes.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I suppose there are no oil or mineral rights connected with the land at all?

Mr. MORRIS. I have never heard of any. The gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] might answer that question; it is his bill.

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

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed with the consent of the Tribal Council of the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation, to issue to School District No. 28, Ronan, Montana, a patent in fee to certain land situated in Ronan, Montana, and more particularly described as follows: South half northwest quarter southwest quarter southeast quarter, section 36, township 21 north, range 20 west, containing five acres, more or less, of Tribal Agency Reserve Land.

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

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. STAGGERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes today, following the special orders heretofore entered.

IMPORTANT BUSINESS SHOULD BE CONSIDERED BEFORE ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, I hope there will be no adjournment until some of the extremely important unfinished business is completed. I do not want to take the time of the Members to give many illustrations because we all know of the important matters that need attention. However, as only one example, let me just mention in passing that this session of the Congress has done practically nothing even on those recommendations of the Hoover Commission that are not controversial—and there are some in that category.

I hope there will be no adjournment until some of the legislation that should be enacted is considered by the Congress.

WORLD REBELLION VERSUS TYRANNY

Mr. PHILBIN. 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 Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, the last few days have given us striking evidence of the rebellious spirit of dissatisfaction and resentment that exists in many parts of the world.

We have witnessed the United Nations protest of the Iranian premier against an imperialistic policy, which, from his standpoint, has adversely affected the great natural oil resources of his nation.

We have learned of the heinous and tragic assassination of the outstanding Pakistan leader, Liaquat Ali Khan, who, not long ago, addressed this Congress and gave us a distinct impression of his great ability, understanding and stability as a great statesman of this newly founded nation. No one will doubt that he was, as Premier Nehru termed him, "a steadying influence" in the affairs of the Far East.

We have also observed the rebellion in Egypt against imperialistic domination over the territory and independence of that nation.

While these instances are all separate, they are, unquestionably, part of a pattern—an international pattern fabricated, in part, out of Communist conspiracy and, in part, from the natural indignation and animosity, which generate from real or fancied interferences by the strong with the affairs of the weak. These instances materially serve the Communist cause by producing bloodshed, disorder, social unrest, and insurrection against the existing order.

These incidents are not transitory. They do not spring from ordinary casual events. They are rooted deeply into the fabric of many small governments. They stem from long-contained feelings of hatred and resentment which have been gradually developing against imperialism, colonialism and dictatorship over the affairs of small nations. It is obvious to me that our Nation alone cannot effectively deal with these disturbing and revolutionary manifestations. In fact, it has been our traditional policy to avoid interfering with the internal affairs of other nations, even as we have encouraged those in bondage to seek and secure their freedom. The establishment of the United Nations marked an official step by this Nation in the direction of maintaining order and peace through principles of collective security and collective judicial settlement of episodes likely to affect the peace of the world.

But if we are to find the causes of these violent protests against existing orders, we must probe much more deeply into the psychology, into the national aspirations and into the spiritual values of the peoples presently torn by these revolutionary movements. To my mind, there is, undoubtedly, an admixture of hatred of imperialism, and colonialism and resentment of interference with basic national and individual human rights because it is apparent to me that many small peoples throughout the world, heretofore manacled by imperialism and force, are fairly seething with hatred and violently moving to break away from every form of bondage and exploitation which presently binds them.

There is another factor in these situations, which is manifest to me, and must surely be manifest to those who have studied pending international developments and are familiar with the background and heritage of the peoples involved, and that is the emergence, not only of understandable nationalistic feelings based on aspirations for free government, but also strong compulsive racial feelings, which emanate from the real or fancied program of the white Anglo-Saxon peoples to dominate the world organization for peace and, consequently, as these other peoples believe, thwart and obstruct their hopes for liberation from various forms of tyranny, which have heretofore beset them.

In my opinion, these nationalistic and racial feelings are sweeping through a great many nations, not only in the Near and Far East, but also in Europe. It should be evident to us that we cannot build a world organization, designed to maintain order and peace, without considering the feelings, the aims, the hopes and the aspirations of those races and nations, who now feel that they are excluded from any, save a nominal part, of the policy making and other operations of the United Nations. Such a situation greatly promotes world communism.

Americans detest war. We detest violence as a means of settling international disputes. We seek, in accordance with our traditions, the settlement of these disputes by argument, discussion, judicial methods and moral suasion, and the force of public opinion moving toward collective action.

We should recognize that no satisfactory or constructive United States foreign policy can be based on the exclusion of millions, yes, more than a billion, of struggling, aspiring peoples throughout the world, who have become aroused in one way or another, frequently, by Communist propaganda and subterfuge, but just as often by the age-old urge of men and women for the blessings of human liberty.

There is great danger at the moment that what we do by way of safeguarding our own democratic institutions may have too much of the appearance of supporting western imperialism and colonialism and too little of an all-embracing universal policy recognizing and protecting the rights of the small nations, the small inarticulate peoples of the world, to establish themselves on a firm basis of free, unfettered government, which like our own accords to the individual his free choice in determining the kind of political system under which he shall live. There has been too much emphasis on a make-shift expediency and too little upon great fundamental principles of freedom.

In this campaign for broader participation, we could well begin in our own country by promoting even greater tolerance and unity among the American people. That is certainly indicated as a most commendable domestic policy. But we can also move with as much speed as practicable and sound to bring wholeheartedly into our great work for defense, peace, and order the peoples of our own Western Hemisphere—the great, free peoples of Canada and Central and South America, who have the same stake we have in the part of the world in which we live.

We should also seek every means of strengthening the ties between the great English-speaking peoples of Europe from whom America has drawn so much of her strength—her language, her law, her democratic institutions, her culture and we should not hesitate to include also the other great peoples of Europe, who are naturally on our side and from whom our Nation has drawn so much of its inspiration and strength, not only of institutions but of loyal citizenship.

If we do these things and, in addition, in equity and justice recognize the claims of the other racial groups in the Near and Far East, who, I believe, desire to be friends of ours, provided that we exhibit a friendly attitude toward them and encourage their aspirations, we shall find many firm friends and willing allies in the fearful, but critical, struggle between totalitarian slavery and freedom of democracy.

I must also state that in these efforts to gain a broader front against world communism this Nation should place its case on principle rather than expediency, on impartiality rather than favoritism, on universality rather than provincial racism, on real justice rather than international bribery. A friend gained by purchase or blackmail will not prove a true friend in this or any other crucial struggle.

ARMY EQUIPMENT AND SUPPLIES

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

The SPEAKER. If there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of a letter from a constituent of mine in San Rafael, and I desire to quote a portion of the same:

> Winter has arrived at Yanggu, and it is as cold as ever—and no winter clothing for our boys. The last three letters we have received from our young son requesting us to send him boot sox, knit cap, and gloves, has made us plenty mad. Where is all the money going that we read has been handed over to the Army "planners," those clever "twirps" who let our poor boys freeze last winter? It looks like they never learn, not even from painful experience.

The letter goes on in such tone. Could it be possible that the moneys we have appropriated in an effort to give our boys good equipment and proper supplies is not being properly spent?

I trust the Armed Services Committee will give recognition to this type of complaint.

CONGRESS HAS FAILED MISERABLY TO DISCHARGE ITS OBLIGATION TO THE AGED OF THIS NATION

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

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

There was no objection.

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

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 3 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 284. Joint resolution authorizing the participation of the United States in the preparation and completion of plans for the observance and memorialization on April 9, 1952, of the one hundredth anniversary of the death of John Howard Payne, author of that family hymn of America Home Sweet Home.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4473) entitled "An act to provide revenue, and for other purposes."

The message also anounced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 5684. An act making appropriations for mutual security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. McKellar, Mr. Hayden, Mr. Russell, Mr. McCarran, Mr. O'Mahoney, Mr. Bridges, Mr. Ferguson, Mr. Cordon, and Mr. Saltonstall to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill H. R. 5448.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT TO RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACT AND THE RAILROAD RETIREMENT TAX ACT

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 3669, an act to amend the Railroad Retirement Act, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. Crosser, Beckworth, and Wolverton.

QUESTION OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, I have here photostatic copy of a deportation proceeding hearing which was held in Los Angeles, Calif., on November 29, 1950. I would like to read from page 126 of this stenographic record the following testimony by John L. Leech, testifying as a Government witness on behalf of the Immigration and Naturalization Service of the Department of Justice before a hearing officer of that Service.

Question by the attorney for the defendant in this proceeding, whose name, I believe, was Alice Orins; I do not recall ever hearing of her before:

Now, so that we don't have any question about a matter we went into this morning, you did testify, did you not, on July 16, 1940, at Beaumont, Tex., under oath as follows in response to the following questions:

"Do you know the present Member of Congress from San Francisco, Mr. Franck Havenner?

"Answer. Yes, sir.

"Question. Has he any connection with the Communist Party?

"Answer. Yes."

Did you so testify?

Answer. I so testified.

Question. Do you now testify under oath that the testimony which you gave then was true as of that period?

Answer. Yes.

Question. That he was at that period a member of the Communist Party?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Do you now reassert that?

Answer. I now reassert that as of that period. I have no knowledge of his present activities and affiliations.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks that the gentleman states a question of personal privilege, having been accused of being a Communist, as the lowest designation that could possibly be made of a man.

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, I deeply regret the necessity of rising on a question of personal privilege during these busy closing hours of the congressional session, but I think when the Members of the House have heard my statement, they will agree that under the circumstances no other course would be open to any self-respecting Member.

Nearly 7 years ago, on January 11, 1945, I read to the House of Representatives a political advertisement which appeared in the San Francisco Chronicle of October 30, 1944, under the following heading:

Would you trust your postwar future in these hands? Investigation of Un-American Propaganda Activities in the United States (hearing), Tuesday, July 16, 1940, House of Representatives Subcommittee of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, Beaumont, Tex.—Excerpts from sworn testimony of John L. Leech, former member, State committee, Communist Party of California, and candidate for Congress on the Communist Party ticket in 1936 from the Seventeenth California Congressional District.

I now quote from the advertisement:

Question. Do you know the present Member of Congress from San Francisco, Mr. Franck Havenner?

Answer. Yes, sir.

Question. Does he have any connection with the Communist Party?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Did you ever meet him in a meeting where no one else was present except Communists?

Answer. Yes.

Question. You stated you had met with Mr. Havenner in a fraction meeting of the Communist Party?

Answer. That is correct.

Question. Was that fraction meeting held in San Francisco?

Answer. Now excuse me; I would like to make a correction for the record. I did not mean to say, if I did, that I had met him in a fraction meeting. I had met him in a State executive committee meeting.

Question. Is Mr. Havenner a member of the State executive committee of the Communist Party?

Answer. No.

Question. What was he doing at this State executive committee meeting?

Answer. To the best of my recollection this was a discussion—and it is not necessary that a person be a member of the State executive committee or the State committee, to be called in for assistance, or directions of the State executive committee.

Question. Could he have attended this meeting if he had not been a member of the Communist Party?

Answer. No; I have never known of a case, and I don't believe such a connection has ever taken place where a nonmember could meet with a leading body of the party.

Question. Now, in addition to this meeting you have already discussed, you stated you met with him on other occasions?

Answer. Yes; informally, in left-wing affairs. In other words, he participated in affairs organized by the Communist Party or left-wing organization under the domination of the Communist Party.

Question. And at this time he was a Member of Congress?

Answer. That is correct.

Mr. Speaker, when I read this political advertisement in San Francisco in 1944, I knew nothing about this meeting of the subcommittee of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities which the advertisement alleged was held in Beaumont, Tex., on July 16, 1940. Naturally, I immediately inquired whether such a meeting had actually been held.

I am informed that representatives of the press who went to the office of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities were furnished with a printed volume entitled "Investigation of Un-American Propaganda in the United States," which contained a report of a meeting of a subcommittee held in Beaumont, Tex., on the date mentioned. It was marked "Executive session" and showed as present Hon. Martin Dies, chairman; Robert E. Stripling, secretary of the committee; and James H. Stedman, investigator.

In this printed volume appeared all of the questions and answers which were contained in the political advertisement which I have just read, together with other questions and answers relating to me, as follows:

Question. When did you first meet Mr. Havenner, Mr. Leech?

Answer. I have been several times with him, Mr. Stedman. However, some of the times were simply at left-wing gatherings, and I am afraid, to be completely accurate, I could not even place the dates.

Question. But you have met him on a number of occasions?

Answer. Yes, sir; I have met him on a number of occasions.

Question. Did Mr. Havenner ever join the Communist Party?

Answer. I have never seen an application card or any documentary proof as to that. It is my understanding, on the basis of his participation in party activity, that he has been and is at the present time a member of the Communist Party. But, again I say, I have at no time ever seen documentary proof of this.

Question. You have met him in strictly Communist Party meetings?

Answer. On one occasion that I remember.

Question. Would you please state what that occasion was, Mr. Leech?

Answer. That is a very serious question. I am afraid of my accuracy not on the basic facts—but I am afraid of my accuracy on it.

Question. Could you give us the approximate year when this meeting occurred?

Answer. Well, this meeting occurred some time during the course of 1936. Again I think it was in preparation for the State criminal syndicalism congress.

Question. Did Mr. HAVENNER take an active part in that conference?

Answer. In the discussion—he was not, to the best of my recollection, at the conference but he took an active part in the discussion and preparation and the outlining of this conference.

Question. Do you know what he was doing at that time?

Answer. I think he was connected in some way with the first California writers' project. I do know he worked and associated with Harry Carlyle, who was a member of the Communist Party, and he was the organizer of the first California State writers' project. But all of my party work was in the Los Angeles area and Mr. HAVENNER lived in San Francisco, and I will have to say that my recollection of details is vague here.

Question. But you do know Mr. HAVENNER cooperated with the party?

Answer. I do know that to be a fact; yes, sir.

Mr. Speaker, at the time of this meeting of the Subcommittee of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities at Beaumont, Tex., on July 16, 1940, I was a Member of the House of Representatives and had been for 3½ years next preceding that date. I had never received any notice of this hearing prior to the time it was held and have never received any notice of the hearing from the Special Committee on Un-American Activities or from any other person up to the present time. The first knowledge I had that such a subcommittee meeting was held was more than 4 years later when I read in this political advertisement printed in several San Francisco daily newspapers during the months of October and November 1944, excerpts from the testimony given by witness Leech which I have just read to the Members of the House. I have never been given an opportunity to face my accuser or to reply to his testimony.

I may interpolate here, Mr. Speaker, that for years I attempted to locate this individual Leech and was unable to do so. He had apparently dropped from sight for a long time. That opens up one of the most amazing aspects of the statement I am now going to make to the House.

If the former chairman of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, who presided at this secret meeting, believed that this sworn testimony was true, it was his duty to report it to the House of Representatives and recommend that I be brought before the bar of the House and expelled. If there was any doubt in his mind as to the truth of this testimony, it certainly was his duty to notify me and call me before his committee to disprove the testimony, if I could.

But Mr. Speaker, the former chairman of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, Mr. Dies, did neither of those things. He did not even notify the other members of his special committee that this damaging testimony had been given against a Member of Congress. Instead, the record of this secret meeting held down in Beaumont, Tex., was pigeonholed for more than 4 years, when, suddenly and mysteriously, it was made available for use against me in a political campaign.

I might interpolate again, Mr. Speaker, at the time I made this statement in 1945, certain members of the Texas delegation came to me and said:

We think we can tell you why this matter was held secret for 4 years. It was held secret for 4 years in order to allow the statute of limitations against perjury and libel to expire.

Mr. Speaker, the sworn testimony of Witness Leech in this printed report is false in its entirety and constitutes perjury of the most vicious and malicious type. I am not and never have been a member of the Communist Party, nor have I ever had any connections or associations with that party or its activities in any manner whatever. I do not subscribe and never have subscribed to the platform or the program of the Communist Party. I am now and always have been a devout believer in and supporter of the fundamental principles and institutions upon which the American Government is founded. The idea of the employment of force and violence to overthrow the Government which I love is as hateful to me as it possibly could be to any other true American citizen.

Indeed the only time when I could possibly advocate the use of violent force with relation to our Government would be in defense of its fundamental principles and institutions. For more than 25 years I have been a public official in America, sworn to uphold and protect our Constitution and our form of government, and no man in all those years, except in the instance to which I am now addressing myself, has ever accused me of being false to that high trust.

Mr. Speaker, I do not desire to take the time of the House now to recite all of the history of this case. For the present it will suffice to say that after a most painstaking inquiry the House Un-American Activities Committee of the Eightieth Congress, by unanimous vote, expunged all of the testimony of this Witness Leech concerning me from the records of the committee. I am very proud of that vindication by the Committee on Un-American Activities, particularly because it was done at a time when the Republican Party was in the majority in the House of Representatives and was in control of the committee.

When I was able to examine the record of the secret hearing of the Dies subcommittee at which the witness Leech gave this perjured testimony against me I found that he had given similar testimony against a large number of other persons, including my present colleague from California, Representative SHELLEY, who is now in California because of very serious illness in his family. Mr. SHELLEY called me by long distance yesterday and asked me to say that if he were present he would also rise to a question of personal privilege, as I am doing now.

Mr. Speaker, witnesses like Leech do not appear by mere accident at a secret meeting of a subcommittee of the House of Representatives in a place remote from the Capitol of the United States to attack the reputation of a Member of Congress who is at his post of duty at the Capitol. Someone brought this witness, Leech, to that secret meeting in Beaumont, Tex., by prearrangement, and whoever brought him there was undoubtedly thoroughly familiar with the testimony he was prepared to give. And if his testimony concerning me was, as I now solemnly assure the House, perjured in its entirety, then someone was guilty of subornation of perjury.

Mr. Speaker, my reason for addressing the House on this subject again at this time is that I have just been advised that this witness, John L. Leech, after the lapse of more than 10 years, has within the past year repeated under oath the perjured testimony he gave at the secret meeting of the subcommittee on Un-American Activities concerning me and the gentleman from California [Mr. SHELLEY]. This testimony was given in deportation proceedings in the case of Alice Orans before a hearing officer of the Immigration and Naturalization Service of the United States Department of Justice. The hearings were held in Los Angeles, Calif., on November 29, 1950 and December 11, 1950. I do not know the defendant in this case, Alice Orans, nor did I know that any such hearings had ever been held until I received a letter from the defendant's attorney a few days ago.

I am now in possession of photostatic copies of the transcript of these hearings which show that John L. Leech, under detailed examination on the witness stand, repeatedly swore that the testimony he had given concerning me and concerning the gentleman from California [Mr. SHELLEY], at the secret subcommittee hearing in Beaumont, Tex., in 1940, was true. I was amazed to find that John L. Leech had appeared at these hearings as a Government witness for the Immigration and Naturalization Service of the Department of Justice.

Mr. Speaker, when I first addressed the House on the subject of this perjured testimony on January 11, 1945, the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] expressed the opinion that there was a conspiracy among certain individuals in California to smear me. During the next 4 or 5 years I was repeatedly made the target of Communist smear attacks. Finally, during the congressional campaign of 1948 I filed suit for libel against the San Francisco Examiner, a Hearst newspaper.

On Sunday, February 27, 1949, the following letter, signed by the publisher of the San Francisco Examiner, was printed on the first page of all editions of that newspaper:

SAN FRANCISCO EXAMINER,
February 24, 1949.

Hon. FRANCK R. HAVENNER,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HAVENNER: As part of the amicable settlement of the libel suit

brought by you against us, we are pleased to address this letter to you publicly.

Your suit was instituted as a result of editorials and articles appearing in the San Francisco Examiner.

We are convinced that you are not a Communist nor in sympathy with communism.

We are convinced that you are a true American in the American tradition. We are sorry that we attempted to cast a doubt on your Americanism during your various campaigns for public office.

It is not necessary to reserve the right to differ with you in the future on specific issues, but we do not wish this apology to carry the implication that any promise has been made to support you. As a real American, we know you wish us to assert an independent judgment on all issues.

Very truly yours,

CLARENCE R. LINDNER.

Mr. Speaker, the astonishing renewal of this perjured testimony against two Members of Congress by a witness appearing on behalf of the Government of the United States strengthens my belief that the majority leader, Mr. McCORMACK, was right when he said that there was a conspiracy to smear me, and that this conspiracy should be investigated by Congress. I now urgently request that the Committee on the Judiciary, under the authority granted it by House Resolution 95, conduct a complete investigation of all of the charges made by John L. Leech against the gentleman from California [Mr. SHELLEY] and myself.

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

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

Mr. McCORMACK. I remember well the experience which the gentleman from California went through. I remember the discussion on the floor of the House several years ago and the remarks that I made on that occasion. Of course, nobody believes this infamous liar. I hesitate personally to criticize, because I like to exercise restraint, but where the evidence is so overwhelming about a man of hate, and I have nothing but contempt for persons of that kind, in this case to term him as "an infamous liar" is tolerance on my part.

The gentleman from California has been subjected to the attacks of this man, and behind him is someone who started him and who spearheaded him. There is no question about that, in my mind. But the best evidence that it has not fallen on fruitful ground is the fact that the people of the gentleman's district have continuously reelected him. But that is not the answer. The pain and the suffering the gentleman from California has undergone, and that his loved ones have undergone, cannot be softened. When we in public life are unjustifiably attacked, it is not ourselves who suffer most, but our loved ones. I can understand thoroughly the position of the gentleman from California, his justifiable wrath at these unjust, these false attacks and the continuation of them.

We remember well how several years ago the gentleman himself demanded that a committee of this Congress investigate the conspiracy against him, and now another colleague of ours is attacked. This is convincing proof to anyone that the gentleman from California who is addressing the House as well as the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. SHELLEY] fear nothing, but they want to expose this vicious conspiracy which for some reason or other is trying to destroy the character and reputation of two honorable men. This is not a matter that addresses itself to the House concerning one who is a member of the Democratic party. It could just as well apply to any colleague of mine on the other side. This is an attack against a Member of the House.

I hope the Committee on the Judiciary will take cognizance of the gentleman's request and if any authorization by the House is necessary I hope the House will grant it and investigate the charges of this Leech. His name is certainly consistent with his character. I hope they will investigate the conspiracy that exists to undermine the character and reputation of the gentleman from California—and now another one. I never heard the slightest intimation of an attack against the gentleman from California [Mr. SHELLEY] before, but it has come—and it might be any one of us, attacked by some man of hate. It might be someone in our own community, full of hatred and resentment. Tomorrow it might be another section of the country. Today it is California, but it might be Massachusetts or somewhere else. Minds that hate, no matter where they exist, are contemptible, destructive.

My purpose is mainly to commend the gentleman for his fine service in this House. We do not always agree, but I never impugn the motives of any one of my colleagues, nor their intent. It is a good thing to have in this body Members who disagree, for then we get the cross current of the country; but no one ever heard me attack the motives of any one of our Members. I might disagree as to what results might flow from his actions, but that is different.

The gentleman from California who is addressing the House has been here for years and rendered honorable and outstanding service, as has the gentleman from California [Mr. SHELLEY]. So it is not a question of defending either one of them; it is a question of looking behind the scenes, finding out who are the vicious forces and what purpose they have in mind in conceiving and carrying on this conspiracy to destroy the standing and reputation and to poison the minds of Americans against the patriotism of the gentleman from California [Mr. HAVENNER] and now the gentleman from California [Mr. SHELLEY].

I sincerely hope, I repeat, that if not in the remaining days of this session, at least in the early days of the next session, appropriate action will be taken by one of our committees; and if they lack authority, that the House will grant the authority to investigate this contemptible conspiracy.

Mr. HAVENNER. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts.

I would like to say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that I discussed this matter with the chairman of the Judiciary Committee and I think he believes his committee now has the necessary authority to make an exhaustive and thorough investigation of this matter. I gathered from his conversation with me today that he is willing to do so.

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

Mr. HAVENNER. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. BURDICK. I just want to remark that what this man said against the gentleman 1,800 or 2,000 miles from where he was he could have said of any Member of Congress and if it could be secluded for 4 years any Member of Congress would be handicapped the same way. So, as an old-time prosecutor for the Government, I am convinced that there was and is a conspiracy. There is some reason why that was done. There is some purpose behind that more than to injure the gentleman personally. Why not pick out somebody else? They could have picked me out. Nobody would believe that story if they did say it. I am in a sparsely settled country where they do not have many newspapers. But they picked out the wrong fellow when they picked the gentleman out because everyone knows that he was secretary to the great Senator from California, Hiram Johnson, for years here in the Capitol. He has been in public life and in front of people for a quarter of a century. Here in this Congress he is respected by every Member and has been for years. The people of California elect him term after term. It seems to me they picked out the wrong man to foster on a witch-hunt charge of communism. I will do whatever I can as a Member of Congress to see that the gentleman gets that investigation, because I am interested in finding out why Congressman HAVENNER was singled out for attack.

Mr. HAVENNER. I thank the gentleman.

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

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

Mr. EBERHARTER. I just want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I agree wholeheartedly with the sentiments expressed by the gentleman from Massachusetts, our majority leader [Mr. McCORMACK]. We who have served with the gentleman from California for many years in this House have not the slightest doubt but what a conspiracy exists, as he stated this afternoon. I strongly believe that every Member of this House on both sides of the aisle will join in insisting that an investigation be made of this conspiracy, because these methods of attacking without any justification whatsoever people in public life must be stopped if we are to carry forward the principles of our country. I am certain that we will do the country good and stop some of this stuff if a real investigation is made of this conspiracy.

Mr. HAVENNER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I may also add that I am confirmed in that conviction by what has just been said by the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK].

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

Mr. HAVENNER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, I have known the gentleman from California [Mr. HAVENNER] for many, many years. I knew him by reputation long before I had the pleasure of meeting him. He is one of the most highly respected and beloved public servants that California has ever sent to this Congress. For that reason it is very profitable to some people and profitable to the Communists to get a gentleman of his standing and character named as a Communist by some person who, as the majority leader referred to correctly, is a liar. Because that sort of propaganda confuses the people and leads them to believe that all charges of communism are just as false as the one they know to be false leveled against a gentleman like the gentleman from California [Mr. HAVENNER]. So I have no doubt that if the committee will thoroughly go into this conspiracy back of it they will find the Communists themselves trying to spread these false rumors, as they have in other cases.

I am very much surprised that the Government would use a witness like this man Leech in a case as important as this case, thereby discrediting their whole case against her by using a witness whose testimony is not reliable.

Alice Orans was assistant director of relief in Los Angeles County in 1939 when my own State Committee on Un-American Activities investigated communism in relief organizations. I heard her testimony and I became convinced, as did the whole committee, without question that she was a Communist and a leader in the Communist movement to take over the relief organizations in the State of California.

She led 500 pickets out in front of my house and trampled the grass in front of it and the grass in front of my neighbor's house carrying placards up and down the street. We found out later that she was not an American citizen. She is a citizen of Russia. I myself conferred with the FBI and turned over my files about Alice Orans to them.

In my judgment she ought to be deported. To think that the Government would use a witness like Leech in an important case like this, and by leveling false and ridiculous charges against a fine gentleman like the gentleman from California [Mr. HAVENNER] is just beyond belief.

REVENUE ACT OF 1951

Mr. COOPER (on behalf of Mr. DOUGHTON) submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 4473) to provide revenue, and for other purposes.

READJUSTMENT OF POSTAL RATES

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (S. 1046) to readjust postal rates and for other purposes.

INCREASING RATES OF COMPENSATION OF OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (S. 622) to increase the basic rates of compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government and for other purposes.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACT

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleague the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER], I ask unanimous consent that he may have permission to file a conference report on the Railroad Retirement Act, H. R. 3669, before midnight tonight.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, this Congress has labored over and found solutions for many of the most vital and domestic problems ever brought before a legislative assembly. For these achievements, touching all aspects of human endeavor, the commendations of all mankind are justly merited. However, the failure of this Congress to provide for another of the most pressing needs of our own people, Federal aid to education, jeopardizes the effectiveness of much that we have attempted to do.

Our country, our people have accepted the responsibility of the leadership of the nations of the free world. To be equal to this leadership, we must provide for the more effective training of all our people in the issues involved in world leadership. The demands made upon our people of this and future generations are, and will continue to be, of increasing complexity. Our citizens are now confronted with the necessity of being as well-informed on the problems of other peoples of the free world as they are upon their own domestic problems. They are now aiding in making decisions that affect the lives of peoples throughout the entire world. They are supplying much of the labor and the wealth to implement those decisions. That we have so ably succeeded, thus far, in fulfilling the responsibilities thrust upon us, is a glorious tribute to public education in America. If we are to continue to hold our present position, and to be prepared to meet the challenges of the years to come, it will be only because we have a program of education that will effectively train our people to do so.

Up to this time the responsibility for financial support of the public schools has been a State responsibility. For the great part the States have sincerely endeavored to meet their educational needs to the limit of their abilities. As the citizens have been informed of the increased needs for funds for buildings, equipment, and salaries they have repeatedly demonstrated their desire to support education by increasing existing taxes and adding new ones. It is the belief of the people of many States that they have given proof of making a supreme effort to provide for schools. They also feel that their educational needs contrasted with their ability to pay conclusively prove that they are unable to adequately educate their people without Federal aid.

If this be true, then all that we have done toward world security can be threatened by our failure to find a workable solution for this problem which has long been before us.

This year my State, West Virginia, added more than $18,000,000 to its budget for State aid to schools, bringing the total for public education for the biennium to approximately ninety-five millions. This made possible a salary increase of $540 a year for degree teachers and proportionate increases for those with lesser certificates. However, this increase is not sufficient to meet the advance in the cost of living as shown by the Index of the Bureau of Labor Statistics. In spite of the effort of the people of our State, many teachers have moved to other States where salaries are much higher, or have taken jobs in industry. The State has been forced to issue great numbers of emergency certificates. Some counties have schools closed because teachers cannot be obtained.

Increased enrollments for many years to come demand classrooms, equipment, and teachers not now available.

The conditions which exist in West Virginia are duplicated in many States throughout the country.

Can this country survive without a citizenry prepared through public education to meet the tasks which will confront them? If survival is dependent upon our schools, dare we continue to delay to provide Federal funds for education where they are needed?

The children of today will be the America of tomorrow. Will it be a weak America, or a strong and happy America? The answer to that question lies within the ability, or the inability, of all of us who determine here and now whether our leaders of tomorrow will be equipped with ignorance and stupidity, or knowledge and wisdom.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

VETERANS' LEGISLATION

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I rise to notify the Members that there is no chance of the President's veto of the amputee car bill being brought before the House this evening. Many Members have asked that question as they want to be here to override the veto. It was a Senate bill and they must act upon it first. My belief is that the Senate will override the veto just as will the House. We took the Senate bill and struck out all after the enacting clause when it came over here and inserted the provisions of the Elliott bill with certain amendments. The very fine gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT] is himself a battle-wounded veteran, with very splendid war service. The House knows that the bill as amended passed overwhelmingly, and it passed the Senate overwhelmingly. The President's veto, I think, was a surprise to very many persons.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. What was the basis for the veto? What reason was put forth?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. A somewhat similar bill was vetoed by the President 2 years ago. Some of the President's objections were taken out, the cash payment and the objection so far as mobility is concerned, but to tell the truth I am not quite sure why he vetoed it.

I have talked with many Army doctors and Navy doctors and Public Health doctors and they all feel that it was a very fine rehabilitation measure for the men that had already received cars and also for these new groups. Many of these men were wounded, not intentionally, but during World War II and the Korean war many of our men were wounded by our own guns and our own bullets, guns and bullets that were sent to Russia. They were sent to Korea and sent to China and to Russia and used by the Communists. They were missiles of war that were sent or given by the English to Russia and the Chinese and our own United States. The boys have seen on some of the missiles the mark of the United States.

All of these heroes are service-connected cases. The House and the Senate both overruled an increase in pension for the permanently disabled some time ago. They were not service-connected. These boys in this bill are few and are service-connected. The amount of money is a mere pittance. Compare it with the billions upon billions given to foreign countries and billions given in military preparedness and billions for everything under the sun. There was a misunderstanding about that bill because of the increase in pension, and they were permanently and totally disabled. The House would be interested in a number of letters I have received stating that because of the increase in the pension the men were taken out of the hospital and were living at home, saving the Goverment money. The President does his own thinking and the Congress does its own thinking.

I am very sure the Congress will override the President's veto. We must not adjourn until it does.

FOOD PRODUCTION

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes 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. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, it is my desire to bring to your attention the needs, as I see them, of the agricultural section of our country. The farmer is in a peculiar position in relation to labor, industry, and Government, for he has no control over the price he pays for needed supplies and very little control over the selling price of farm products. He is at the mercy of the urban consumers on the price question, since he is overshadowed by this greater populace.

What affects the farmer, as we all know, affects the entire Nation. Since the founding of our country one of the basic factors contributing to the high standard of living we enjoy has been cheap and abundant food of wide variety. Even today it takes the pay of less hours of labor to adequately feed an American family than in any other country on earth.

Up until the present time there has been sufficient farm land to produce more than we need, and although the acreage under cultivation is not increasing to any appreciable amount, the modernization of our farms has allowed the food supplies to keep up with the increase in population and the rising standard of living.

There is very little new land that can be brought into production. The possibilities of maintaining an adequate food supply will depend to no small extent upon the intelligent understanding of both the farmer and the city dweller, and upon how we handle our farm land to preserve it from the ravages of mishandling and erosion.

Today we understand the importance of wise land use, and realize that it is not alone the farmers' problem. The results of proper or improper land use affects us all and we acknowledge it is every one's problem. Because of the awareness of the situation every State of the Union has passed laws enabling farmers to vote soil-conservation districts into being.

It is recognized that the problem of conservation and wise use of our soil are Nation-wide in scope, and constitute a job too big for the individual. The production of food is a problem to be dealt with on a national basis. It is, therefore, essential that the necessary machinery and supplies be made available to the farmer in order to satisfy our ever-increasing needs. Farm-equipment manufacturers must receive the needed allocations of metals, and other farm supplies must be kept available. With farm labor becoming more scarce, it is necessary that we increase the mechanization and efficiency of farming.

The farmer has always responded to emergencies, and has made almost superhuman effort to keep our food supplies adequate. He will respond again and again when called upon. But his efforts alone, without understanding and help on our part, may not be enough the next time. An appraisal of his needs and problems is a national duty. We cannot short change the soldiers who are protecting us from the aggressor in Asia and Europe by curtailing their food supplies, nor the supplies of those in industry who keep them furnished with the weapons of war.

Food is essential. The farmer supplies it. Let us understand and help him to the best of our ability.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. HART and to include an address by the President of the United States.

Mr. HEFFERNAN in three instances, to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ZABLOCKI and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. O'NEIL and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GATHINGS in two instances, in one to include a speech by Senator FULBRIGHT, and in another a speech by Dr. John W. Cronin, of the Public Health Service.

Mr. MADDEN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. LANE in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois and to include a report of the projects committee of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress.

Mr. BELCHER.

Mr. VAN PELT and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BEALL (at the request of Mr. DEVEREUX) and to include some excerpts from a speech by Governor McKeldin.

Mr. WOOD of Idaho and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin in four instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SMITH of Kansas and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BENDER in two separate instances.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL in three instances and to include letters.

Mr. RHODES

Mr. MANSFIELD and to include an article from the Reclamation News.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address I delivered October 17, 1951, over the following stations: WSPC and WHMA, Anniston, Ala; WHTB, Talladega, Ala.; WGWC and WHBB, Selma, Ala.; and WFEB and WMLS, Sylacauga, Ala.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCMULLEN and to include a statement dealing with the port of Tampa, Fa.

Mr. RIVERS and to include a radio address by State Senator Charles Fenwick of Arlington County, Va., over radio station WARL, September 30, about the Hill-Burton funds expended in that county.

Mr. MILLS and include a telegram.

Mr. HELLER (at the request of Mr. CHELF).

Mr. BOYKIN (at the request of Mr. DOYLE) and to include extraneous material.

Mr. DOYLE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. OSTERTAG and to include five resolutions from the New York Joint Legislative Committee on Interstate Cooperation.

Mr. WERDEL (at the request of Mr MARTIN of Massachusetts) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts).

Mr. WEICHEL (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts)

Mr. VAN ZANDT.

Mr. MORTON and to include a letter from a constituent to Mr. Eric Johnston.

Mr. MACK of Washington.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 3298. An act to amend sections 303 (c) and 503 (b) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended;

H. R. 3376. An act for the relief of Margaret K. N. Miller;

H. R. 4386. An act making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5131. An act granting the consent of Congress to a compact or agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey concerning a bridge across the Delaware River to provide a connection between the Pennsylvania Turnpike System and the New Jersey Turnpike, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 341. Joint resolution making appropriations for rehabilitation of flood-stricken areas for the fiscal year 1952, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 264. An act to provide for granting to officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, and the White House and United States Park Police forces, additional compensation for working on holidays;

S. 1335. An act to readjust size and weight limitations on fourth-class (parcel post) mail; and

S. 1967. An act to amend or repeal certain laws relating to Government records, and for other purposes.

BILLS AND A JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1181. An act to amend section 207 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 so as to authorize payment of claims arising from the correction of military or naval records;

H. R. 1215. An act to authorize certain land and other property transactions, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3298. An act to amend sections 303 (c) and 503 (b) of the Federal, Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended;

H. R. 3376. An act for the relief of Margaret K. N. Miller;

H. R. 4386. An act making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5131. An act granting the consent of Congress to a compact or agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey concerning a bridge across the Delaware River to provide a connection between the Pennsylvania Turnpike system and the New Jersey Turnpike, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 341. Joint resolution making appropriations for rehabilitation of flood-stricken areas for the fiscal year 1952, and for other purposes.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. SIEMINSKI, for Friday and Saturday of this week, on account of official business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 52 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, October 19, 1951, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

893. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

894. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled, "A bill for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Foreign Service of the United States and others, who, while in the course of their respective duties, suffered losses of personal property by reason of the outbreak of hostilities in Korea"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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. FALLON: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 4900. A bill granting the consent of Congress to a supplemental compact or agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey concerning the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1208). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee: Committee of conference. S. 1046. An act to readjust postal rates (Rept. No. 1210). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee: Committee of conference. S. 355. An act to adjust the salaries of postmasters, supervisors, and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department (Rept. No. 1211). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee: Committee of conference. S. 622. An act to increase the basic rates of compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1212). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. DOUGHTON: Committee of conference. H. R. 4473. A bill to provide revenue, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1213). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. DOUGHTON: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 5448. A bill to provide for the temporary free importation of zinc; with amendment (Rept. No. 1214). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CROSSER: Committee of conference. H. R. 3669. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1215). Ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5730. A bill for the relief of William Lund Main; without amendment (Rept. No. 1209). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 5788. A bill to extend certain 10-year oil and gas leases; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HART (by request):

H. R. 5789. A bill to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LIND:

H. R. 5790. A bill to amend chapter 33 of title 18 of the United States Code by adding a new section to be known as section 711; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H. R. 5791. A bill to finance the exploration, development, production, and production expansion of critical and strategic minerals and metals within the United States, its Territories, and insular possessions; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. R. 5792. A bill to repeal section 104 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H. R. 5793. A bill to channel into Government hands excess production of basic commodities needed for defense purposes and to prevent the price-depressive effects of such production; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DORN:

H. R. 5794. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide that, for the purpose of old-age and survivors insurance benefits, retirement age shall be 60 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

H. R. 5795. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for research and investigation with respect to the cause, prevention, and treatment of multiple sclerosis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H. R. 5796. A bill to amend section 41 of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act so as to provide a system of safety rules, regulations, and safety inspection and training, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 5797. A bill to authorize a preliminary examination and survey for flood control, navigation, hydroelectric power, water conservation, and allied purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED:

H. R. 5798. A bill to authorize a preliminary examination and survey for flood control, navigation, hydroelectric power, water conservation and allied purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. COLE of Kansas:

H. R. 5799. A bill to assist in the rehabilitation of disaster-stricken areas by assuring adequate relief under the housing laws; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CRUMPACKER:

H. R. 5800. A bill to amend the National Housing Act to provide additional authority to insure mortgages on existing single-family residences; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 5801. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, regarding published articles and broadcasts by foreign agents; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 5802. A bill for the relief of nationals of the United States against whom acts of sabotage were committed before the entry of the United States into World War I, and in whose favor the Mixed Claims Commis-

sion, United States and Germany, made awards of damages which have not been satisfied; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WEICHEL:

H. R. 5803. A bill to prevent the shipment in interstate commerce of illegal undersized fish; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. Res. 470. Resolution authorizing expenses of conducting studies and investigations of certain matters pertaining to immigration; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alabama, relative to transmitting a copy of the mutual aid compact entered into between the States of Alabama and Florida, dated October 15, 1951; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. R. 5804. A bill for the relief of Mitsuko Sato; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5805. A bill for the relief of Patricia Lauretta Pray; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRAMBLETT:

H. R. 5806. A bill for the relief of Toshiko Yamane; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 5807. A bill for the relief of Shukri Elias Ajlouni (Ajluni); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H. R. 5808. A bill for the relief of Antonia Majer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 5809. A bill for the relief of Francesco Cavero; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'TOOLE (by request):

H. R. 5810. A bill for the relief of Jose Medalha; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5811. A bill for the relief of Jose Simao; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5812. A bill for the relief of Joaquim Madeira; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REAMS:

H. R. 5813. A bill for the relief of Theodore Karam; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 5814. A bill for the relief of John J. Hopkins; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5815. A bill to provide additional time for presenting certain tort claims against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER (by request):

H. R. 5816. A bill for the relief of William Elden Joslin; 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:

478. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Statewide Tidelands Committee of Texas, Austin, Tex., relative to a resolution of the board of directors of the Missouri State Chamber of Commerce, held October 8, 1951, dealing with the tidelands matter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

479. Also, petition of Joseph F. Lamb, supreme secretary, Knights of Columbus, New Haven, Conn., relative to changes in immigration laws as would permit at least 100,000 expellees and 100,000 Italians to enter the United States as immigrants; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 19, 1951

(Legislative day of Monday, October 1, 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:

Almighty God, under the all-embracing canopy of Thy goodness and mercy which have followed us all the days of our lives, we come as children in our Father's house. Beneath all diversities of gifts and of thought we seek the common unity which binds us together with the cords of Thy brooding love, which will not let us go, and which seeketh us, even in perplexities and pain. Away from all the divisive forces of the world about us, which tear and separate and push apart, we would kneel in penitence at the altar of the one God whose love shed abroad in our hearts alone can send us out on our differing and often difficult paths, hoping all things and enduring all things.

From the valley of futility and despair we lift our eyes to the hills of eternal verities which stab the horizon like great and glorious steeples pointing to the skies, for we know that our help and our hope are in Thee, who hath made heaven and earth. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MCFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, October 18, 1951, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 1311) granting the consent of Congress to a compact entered into by the States of Montana, North Dakota, and Wyoming relating to the waters of the Yellowstone River.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 210) authorizing the naturalization of Jesus Juan Llanderal, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the amendment of the House numbered 4 to the bill (S. 657) to amend and clarify the District of Columbia Teachers' Leave Act of 1949, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 36) authorizing the appointment of 14 Members of Congress to participate in a public discussion of problems of common interest with representatives of the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2094) to amend the act of August 7, 1946, so as to authorize the making of grants for hospital facilities, to provide a basis for repayment to the Government by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

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

H. R. 800. An act for the relief of Cindy Eberhardt;

H. R. 827. An act for the relief of Dr. Manuel J. Casas and Mrs. Julia Nakpil Casas;

H. R. 1161. An act for the relief of Kenneth McRight;

H. R. 1267. An act to reimburse the Stamey Construction Co. and/or the Oklahoma Paving Co., as their interests appear;

H. R. 1828. An act for the relief of Maria Szertgyorgyi Mayer;

H. R. 1857. An act for the relief of James Yao;

H. R. 1974. An act for the relief of Mary Gemma Kawamura;

H. R. 2662. An act for the relief of Mrs. Thelma A. Nolen;

H. R. 2775. An act for the relief of Anneliese Barbara Vollrath and Mrs. Margarete Elise Vollrath;

H. R. 2833. An act for the relief of Rudolf Bing and Nina Bing;

H. R. 2962. An act for the relief of Maude S. Burman;

H. R. 3219. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Robert E. Vigus;

H. R. 3375. An act for the relief of Mrs. Orinda Josephine Quigley;

H. R. 3569. An act for the relief of Louis Campbell Boyd;

H. R. 3600. An act for the relief of Dr. Alexander Symeonidis;

H. R. 3668. An act for the relief of David Yeh;

H. R. 3847. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue to school district No. 28, Ronan, Mont., a patent in fee to certain Indian land;

H. R. 3877. An act for the relief of Erlinda Maria Bowers;

H. R. 3971. An act for the relief of Esther Park;

H. R 3985. An act for the relief of Hai Soon Lee;

H. R. 4130. An act for the relief of Caroline Wu;

H. R. 4558. An act for the relief of Mrs. Alberta S. Rozanski;

H. R. 4876. An act for the relief of Francesco Fratalia;

H. R. 4877. An act for the relief of Mrs. Margherita Caroli;

H. R. 5097. An act to extend the time during which the Secretary of the Interior may enter into amendatory repayment contracts under the Federal reclamation laws, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5397. An act for the relief of Mrs. Dora Troost;

H. R. 5730. An act for the relief of William Lund Main; and

H. J. Res. 285. Joint resolution to authorize appropriate participation by the United States in commemoration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the establishment of the United States Military Academy.