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. 3017. A bill for the relief of San Jose Manufacturing Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CURTIS: H. R. 3018. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Vanas H. Hicks; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GROSS: H. R. 3019. A bill for the relief of Harry D. Koenig; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 3020. A bill for the relief of Leslie A. Fry; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MCCARTHY: H. R. 3021. A bill for the relief of the J. M. Jones Lumber Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PHILLIPS: H. R. 3022. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Hazel M. Skoges; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ROGERS of New York: H. R. 3023. A bill to authorize the cancellation of deportation proceedings in the case of Apostolos Vasil1 Perkas; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1022. By Mr. O'CHIAR: Petition of C. E. Hilderman, citizen of Missouri, protesting against the passage of any prohibition legislation by the Congress; to the Committee on Judiciary.

1023. Also, petition of Spencer Salisbury and 297 other citizens of Missouri, protesting against the passage of any prohibition legislation by the Congress; to the Committee on Judiciary.

1024. By Mr. BARKLEY: Petition of Thomas J. Reardon and 297 other citizens of Missouri, protesting against the passage of any prohibition legislation by the Congress; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

SENATE

Friday, June 29, 1945

(legislative day of Monday, June 25, 1945)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, pursuant to adjournment. Mr. Bankley, by unanimous consent, read the Journal of the proceedings of the preceding day, and the Journal was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

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

H. R. 3358. An act to amend the Nationality Act of 1940.

H. R. 3328. An act reducing the rates of postage on catalogs and similar printed advertising matter and on publications, and for other purposes.

H. R. 3379. An act making appropriations to supplement appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for fiscal years 1946, to provide appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes; and:


ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Senate had affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (S. J. Res. 65) to transfer to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation the functions, powers, duties, and records of certain corporations, as it was signed by the President pro tempore.

ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT AT THE FINAL SESSION OF THE SAN FRANCISCO CONFERENCE

Mr. BARKEY. Mr. President, I intended yesterday to ask that the address delivered by the President at San Francisco on Tuesday be printed in the body of the Congressional Record. Other things intervened, and the request was not made. I now make it. I now make it.

The President pro tempore. Without objection, the address delivered by the President will be printed in the Record.

The address is as follows:

Mr. Chairman and delegates to the United Nations Conference on International Organization, oh, what a great day this can be in history. I deeply regret that the press of circumstances when this Conference opened made it impossible for me to be here to greet you in person. I have asked for the privilege of coming today to express on behalf of the people of the United States our thanks for what you have done here and to wish you Godspeed on your journeys home.

Somewhere in this broad country, every one of you can find some of our citizens who are sons and daughters, or descendants in some degree, of your own native land. All our people, wherever they may be, have been working together for a lasting peace. That is true. The important thing is that all people of the world, every peace-loving people the world over.

Their confidence in you has been justified. Their hopes for your success have been fulfilled.

CALLS CHARTER A VICTORY

The Charter of the United Nations which you are now signing is a solid structure upon which we can build for the future. History will honor you for it. Between the victory in Europe and the final victory in Japan, the_and destruction of Hiroshima, you have won a victory against war itself.

It was the hope of such a charter that have sustained the courage of the peoples through the darkest days of the war. For it is a declaration of great faith by the peoples of the earth that war is not inevitable, faith that peace can be maintained.

If we had had this charter a few years ago—and above all, the will to use it millions now dead would be alive. If we should falter in the future in our will to use it, millions now living will suffer death.

It has already been said by many that this is only a first step to a lasting peace. That is true. The important thing is that all our
thinking and all our actions be based on the realization that it is in fact only a first step. Let us all have it firmly in mind that we start today from a good beginning, and we head always on the final objective, let us march forward.

The Constitution of our own country came from the minds of men like this. It was made up of delegates with many different views. Like this charter, our Constitution cannot be expanded and developed by exchange of conflicting opinions. When it was adopted, no one regarded it as a perfect document. And upon it there was built a bigger, a better, and a more perfect Union.

That union, for its own Constitution, will be expanded and improved as time goes on. No one claims that it is now a final or a perfect instrument. It has not been poured into a fixed mold. Changing world conditions will require readjustments—but they will be the readjustments of peace and not of war.

That we now have this charter at all is a great wonder. It is also a cause for profound thanksgiving to Almighty God, who has brought us so far in our search for peace through world organization.

DIFFERENCES IN VIEWS RECALLED

There were many who doubted that agreement could ever be reached by these 50 countries differing so much in race and religion, in language and culture. But these differencies are now forgotten in one unshakable world forum. The faith and the hope of a spirit of give-and-take, of tolerance for differing views when requirements are all forgotten in one unshakable alliance, opinions were expressed openly and freely. The faith and the hope of the tradition of liberty-loving peoples, the will to peace and safety was a charter for freedom. When the world forum was built a big foundation stone of this charter. That is the foundation stone of this charter. That is why we have here resolved to wage war, not with the threat of force, but with the plea for peace.

Out of this conflict have come powerful military nations, now fully trained and equipped for war, or they have no right to dominate the world. It is rather the duty of these powerful nations to assume the responsibility for leadership of the world. It is the result of their organized unity for peace that the world forum was built.

In spite of these differences, the world was held together by a common interest to keep the peace for itself, to keep it secure for itself, to keep it immune from a war. All war-takers and destroy concentration camps in the world must be stopped and put an end to. That is why we have here resolved to wage war, not with the threat of force, but with the plea for peace.

By their own example the strong nations of the world should lead the way to international justice and to public order, to public safety, to public peace. That is why we have here resolved that power and strength shall be used not to wage war, but to bring about peace, and to free the world from fear of war.

The time for action is here now. Let us, therefore, each in his own nation and according to its own way, seek immediate approval of this charter—and make it a living thing.

I EXPECT SPEEDY SENATE APPROVAL.

I shall send this charter to the United States Senate at once. I am sure that the overwhelming sentiment of the people of my country and of the representatives in the Senate is in favor of immediate ratification. A just and lasting peace cannot be attained by diplomatic agreement alone, or by military cooperation alone. Experience has shown how deeply the seeds of war are planted by economic rivalry and by social injustice. The charter recognizes this fact, for it has provided for economic and social cooperation as a part of the very heart of the entire compact. It has set up machinery of international cooperation which men and nations of good will can use to help correct the economic and social causes for conflict.
Let us not fail to grasp this supreme chance to establish a world-wide rule of reason—to create an enduring peace under the guidance of God.

PRINTING OF SENATOR CONNALLY'S SPEECH ON UNITED NATIONS' CHARTER (S. DOC. NO. 58)

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk the following order and ask that it be agreed to:

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The order will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Ordered, That the remarks of Senator Tom Connally, delivered in the Senate on June 28, 1945, on the charter of the United Nations, be printed as a Senate document and that 10,000 additional copies be printed for the use of the Senate document room.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is entered.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. VANDENBERG obtained the floor. Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield? Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

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

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

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

Aiken
Austin
Ball
Barkley
Biddle
Brewster
Bricker
Bridges
Brooks
Burton
Butler
Bushfield
Bush
Byrd
Capehart
Capper
Chaffee
Connally
Cordon
Dennison
Downey
Eldridge
Elender
Ferguson
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passions, their errors of opinion, their local interests, and their selfish views. From such an assembly product can we expect? It therefore astonishes me, Sir, to find this system approaching so near to perfection as it does.

Mr. President, if that was true in a limited area among our relatively close neighbors, how much more true is it when we contemplate the San Francisco Conference, where 50 nations, gathered from the opposite poles and from the ends of the earth—by race, by language, and tradition, representing 85 percent of the world’s population, and dealing with a problem which spans the seven seas, separated from each other by race, language, and tradition, with no common denominator to express their common purpose. Only those who have engaged in such a universal Congress—veritably the parliament of man—can wholly understand the limitations and the difficulties. But they must be obvious to any thinking mind. It is no wonder we had many a troublesome day, many a critical night. It is no wonder that none of us can say that he wholly approves the net result. The wonder is that we can all approve so much.

Within the framework of the charter, through its refinement in the light of experience, the future can overcome our errors. But there will be no future for it unless we make this start. I doubt if there ever can be another or a better start. I commend this over-all consideration to all of my colleagues who have any interest in collective security as an insurance of individual peace. I commend it to all who are listening to the prayers for peace which rise from the hearthstones of our land.

You cannot plant an acorn, Mr. President, and expect an oak from it the morning following, but you will never have an oak unless you plant the acorn. In the San Francisco Charter we undertook an active peace. How can we say with finality how they will flower, but this I know: Without roots there will be no flowers. I prefer the chance rather than the certainty.

Mr. President, an over-view regarding collective security is well known. I have repeatedly stated it upon this floor. While I want a powerful Army and an invincible Navy to make our national defense as impregnable as possible, pending the time when mutual arms limitations can be made dependably effective, I believe that no nation can hereafter immunize itself by its own exclusive action. I say again, as I said on January 10, that since Pearl Harbor, World War II has put the cruel science of mass murder into new and simulated forms. I say again that the oceans have ceased to be courts which automatically protect our ramparts. I say again that flesh and blood now complete unequivocally with absolute skill, has an all-consuming juggernaut. I say again that if World War III ever unhappily arrives, it will open new laboratories of death too horrible to contemplate.

Mr. President, they must be kept closed all around the earth both by moral standards and by law. We cannot trust space any longer promises to shield the victims of treacherous attack. We must have collective security to stop the next war, if possible, before it starts, and we must have collective action to crush it swiftly and in spite of our organized precautions.

That vital aspiration, Mr. President, is the object of the San Francisco Charter. The charter is not content merely with this latter singular assignment to meet force with force when there is nothing left to do but fight. It seeks, above all else, to cure the underlying causes of war. It seeks to fortify the peace; to resolve disputes by peaceful means before they take on the suicidal magnitudes of war; in a familiar metaphor, to ‘lock the barn before the horse is stolen.”

You may tell me that I speak of the millennium. I reply, in the words of Holy Writ: “Where there is no vision the people perish; but he who keeps the peace will not fail to try. We dare not fail to strive in this direction no matter how far we fall short of the goal.”

Here, Mr. President, are 50 sovereign nations each one of which is under the solemn pledge that can be made under God among the peoples of the earth—under pledge to do what? Listen:

To maintain international peace and security; and to that end to take collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace and the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace, and to bring about by peaceful means, and in accordance with principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which may lead to a breach of the peace.

Under pledge to do what else?

To develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principles of equal rights and self-determination of peoples and to take other appropriate measures to strengthen universal peace.

Under pledge to do what else?

To achieve international cooperation in the solution of international problems of an economic, social, or cultural character and in the promotion and encouragement of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, language, religion, or sex.

You may tell me that I have but to scan the present world with realistic eyes in order to see these fine phrases often contemptuously reduced to a contemptible farce. You may tell me that some of the signatories to this charter practice the precise opposite of what they preach even as they sign. You may tell me that the aftermath of this war seems to threaten the utter disintegration of these ideals at the very moment they are born. I reply that the nearer right you may be in any such gloomy indictment, the greater is the impetuous effort to stem these evil tides. The nearer right you are, the greater becomes the importance of this new self-denying ordinance, which promises a chastened view in 50 capitals of this earth. The nearer right you are, the greater is the urgency for invoking the emanations which the San Francisco Charter contemplates. If the effort fails, we can at least face the consequence with clean hands.

Now, Mr. President, I briefly sketch the charter’s working structure. It will function through six major organs: First, a general assembly in which each signatory nation has one vote—tomorrow’s “town meeting of the world”; second, a security council; the great powers plus the five great powers; third, the international court of justice where all nations will have the option of seeking judicial decisions; fourth, a social and economic council, consisting of 18 nations chosen periodically by the assembly, which will explore those social and economic dislocations, in the family of nations, that too often breed the wars which might otherwise be avoided through voluntary readjustments.

The security council will have at its ultimate potential disposal, when all other recourses have failed to maintain peace and security, an armed force to which the signatory states will be prepared to contribute upon call and in such proportions as shall be determined by collateral agreements made between the Security Council and these states. These agreements will not be negotiated until the new organization is in being. Their detail is not involved in the discussion of this primary treaty. But this treaty guarantees that these shall be “subject to ratification by the signatory states in accordance with their constitutional processes.” Hence the Senate need have no fear that this separate obligation will not subsequently be available to its full scrutiny and consent.

There are those, Mr. President, who look upon this final availability of force as an end in itself. This is the spirit of the enterprise. They argue that the aggressor of tomorrow, like the brutal aggressors of yesterday and today, will understand no language except guns and tanks and planes; practically this is true. Certainly I do not disagree that the United Nations must possess the potential power to fight to keep the peace which they have won by kindred means. I agree that we must “keep our powder dry” and be prepared to “pass the ammunition.” But I would not agree that force is the real genius of this new institution. On the contrary, it is my conviction that the great hope which is here held out to humankind stems largely from the solemn formula which the San Francisco Charter creates for the pacific settlement of controversies before they ever reach a fighting stage. It is my profound belief that the pacific contacts and consultations which will constantly be maintained by the United Nations among the great powers—plus the pacific routines which every dispute must hereafter exhaust before it is subject to any sort of sanctions, can and will resolve most, if not all, of the problems to which otherwise might lead once more to war.
will be consulted, in view of the nature, character, and extent of this new obligation, which stands in a degree of sacred trust which has never heretofore been approached by an international obligation in history. Nowhere else in these pacific routines to which resort must be made by the large as well as by the small powers before there can be any consideration, thought, or suggestion of resorting to armed forces for the adjustment of international relations; second, solution by inquiry; third, solution by mediation; fourth, solution by conciliation; fifth, solution by arbitration; sixth, solution by judicial settlement; seventh, solution by resort to temporary arrangements; eighth, other peaceful means chosen by the disputants themselves; ninth, appropriate procedures or methods of adjustment recommended by the Security Council.

This procedure, among other things, will be a “cooling off” process. It will temper and discourage impetuous wrath which too often flares out of sudden national hysteria. It allows the time for rules of reason to reendow our sanities. It promises justice as a substitute for force. And all the time it invokes the moral purpose of men and things. What is the science of the world, functioning through this organization, upon any nation, big or little, which ignores this pacific routine and draws its ruthless sword. You have no choice, and hence about a big veto to which I shall presently refer. There is no veto—no self-administered immunity bath—which can void this primary obligation which every member of the world must take when it endorses the San Francisco Charter. There will be no doubt about the record. The self-confessed criminal of tomorrow will stand condemned. I admit that the Security Council cannot go as far against one of the five big powers as it can against the middle and lesser powers. I shall discuss that in a moment. But as a superpower, however great, from the clear responsibility which it will unavoidably assume before a outraged world if it takes to the warpath before it has exhausted these paths of peaceful procedure, the spiritual forces of this earth—when once thus universally aroused and organized and given a mighty oracle for militant expression—will prevail against all enemies. In my view, this is the San Francisco Charter’s rendezvous with destiny.

I should like further to illuminate this point, Mr. President. The other day, in a radio quiz, I was asked the following question:

Will you trace the steps of procedure in the event of a problem? "Taking the most unlikely of suppositions, suppose Canada and the United States were to become involved in a boundary dispute?"

This certainly would be “the most unlikely case,” because the unfortified 3,000 miles of Canadian-American boundary has been an area of total peace for more than a century. And yet, when I was a boy, and the world has to worry about. Nevertheless, let me answer the question. Canada and America have their own treaties, plus a permanent Boundary Commission, to settle such disputes. This would continue to be the first recourse. If it failed, Canada and America would be further obligated under the United Nations Charter to seek a settlement by (1) negotiation, (2) inquiry, (3) mediation or conciliation, (4) judicial settlement, (5) other actions either on their own initiative or on the suggestion of the Security Council. It is inconceivable that this route would not succeed. But if the Security Council itself would call on the other United Nations to use sanctions against the designated offender—such sanctions as complete or partial interruption of economic relations and of rail, sea, air, postal, telegraph, radio, and other means of communication, and the severance of diplomatic relations. If, finally, even this procedure should fail, the Security Council could call upon the United Nations for armed force against the aggressor. It is, of course, unthinkable that any possible dispute between Canada and the United States would be such an extreme. Further, considerations of the famous “veto” also enter this particular equation. But it nonetheless illustrates the general routine. You can apply the same principle to other states in any part of the world. In my opinion, it is a routine which will stop almost every dispute short of the necessity for the consideration either of peacekeeping or of peace-making. In any event, in my opinion, is the great practical value of the formula which we propose.

As a result of the San Francisco Conference, Dumbarton Oaks has been given a new soul. As it was drawn, it promised to avoid any reference to justice—without which there can be no stable peace. San Francisco’s Charter fills that void. The charter names justice as the prime criterion of peace. It repeatedly dedicates itself to human rights and fundamental freedoms. It declines to accept a static world in which yesterday’s inequities are frozen in a strait-jacket. It tells the general assembly that it is empowered periodically in a free and untrammeled general assembly can make decisions for the peaceful adjustment of any situations, regardless of origin, which it deems likely to impair the general welfare.

That is indeed a glorious assignment for tomorrow’s “Town meeting of the world.”

In this and other aspects, the Dumbarton Oaks plan has been greatly liberalized by the progressive labor of this Conference. I submit that the justice is not only better, but something greater. I am hearing under the healthiest possible auspices available to this distraught and tangled world. I submit that justice is the most thorough and most effective democratic weapon to be found, and that it would be a blemish to any forum than it would be if such a forum were refused. I suggest that the more one fears the nation of the true peace, speaking not of our enemies but of our friends, the sooner should be established an institution which can promise some element of orderly correction. Under such circumstances, the quicker this institution begins to function the quicker justice may hope to find its voice and mobilize its friends.

I am definitely not saying, Mr. President, that a good league can compensate for a bad peace. I am not diluting this responsibility, that is the responsibility which will rest upon those who chart the final peace. But I am saying that, whatever the final result, the San Francisco Charter will eventually make a better, a wiser, and a safer job of it in its ultimate impacts upon humankind. We could wish for more assurance than this charter gives, but we would desert our own ideals if we should permit our desire for the unattainable to blind us to the wisdom of embracing the boon which is at hand.

It is said, by way of assent upon this scheme of things, that the San Francisco Charter virtually delivers the world to the domination of a three-power alliance—America, Russia, Britain, France, and China—since these nations permanently exercise major authority in the Security Council which we here endorsed. It is said that in stark reality, becomes a three-power military alliance between Russia, Britain, and the United States, since in the event of a dispute, the United Nations can only recommend measures of peace enforcement when the need for force arises. So far as peace enforcement is concerned, I agree that there is substance to this contention. But I hasten to assert that so far as force is
concerned, the world is at the mercy of Russia, Britain, and the United States, regardless of whether we form a peace league or not. Those happen to be the facts of life. But I submit that the world is even more at their mercy without the San Francisco Charter than with it. Without the charter there is no curb upon these great military powers except the rivalry between them—and military rivalry has never yet been the harbinger of peace. With the charter there is at least the restraint of a peace formula, for whatever that may be worth, and the grim assurance, Mr. President, of every American citizen, who breaks this contract will stand in naked infamy before the embattled world. The truth of the matter is that the condition it would not be worth making a virtue of necessity—is to embrace peace plans would be to wander in a wishful dream. To accept this realism and then to seek to harness it—to thus continue for the foreseeable future to the use of the pacific tools and security in the world as it is and as it is destined to be for some time to come—whether we like it or not—the Great Powers must assume special and particular responsibilities. There is no other alternative. The Great Powers must assume these responsibilities the Great Powers obviously must have special and particular authority. Without the latter, the former are impossible. This special and particular authority is the equivalent of special and particular privilege. But, in the last analysis, it is the privilege of serving the world. If it ever becomes the property of a predatory people, this organization will die of cancer. For myself, I decline to write any such obituary in anticipation of a funeral which never need occur. But I do not for an instant blind myself to the overriding fact that these responsibilities, these authorities, these privileges which the Great Powers thus accept are the most important public trust ever created in the affairs of men. It is indispensable that this obligation be accepted in this spirit by all concerned.

If you tell me that I have no warrant in anyHip order of the principles of this great peace mission, to the idealism of the San Francisco Charter, let me recognize the valid fact that for this generation the United Nations have a habit of keeping our country's word—a habit, by the way, which needs to become contagious if any sort of world order shall survive. The late President exempted himself and my colleagues from any suggestion that, though we cooperate wholeheartedly with the United Nations for peace and security, we remain the captains of our own souls. It guarantees our perpetuated independence of international coercion. If the veto is viewed by some of our citizens as a cloud upon the idealism of the San Francisco Charter, let us recognize the valid fact that for others of our citizens the cloud has a silver lining. Indeed, for millions of our people it will be all "silver lining" and no cloud at all.

In my view, Mr. President, we sacrifice none of our essential American sovereignty and none of our essential American rights when, exercising intelligent self-interest and self-defense, we join this international enterprise to seek a peace and a security which are as essential to our welfare as the air we breathe. The American people the American people have found a practical way to integrate regional arrangements with the over-all authority of the United Nations League, and thus to put the international organization of the American system—one once symbolized by...
the Monroe Doctrine and recently endowed with new vitality at Chapultepec. For 50 years this inter-American Union has been the most powerful instrument for peace and security the world has ever seen. We do not surrender its mutual advantage. On the contrary, the United Nations Congress will persistently facilitate the enlargement of this large system. We integrate them with the larger plan.

Another example—we preserve the right of individual and collective self-defence against invasion of a new order, a new state, in the event of summary attack. Another example—we exempt all essential domestic matters from the jurisdiction of the new international authority. Another example—condemned to those who want American freedom of postwar action in respect to far Pacific island bases—we have written a trusteeship chapter in the San Francisco Charter which sets up a splendid optional program that shall lift mandates to new levels of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. Indeed, I quote from the Charter:—"It would be a matter of subsequent agreement as to which territories would be brought under a trusteeship system and upon what terms and conditions that would be recognized." Short of the compulsory idealism which some of our citizens desire, is an assurance to others of our citizens that America reserves complete freedom of action to herself in this regard.

In a word, we have not created a superstate. We have not organized a "world government." We have not hauled down the Stars and Stripes from the dome of the Capitol. We have simply agreed to cooperate effectively with 49 other sovereign states in the mutual pursuit of peace and security. Our own American self-interest in that objective, as demonstrated by two world wars in a quarter century, is as keen and as intimate and as universal as that of any other nation on this globe. I know of no land on earth which has a greater stake in this world peace than our own United States of America.

Mr. President, in this brief report I have tried to touch upon just a few of the tremendous subject. I have presented only a sketchy outline of the proposed Social and Economic Council which will persistently facilitate "the development of conditions of stability and well-being which are necessary for peaceful and friendly relations among nations, based on respect for the principles of the new order and self-determination of peoples." This is one of the most significant and most promising improvements on the old Geneva Covenant. I also particularly have in mind the new commission which is put upon international law as an institution for human service, substituting orderly justice for the jungle-creed that might makes right. I also have in mind the certainty that, with the institution, with the superstate, with the San Francisco Charter, we here mobilize, not Axis Powers nor any counterpart thereof shall ever rise again.

These and many other considerations will be the appropriate subjects of future investigation by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and of full debate on the Senate floor. And I am sure that I believe the San Francisco Charter can withstand such scrutiny. I have no disposition to urge precipitous haste in this most difficult work. The Senate and the country to know all there is to know about this mighty enterprise. On the other hand, I should deeply regret any needless or undue delay in proceeding with the Senate amendments and to witness the Senate's will. None of us can be unaware of the importance which will attach to our decision, nor of the impact which will be made upon the life of the world in this moment of its greatest flux. History is writing with a rushing pen and we, Mr. President, must accommodate its pace. If America is to assume the moral leadership of a better world in which we have fought our way to glorious eminence, we can scarcely be content to be among the last who care or dare to speak when this United Nations' roll is called.

Mr. President, I was still at my Conference tasks in San Francisco when Washington had the great privilege of welcoming General Eisenhower a few days ago. It was a source of deep regret to me that I could not be here with you to join the grateful throng which greeted him in the great Senate. I am envious of those who can. But I have upon the life of this great nation of peoples this present moment to be my tribute to the greatest single leader which the world has ever known. Here is Washington's exemplar for us to follow and emulate. That那种, Mr. President; I was still at my Conference tasks in San Francisco when Washington had the great privilege of welcoming General Eisenhower a few days ago. It was a source of deep regret to me that I could not be here with you to join the grateful throng which greeted him in the great Senate. I am envious of those who can. But I have upon the life of this great nation of peoples this present moment to be my tribute to the greatest single leader which the world has ever known. Here is Washington's exemplar for us to follow and emulate. That, Mr. President, is the aspiration and the dedication of the San Francisco Charter. None of its authors will certify to its perfection. But all of its authors and signatories will certify to its preponderant advantages. It is the only plan available for international cooperation in the pursuit of peace and justice. It is laden with promise and with hope. It deserves a fair trial. It has everything to gain and nothing to lose by giving it support; everything to lose and nothing to gain by declining this continued franchise with the United Nations in behalf of the dearest dream of humankind. I recommend the San Francisco Charter to Congress and the country. [Prolonged applause, Senators rising.]

ORDER FOR PRINTING OF ADDRESS BY SENATOR VANDENBERG ON UNITED NATIONS CHARTER (S. DOC. 59)

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I send to the desk an order and ask for its immediate consideration.

The President pro tempore. The clerk will read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Ordered, That the remarks of Senator Arthur H. Vandenberg, delivered in the Senate on June 29, 1945, on the Charter of the United Nations, be printed as a Senate document and that 10,000 additional copies be printed for the use of the Senate document room.

The President pro tempore. Without objection, the order is entered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The President pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

WESTERN STEEL PLANTS AND THE TIN PLATE INDUSTRY

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, his fourth report dealing with western steel plants and the tin-plate industry (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REPORT OF DIRECTOR OF WAR MOBILIZATION AND RECONVERSION—THE ROAD TO TOKYO AND BEYOND

A letter from the Director of the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, transmitting, pursuant to law, his quarterly report relating to the mobilization of the United States, to the Committee on Finance.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate by the President pro tempore and referred as indicated:

Resolutions adopted by the Hudson County (N. J.) Republican Committee, commending Hon. Walter E. Edge, Governor of New Jersey, and former United States Senator, for his efforts in sponsoring legislation in behalf of veterans, liberalizing the workmen's compensation laws, reorganization of the various State departments and agencies, and postwar planning in the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on Finance.

The petition of Earl McCracken, of New York City, N. Y., praying that he be discharged from the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the chairman and several members of certain committees of the Filipino Territorial Council Delegation, and the Washington representative of the Filipino Inter-Community Organization of the Western States, Washington, D. C., praying for the enactment of legislation for the security of certain Filipino seamen during the postwar period; to the Committee on Commerce.

A resolution adopted by the interim committee of the American Jewish Committee, New York City, N. Y., recommending prompt ratification of the San Francisco Charter for Peace; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A memorial to the Senate of New York State, praying for the enactment of a law providing for the execution of certain laws relating to the education of the blind of the State; to the Committee on Education and Labor.
The following reports of committees were received:

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

S. 1117. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey the Dorinda Estate in Santa Barbara County, Calif., to Robert Woods Bliss and Mildred B. Bliss; with amendment (Rept. No. 449).

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

H. R. 2998. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to reorganize the District of Columbia by levying a tax upon all dogs therein, to make such dogs personal property, and for other purposes," approved June 19, 1878, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 449).

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on June 28, 1945, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 937) to amend the act suspending until June 30, 1945, the running of the statute of limitations applicable to violations of the antitrust laws, so as to continue such suspension until June 30, 1946.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. BYRD:

S. 1200. A bill to amend sections 44 and 38 of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 1218. A bill for the relief of Charles H. Craig; and

S. 1211. A bill to permit settlement of accounts of deceased officers and enlisted men of the Army without administration of estates; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED OR PlACED ON CALENDAR

The following bills and joint resolution were severally read twice by their titles and referred, or ordered to be referred, or placed on the Calendar, as indicated:

H. R. 511. An act to amend the Nationality Act of 1940; to the Committee on Immigration.

H. R. 3298. An act readjusting the rates of postage on catalogs and similar printed advertising and other matter of fourth-class mail, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

H. R. 3379. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1945, and June 30, 1946, to provide appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H. Res. 215. Joint resolution authorizing the President to grant a leave of absence to Senator Frad. And for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H. J. Res. 215. Joint resolution authorizing the President to grant a leave of absence to Senator Frad. And for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

THE LATE TESTIMONIAL DINNER

Senator 'Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the President yield to the late testimonial dinner to have printed in the Congressional Record of the Senate?

Hon. Frances Perkins, at Washington, D. C., on June 27, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.

POEMS BY NICK KENNY ON THE LATE PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT AND PRESIDENT TRUMAN

[Mr. DARBY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record two poems composed by Nick Kenny, President Franklin D. Rooscn. and the other on President Truman, which appear in the Appendix.]

POLAND'S SUN FADES AGAIN—ARTICLE BY WILLIAM B. SUN FADES

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an articleentitled "Poland's Sun Fades Again," written by William B. Sun Fades in the Washington Donly News of June 28, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. EASTLAND obtained the floor.

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

Mr. EASTLAND. With the understanding I shall not lose the floor.

Mr. HAYDEN. I merely wish to ask for the consideration of the Senate of the Department appropriation conference report. I send the report to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

There being no objection, the Chief Clerk read the conference report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3024) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed and do recommend to the Senate the following amendments to the Senate amendments:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the ammendment proposed insert "$12,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreements to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$208,860"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$3,600"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$105,950"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert the following: "eighteen; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 24: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$10,050"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert the following: "fifteen; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,076,740"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 37: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$454,695"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 39: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$118,980"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 42: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$12,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.
Amendment numbered 47: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$180,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 48: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 48, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$325,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 49: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 49, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$125,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 50: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$67,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 51: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 51, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$665,750"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 52: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 52, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,414,910"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 53: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 53, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$10,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 54: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 54, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$180,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 55: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 55, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$115,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 56: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 56, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$41,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 57: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 57, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$975,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 58: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 58, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$310,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 59: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 59, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$975,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 60: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 60, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$565,750"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 61: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 61, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$140,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 62: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 62, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$80,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 63: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 63, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 64: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 64, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 65: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 65, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,414,910"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 66: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 66, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$125,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 67: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 67, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$325,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 68: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 68, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$67,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.
Amendment numbered 162: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 162, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$85,760"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 163: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 163, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert the following: "Thirty;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 165: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 165, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "and purchase (not to exceed $10,000) of office furniture and equipment for use in the District of Columbia in addition to that which may be purchased from the appropriation for contingent expenses of the Department."; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 167: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 167, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$2,146,-560"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 169: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 169, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$335,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 190: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 190, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$583,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 191: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 191, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$85,760"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 192: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 192, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$846,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 196: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 196, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,792,-890"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 198: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 198, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,101,-500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 203: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 203, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$620,-000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 204: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 204, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$404,-540"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 205: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 205, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$7,319,-790"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 207: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 207, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,165,700"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 221: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 221, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,004,-860"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 230: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 230, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,500,-000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 238: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 238, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$2,146,-190"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 240: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 240, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,101,-500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 247: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 247, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$2,100,-000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 255: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 255, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$7,319,-790"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 259: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 259, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$846,-860"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 263: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 263, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$904,-700"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 267: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 267, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,004,-860"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 277: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 277, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$311,-800"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 283: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 283, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$804,-000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 291: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 291, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$320,-000"; and the Senate agree to the same.
follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$142.585"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 292: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 292, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$625,200"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 298: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 298, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$621,325"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 295: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 295, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 296: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 296, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$704,628"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 297: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 297, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$4,900,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 303: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 303, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$9,150,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 304: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 304, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert "$10,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 305: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 305, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,980,480"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 313: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 313, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter named in said amendment insert "$8,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.


CARL HAYDEN, RICHARD K. SULLIVAN, ELMER THOMAS, JOSEPH C. O'MAHONY, THOMAS FRANK GREEH, CHAN GERRY, HAROLD H. BURTON, KENNETH S. WHITNEY, MANAGERS OF THE AMENDMENT OF THE SENATE.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Mr. WHITE, Mr. President, is this a complete agreement?

Mr. HAYDEN. It is a complete agreement.

Mr. WHITE. Is it signed by all the members of both houses? Yes, sir.

Mr. HAYDEN. All the conferees signed the report.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment of the Senate numbered 90 to said bill and concurred therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in line 6 of said Senate engrossed amendment insert "$700,000".

Amendment numbered 293: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 64 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum inserted by said amendment insert "not exceeding $20,850 for cooperation with the State of Oklahoma for the construction and equipment of an outbuilding and craft building at Anadarko, Okla."

Amendment numbered 297: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 65 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum inserted by said amendment insert "$64,179.190".

Amendment numbered 299: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 125 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert: "under a contract to be entered into between said tribal attorney and the Osage Tribal Council, which contract shall be approved by the President of the United States, to remain available until expended."

Amendment numbered 300: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 155 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert: "not remain available until expended for carrying out projects (including the construction of transmission lines) or investigations previously herein authorized by Congress."

Amendment numbered 302: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 156 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert: "not exceed $3,847,110 of the unobligated balance of the appropriation for construction, operation, and maintenance, Bonneville power transmission system, that shall be available for appropriation in the fiscal year 1944 for expenses of marketing and operation of transmission facilities, and administrative costs in connection therewith, including $30,850 for personal services in the District of Columbia, and $50,000 for transportation, maintenance, and operation of passenger automobiles, and hire, maintenance, and operation of aircraft; Provided: Funds available for construction of transmission lines shall be available only for the construction of such lines as have been previously authorized by Congress."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 157 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert: "and not exceed $500,000 under a contract to be entered into between said tribal attorney and the Osage Tribal Council, which contract shall be approved by the President of the United States, to remain available until expended."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 158 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert: "in the amount of not less than $15,000 for the purchase of passenger automobiles for the Osage Tribal Council, the Osage Tribal Court, and the Osage Tribal Attorney, which purchase shall be made under a contract to be entered into by the Secretary of the Interior."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 159 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert: "not exceed $32,590."
inserted by said amendment insert: "$10,620,500."
That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 160 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert: "and to remain available until advanced to the Colorado River dam fund, $3,000,000."
That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 165 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert: "and remain available until expended for carrying out projects (including the construction of a transmission line) previously or herein authorized by Congress."
That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 176 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert: "June 30, 1947."
That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 177 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert: "for the purpose of the construction of transmission lines, substations, and other facilities as may be required by the act of May 18, 1938 (16 U. S. C. 833), $155,800, to be immediately available and to remain available until June 30, 1947."
That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 178 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert: "to remain available until June 30, 1947."
The House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 181 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert: "June 30, 1947."
The House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 268 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert: "$1,092,675, including $50,000 for the construction of transmission lines, substations, and other facilities within the Olympic National Park."
The House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 280 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert: "$44,800 and insert: "$40,000."
The House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 280 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum inserted by said amendment insert: "$20,000."
The House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 380 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert: "the sum of $250,000." The motion was agreed to.

continuation of authority to invest in the use of public lands
Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the President here. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Illinois?
Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.
Mr. LUCAS. I wish to have two resolutions agreed to, with the understanding that the Senator from Mississippi shall not lose the floor.
Mr. EASTLAND. With unanimous consent that I do not lose the floor, I yield.
Mr. LUCAS. I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed with that understanding.
The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.
Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably Senate Resolution 139, reported on June 19, 1945, by the senior Senator from Nevada (Mr. McCarran), from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.
Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Illinois, what is the resolution?
Mr. LUCAS. This is a resolution which came from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, and merely continues authority to that committee, without requesting any additional funds.
Mr. WHITE. I have no objection.
The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the resolution?
There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 139) was read, considered, and agreed to, as follows:
Resolved, That the authority conferred by Senate Resolution 241, Seventy-sixth Congress, agreed to May 25, 1940, and Senate Resolution 197, Seventy-seventh Congress, agreed to September 8, 1941, and Senate Resolution 39, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to May 23, 1944, and Senate Resolution 18, Seventy-ninth Congress, agreed to January 3, 1946 (relating to the use of public lands), is hereby continued during the sessions and adjourned periods of the Twenty-ninth Congress, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer oaths, to take such depositions, to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable.
The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $15,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee or the chairman of the subcommittee.
The amendment was agreed to.
The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.
Mr. HILL subsequently said: Mr. President, I wish to make comment with reference to the resolutions of the Senate which the Senate has just approved, providing funds for a subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs dealing with surplus property.
A few moments ago the Senate approved a resolution reported from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, making an appropriation which I understood was a subcommittee of the Senate Commit-
Mr. President, I am greatly interested in the knowledge that we have of the Communist Party’s activities for the past year, and I submit the report of the Subcommittee on the subject of iron and steel. That report contains so much valuable information, so much that is striking and challenging, and that throws light on our postwar situation, particularly with respect to iron and steel, that the Iron Age, which we know is perhaps the most authentic leading publication of the country on the subject of iron and steel, has devoted 14 pages to the report of the subcommittee in the issue of June 21, 1945.

In view of the action of the Senate in providing additional funds for the subcommittee, I felt that the Senate would be interested in what the subcommittee had been doing, and for its very able and challenging report.

Mr. O’MAHONEY. Mr. President, I very much appreciate what the Senator has said. I should like to add that the work of the subcommittee, together with Mr. H. B. McCoy, Chief of the Division of Industrial Economy of the Department of Commerce, played a major role in collecting and preparing this material. Mr. Kurt Borchardt was in charge of collecting the material.

Mr. HILL. As usual, the Senator from Wyoming is generous, and appreciative of the services and good work of his staff and those who helped him in connection with this report.

WAR AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3383) making appropriations for war agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I am not engaging in a filibuster. It was my earnest desire that a fair and reasonable compromise could be reached upon the question which is now before the Senate. I must confess that I believe in filibusters when we have the votes, and I think we will have a special filibuster on FEPC starts in the next few days.

Mr. President, for the past few years this country has been torn by agitators, by Communists, by fellow travelers, who have incited racial hatreds, who have made classes in this country racially conscious, who have made them class conscious, in order to divide our country and in order to weaken American democracy.

The Communist Party is behind this agitation. The Negro group in the United States is the greatest minority, the largest minority, the most powerful minority, the only one that we have. The Communist Party has been behind and has promoted legislative measures such as the one now pending, and I submit the report of the subcommittee, and president of the Communist International. This man Gitlow wrote a book in which he gave the Communist plans to dominate America, and in which he stated the racial program. The Communist Party in this country was one of their leading programs to take over America. I read from Mr. Gitlow’s book.

Let me say now that the facts about Russia have not changed. The American people are God knows they should know the facts—do not know what is happening abroad. They do not know the plans of the Communist Russians. If this debate is to be effective enough I shall discuss in detail the Communist program for world supremacy.

I read further from Mr. Gitlow’s book:

The attitude of the Communists was based upon the belief that the Negroes constituting * * * a section of our population, a section which has special * * grievances and if once properly organized and led, would be the front-rank fighters in a revolution to replace our present Republican with a Soviet form of government.

Besides, the Communist Party was instructed, built special Negro department, built special Negro organizations, issued Negro papers and periodicals, made every inducement for the Negroes to join the party, took advantage of every opportunity to penetrate existing Negro organizations, and to make inroads, in Negro movements, in the purpose of bringing its program before the Negro masses. The party membership was impressed with the importance of every new Negro member brought into the party was looked upon as a Communist achievement, and the Negroes were actually accorded special privileges.

Mr. President, there is the proof from one of the leading Communists in America, from one of the high officials of the Communist Party, that this organization is behind the Negro movement in this country and that the party is exploiting the Negroes by making special promises such as FEPC, such as social equality, such as racial amalgamation, in an attempt to line the Negroes up under the red banner of Communism and to destroy the United States.

I read further from the same book by Mr. Gitlow:

The Negro question was injected into every situation, in every campaign.

Was not Gitlow right about that, Mr. President? Is it not true that in every situation and in every campaign the party, the American Communist Party, as Gitlow says, the injection of the question comes from the Communist Party.

The Negroes were looked upon as the chosen people who were to be the vanguard of the American Communist revolution. Party members were urged to make every effort to establish personal as well as social relations with Negroes. Negros were sought in to the party, not on the basis of their Communist convictions, but on the promise that in the party they would have a reasonable evening together with whites on the basis of equality. Negroes who had recently been in the party were places of leadership simply because they were Negroes and as a demonstration that the Negroes enjoyed preferred treatment in the party. This was done not out of sympathy for Negroes, but for purely political reasons.

Behind the Negro agitation and the stress laid on exploiting the Negro issue was the desire—

Listen to this, Mr. President—

to comply with the orders from Moscow.

I wonder if those in the Senate who support legislation such as this realize that in the last analysis they are following orders from Moscow, because, as Gitlow says, the Communist Party is behind these measures. I read further:

It was hoped through a Negro minorities movement in the United States to give leadership to a colored nationalist movement of world proportions in Central and South America, Africa, Asia, and the Antipodes. The American nationalist Negro movement in Moscow was urged to provide the leadership for such a world movement. Besides, the Communist Party could dominate the American Negroes. Because it was believed possible for a small handful of American Communists to organize and control the 2,000,000 Negro workers in American industry, which force could be the most decisive in the broader world-wide Negro movement.

Mr. President, that book shows the plan of the Communist Party to control the United States. Gitlow states in it, and I state now, that every prediction he made has come true. We see the same pattern behind all similar measures, to use the Negro, to make him class conscious and racial amalgamation, in order to bring him into the Communist Party.

The argument is made that the temporary FEPC is a war measure. It was stated in the Senate that the purpose of bringing the party into the war movement, into the production of arms and ammunition for the purposes of war. That is the reason
this organization was created in the first instance.
Let us see if those same reasons hold true under consideration now, on day before yesterday speeches were made in Negroes who were let out of war plants which closed down, in order to find employment for workers who were thrown out of employment in war industries which were converted, and statements were made that in a few months there would be a surplus of labor in the United States. If that is true, and if the purpose of FEPC is to mobilize all the manpower for war purposes, then, why is it necessary to set up this agency on a temporary basis, when we admit that within the next few months there will be a surplus of labor in the United States?

Furthermore, Mr. President, 1943 was the peak year in employment in the munitions industry in America. In that year 2,000,000 workers were employed. In May, 1945, there were roughly only eight and one-half million workers employed in the same industry, or a decrease of 2,000,000 persons. While I do not give the figures, as they are confidential, of the future decrease, or the rate of shut-down of war industry, I say by authority of my office as a Member of the United States Senate that within 12 months there will be 41 percent less labor in munition industries in the United States than there was 2 years ago.

In addition to that, 1,000,000 men will be discharged from the American Army to go into American industry within the next 12 months period. That being true, what is the necessity to continue this agency? It is not to mobilize every last ounce of our manpower and scrape the bottom of the barrel in order to provide employment for the unemployed. We do not need that labor. We have passed that peak. We are on the down grade. We face a surplus of labor in American industry within the next 12 months.

Mr. President, what is the idea behind this bill? It is argued that this organization is set up to give to the Negro race and other minority groups economic equality. Of course, everyone believes in equal pay for equal work. I certainly would not argue for discrimination against any workingman because of race. But that is most certainly not the question involved here. We cannot legislate against discrimination. We cannot legislate to stamp out of one’s heart the prejudice against the man of another color. What is the object of the FEPC? Economic equality? Then why has it devoted its time to tearing down partitions between white and colored labor to Government buildings and the like? It has gone into industry and taken measures to bring about social equality? I will tell the Senate why.

In accordance with the leadership at this time, and I will prove it in a few moments: In the interest of the business and industry of America, involving one of the most powerful bureaus-as I shall show in a moment, a bureau composed largely of Communist-minded people to control the full control of property, and the unarmmed right of selection of employees are recognized in the Constitution of the United States. They are recognized in the Declaration of Independence. They are recognized in the statutes of our country.

We are asked, under the guise of fair employment practices, to deprive business of a fundamental and sacred right, and to deprive American laboring men organized in unions of the right to say with whom they shall be associated in a union, and whom they shall not. If this agency can say that one man can have a job, it can also say that another man cannot have a job. We have established one of the most powerful agencies in the history of America, an agency which, unless it is checked, will control the business and industry of America. We have made real the dream of Stalin and of the Communist Policy Action Committee to take over American business, because such organizations control the Fair Employment Practice Committee and, through it, the control management of the United States. I submit that in the last analysis that is the principal objective of the leadership of the CIO, a leadership which is shot through and rotten with communism.

Mr. President, I make another statement at this time, and I will prove it in a few moments: In the interest of the future well-being of our country, Sidney Hillman should be deported, because he is one of the Communists and one of the lowest kinds of Communists we have in this country.

Mr. President, what does this agency do? We say we are not changing the American system. Let us examine the order setting up this agency; let us see what it says:

2. All departments and agencies of the Government of the United States concerned with vocational and training programs for war-production shall take all measures appropriate to assure that such programs are administered without discrimination because of race, creed, color, or national origin.

Of course, Mr. President, there is nothing to that section; it does not mean anything. But let us go further: Mr. President, there is no question that the President has the power to give the Executive Office for Emergency Management of the Executive Office of the President a Committee on Fair Employment Practice as the Committee, which shall consist of a Chairman and not more than six other members appointed by the President. The Chairman shall receive such salary as shall be fixed by the President not exceeding $10,000 per year. The other members of the Committee shall receive necessary traveling continue this organization we endorse a policy which deprives the employer of the right of selection of his employees. There are several rights which go with the ownership of property in America. It is fundamental that the owner is the boss of his property so long as he does not illegally step upon the toes of someone else. Ownership which makes the owner supreme so long as he does not infringe upon the rights of others. The principle of this organization deprives him of that fundamental right. Mr. President, the right of ownership, the right to full control of property, and the unarmmed right of selection of employees are recognized in the Constitution of the United States. They are recognized in the Declaration of Independence. They are recognized in the statutes of our country.

We are asked, under the guise of fair employment practices, to deprive business of a fundamental and sacred right, and to deprive American laboring men organized in unions of the right to say with whom they shall be associated in a union, and whom they shall not. If this agency can say that one man can have a job, it can also say that another man cannot have a job. We have established one of the most powerful agencies in the history of America, an agency which, unless it is checked, will control the business and industry of America. We have made real the dream of Stalin and of the Communist Policy Action Committee to take over American business, because such organizations control the Fair Employment Practice Committee and, through it, the control management of the United States. I submit that in the last analysis that is the principal objective of the leadership of the CIO, a leadership which is shot through and rotten with communism.

Mr. President, I make another statement at this time, and I will prove it in a few moments: In the interest of the future well-being of our country, Sidney Hillman should be deported, because he is one of the Communists and one of the lowest kinds of Communists we have in this country.

Mr. President, what does this agency do? We say we are not changing the American system. Let us examine the order setting up this agency; let us see what it says:

2. All departments and agencies of the Government of the United States concerned with vocational and training programs for war-production shall take all measures appropriate to assure that such programs are administered without discrimination because of race, creed, color, or national origin.

Of course, Mr. President, there is nothing to that section; it does not mean anything. But let us go further: Mr. President, there is no question that the President has the power to give the Executive Office for Emergency Management of the Executive Office of the President a Committee on Fair Employment Practice as the Committee, which shall consist of a Chairman and not more than six other members appointed by the President. The Chairman shall receive such salary as shall be fixed by the President not exceeding $10,000 per year. The other members of the Committee shall receive necessary traveling
expenses and, unless their compensation is otherwise prescribed by the President, a per diem allowance of not exceeding $25 per day and subsistence expenses on such days as they are actually engaged in the performance of duties pursuant to this order.

That section does not mean anything. But I read further now and we get down to the meat of the coconut:

4. The Committee shall formulate policies to achieve the purposes of this order and shall make recommendations to the various Federal departments and agencies and to the President which it deems necessary and proper to make effective the provisions of this order.

What does that say? It says that the world is the limit. This agency can formulate its own policies, without regard to statute; it is an agency backed by no legislative authority. I submit that because of that provision, this order is clearly unconstitutional and, further, that the Congress of the United States, if it makes this appropriation and places its stamp of approval upon that order, would authorize the violation of the Constitution. We have no constitutional authority to do such a thing, because that is a delegation of legislative power. No safeguards, no standards are placed there.

Mr. President, that provision violates article I of the Constitution of the United States.

But I read further:

The Committee shall also recommend to the President of the War Manpower Commission appropriate measures for bringing about the full utilization and training of manpower and wage production without discrimination because of race, creed, color, or national origin.

Well, that is bad, but it seems it does not go far enough. I read further:

5. The Committee shall receive and investigate complaints of discrimination forbidden by this order. It may conduct hearings, make findings of fact, and take appropriate steps to obtain elimination of such discrimination.

Mr. President, what could be more sweeping? What could go further than that provision? The order states that the Committee shall receive complaints—not complaints by the aggrieved party, it should be noted. I submit it is fundamental under the Anglo-Saxon system of jurisdiction that the courts only hear complaints filed by or on behalf of the aggrieved party.

I repeat a portion of what I have just read:

It may conduct hearings, make findings of fact, and take appropriate steps to obtain elimination of such discrimination.

What does that do? It gives authority, without checks, without balances, without any bridle, to take any steps this organization may deem necessary to obtain elimination of such discrimination.

Mr. President, that is a wide, sweeping grant of authority by Executive order, and I submit that the Congress of the United States has no authority under the American Constitution to set up this agency or to approve it by an appropriation—which we would do if we make an appropriation—for the reason that it is a delegation of legislative authority, something which we do not have the constitutional authority to do. No standards are provided; no checks are imposed; no formula is fixed. We cannot delegate unwieldy discretion and unbridled authority, free from checks or balances, to any Government agency.

Mr. President, the Congress of the United States, as the American people well know, is the last safeguard of free government in America. When we follow this procedure without any bridle, without any standards, and attempt to delegate legislative authority, we destroy the United States.

But I read further:

6. Upon the appointment of the Committee and the designation of its Chairman, the Fair Employment Practice Committee established by Executive Order No. 8802 of June 15, 1941, hereinafter referred to as the old Committee, shall cease to exist.

Mr. President, if the old Committee had ceased to exist and a new one had not been appointed, in my judgment there would have been won a great victory for American democracy.

I read further:

All records and property of the old Committee and such unexpended balances of allocations or other funds available for its use shall be transferred to the Committee. The Committee shall assume jurisdiction over all complaints and matters pending before the old Committee and shall conduct such investigations and hearings as may be necessary in the performance of its duties under this order.

The same objections which apply to other sections of the order apply to what I have just read. I continue:

7. Within the limits of the fund which may be made available for that purpose, the Chairman shall appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel and make provision for such supplies, facilities, and services as may be necessary to carry out this order.

What is the effect of that language? It gives to the Chairman unlimited authority to hire as many persons as he may desire. There is provided no legislative standard. He may hire an employee or place a man in any position he desires to do. Mr. Eastland, is there any definition in the order of what constitutes an unfair employment practice?

Mr. EASTLAND. No.

Mr. BANKHEAD. There is provided no standard?

Mr. EASTLAND. No.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That situation has been condemned, has it not, by numerous decisions of the courts?

Mr. EASTLAND. It has been condemned. I have sent for a copy of a speech which I delivered last year against the FEPC. In that speech I cited several decisions on the constitutionality of the FEPC. Mr. President, the FEPC could make its own rules of conduct, it could establish its own rules of behavior, and no appeal would lie to the courts from its findings of fact.

I submit that the right of appeal is inherent in the American system. Yet that right is denied legitimate business and legitimate labor organizations throughout the United States merely for the purpose of reaching out and obtaining a few Negro votes.

Both sides of a controversy are not under this order, guaranteed by law equal opportunity for the presentation of their cases. In fact, there are no rules of law, and no rules of justice which would aid these organizations in reaching its decisions. In other words, anything which the examiner or the FEPC desires to do, or any decision which either may wish to make, is final and binding. If the decision is not complied with an appeal may then be made to the President. If that is not legal hijacking I do not know the meaning of the word.

As I have already said, the findings of fact of the Commission are final even
though they are not supported by proper evidence, and no court has the right to examine into the question of whether or not a case was made out.

Mr. EASTLAND. Is any appeal allowed from the decisions of the FEPC?

Mr. BANKHEAD. There may be no appeal whatever. The FEPC’s decision is absolutely binding and final. No court may pass upon the credibility of fact, even though evidence to support the findings may have been flimsy, and the proof on the other side, if it have been made, may determine whether or not the findings of fact are final and no appeal may be taken therefrom.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the head of this organization testified, as the Senator well knows, that they had authority and that it could be exercised.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I do not recall such testimony.

Mr. EASTLAND. I do not recall instances, but, as I remember, there was proof of efforts to cancel war contracts held by industries.

Mr. CHAVEZ. By this agency?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes; for a question.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes; for a question.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I will ask the Senator if, when he was talking about authority and power, he was not thinking of proposed pending legislation or a basic law, and not of the particular agency we are discussing.

Mr. EASTLAND. No; I am thinking about this organization set up under the Executive order I have just read.

Mr. CHAVEZ. It is immaterial what the Chairman of the Board testified to; my understanding is that they have no authority whatsoever under the Executive order.

Mr. EASTLAND. It is not immaterial if a claim is asserted to authority and it is used to hi-jack industries into complying with the orders of this organization. As a matter of fact, as I remember, there were cases where war contracts had been canceled had not the orders of this organization been complied with.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I do not agree with the Senator.

Mr. EASTLAND. That statement was made during the debate a year ago time and time again.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I happen to know that this agency under the Executive order has no authority to enforce any of its rulings.

Mr. EASTLAND. The agency has not, but it can go to the War Department, the Navy Department, and the Maritime Commission, and those Departments have authority to impose economic sanctions. If that is not punishment without right of appeal, without right of trial, I cannot conceive what punishment is.

Mr. CHAVEZ. But let us go further. By setting up this agency we grant an unfair preference to the Negro soldier, who could take over a plant and operate a plant and take it away from the man-
according to his statement, that was why it failed.

Everyone knows, Mr. President, that the races will of themselves live separately. They live together in separate sections of cities. Birds of a feather flock together. Members of the black race desire to live with those of the black race. Members of the white race desire to live with those of the white race. Discrimination and segregation could not be the reason for the failure of the Negro soldier in combat.

Let us consider the Japanese-Americans. Ah, they were moved from their homes by the necessities of this war. I have read accounts in the press of instances when they were insulted in various sections of the country. They tried to work in Illinois, they tried to work in New Jersey, but, oh, no, the people did not want them there. But take the record of their sons on the battlefields of Italy. I say frankly, Mr. President, the Japanese-American division, trained in my own state and armed itself in combat, and, further, saved a Negro regiment from annihilation. So there could not be anything to the argument that segregation was responsible for the Negro's failure in combat, and for their tendency to run when the show-down came.

In Europe, Negro soldiers are used principally as service troops behind the lines, and I state now, on the authority of many American officers, that they were lazy; that they would not work; that it was a mistake to send them to Europe at all. More than that, they should be returned from Europe as sent to the Pacific, where there are races of color. I make that assertion by virtue of statements made by a number of high-ranking American generals. Moreover, of a committee of nine Senators who went abroad, I think practically all will back up my statement.

Mr. President, I dislike going into these things, but by the pending measure we are actually asked to discriminate against the white war veteran, and give the Negro preference over him. Let us consider what happened in Normandy. Nothing has been said in this country about this, it has all been "hush, hush," and a great deal of propaganda has been put out about the great war record and the great fighting of the Negro troops.

It was necessary during the Normandy invasion to disarm a good many Negro soldiers, I was reliably informed by a high-ranking general in Paris. Negro soldiers would go to farm houses and holler "Boche! Boche!" as if they were looking for Germans, call the men "of the f---ing Boche," and hold guns on them while they went in and criminally assaulted the women members of the family. In the small Normandy peninsula, from invasion date to May 15, 1945, there were 150 cases of criminal assault, 26 by Negroes, 7 by whites.

Mr. President, how does that compare with what happened during 4 years under the American constitution? After 4 years while the German Army was there there were two cases of criminal assault, and, in each case the man guilty was apprehended and shot the very day the assault happened, while in the cases of American culprits files would have to come back to Washington, the opposition of the FEPC and the advancement of Colored People would have to be faced, a fight against the infliction of the penalty would be made by the Communist Party, this group and that group, so that it would take 7 or 8 months before any sentence was carried out, and by that time the entire effect of the punishment would be lost.

Mr. President, I state further that the conduct of the Negro soldier in Normandy, as well as all over Europe, was disgraceful, and that Negro soldiers have disgraced the flag of their country. They constitute roughly one-twelfth of the American Army, yet they are guilty of more than half the crime in the Army. Now it is proposed to give the Negro soldier a preference from New York, that is, it is proposed to discriminate against the returning white soldier in favor of the Negro soldier in order to get the Negro vote at the next election. That is all it means, I say, and for political considerations this proposal would not receive 10 votes in the Senate of the United States.

Yes, Mr. President, we have a color line in America. It is in the North as well as in the South. Down in Dixie we are a little more open about it than people are in other sections of the country, but high racial pride, one of the first attributes is, in the breast of the white man everywhere, no matter whether he comes from the North or from the South. In Europe the Negro has crossed the color line, he has gone with white girls of the very lowest caliber, and I know how the northern white boy feels about that.

Thank God, the white soldier from Pennsylvania, the white soldier from the South, the white soldier from the North, the white soldier from every section of the country. They trated by the necessities of this war. I know from conversations with Army officers, that they feel exactly as I do, that I am afraid of the punishment would be lost.

Mr. President, I state further that the conduct of the Negro soldier in Europe, the soldier to whom it is proposed to give preference, has caused the United States to lose prestige; he has caused hatred for our country and for our people. I was told in any number of cities that decent white girls could not go out on the street because they would be accosted by groups of drunken Negro soldiers. I know this to be true. I have talked with Army officers, with generals in the American Army, and with civilians, that in England, in France, in Belgium, that feeling exists in a very intense way. He has disgraced the flag of his country. He will not fight. He will not work. Yet we give him a preference. We discriminate against the white soldier in order to get some Negro soldier to return home.

Mr. President, I stated that I knew how the white soldier felt. I stated that the soldier from the North felt exactly like the soldier from the South felt. The CIO has been permitted to go to Europe and attempt to propagandize the soldiers, but it was like pouring water on a duck's back. The soldiers are mad. We talk of racial toilers. This agitation for social equality has destroyed racial tolerance; and I state frankly that the white soldier is openly and avowedly waiting for his chance when he returns to the United States.

There was a keen interest among the soldiers in public affairs in this country. There was a deep hatred among them of Sidney Hillman, of the leadership of the CIO, and of John L. Lewis. Some of them thought Lewis was at the head of the CIO. They did not know the difference, but they thought that by the agitation, by the raising of the racial question, and by pamelanering labor racketeers, the soldiers had been led down. There is a deep and great fire burning to correct that situation when they get back home.

It is no wonder, Mr. President, that these organizations desire to rush FEPC through. It is no wonder they want to pass the legislation now. There will be no law when the war is over, and I make that statement as one who has visited many of our arms and talked to literally hundreds of American soldiers.

I spoke to a young man from Altoona, Pa., who broke down and cried when he told me that he realized there would be serious trouble in the United States in the postwar era, that the racial question would be the great domestic issue to be settled, and he said he was fearful of the results. He said he did not like the attitude of the Negro soldiers. That they had been taught they could cross the color line, and he said that under no conditions would they be permitted to do so.

There will be no FEPC, there will be no racial equality, there will be no such un-American measures. Mr. President, when the soldier returns, Thank God, there still burns in his breast the fire of real Americanism. Thank God, he is old enough to stop this agitation, to this attempt to destroy his country, when he gets back home.

Mr. President, I say it is nothing but simple justice that a measure such as this, which would fundamentally change our Government, should go over until the man who has fought for and saved America can return to take part and cast his vote on such an issue.

Mr. President, who is the leading light in this matter? I stated that Sidney Hillman was a Communist. I stated that Hillman, one of the principal men behind this measure, was one of the leading Communists in this country, that Sidney Hillman should be deported. What is his record?

Hillman was born on March 23, 1887, in Zagare, Lithuania, where his father was a merchant. He is a Jesuit schoolman, a seminary student there and came to the United States when he was 20 years old. Listen to this: In his early years in New York Hillman was associated with Morris Hillquit and Leon Trotsky. This great political leader, who is attempting to communize and sovietize America, and who it seems controls one wing of the Democratic Party and
of the Republican Party, associated with Trotsky before the Russian Revolution, when Trotsky lived in this country. And it is significant that at that time Mr. Hillman was a member of the Socialist Party.

In 1910 Hillman marshaled his followers in a successful strike against Hart Schaffner, Marx, and under the agreement which followed the winning of the strike he represented his organization as business agent from 1911 to 1914. His political activity was indicated by an editorial statement on March 9, 1917, in the Advance. Listen to what Hillman said in 1917, and tell me whether he is a Communist:

We have unfurled the crimson banner of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America for the tens of thousands of workers who rally around it. It is bearing a message of hope and salvation for the workers. Our banner will never be furled before we reach the goal of emancipation of the working class.

Mr. President, that is a typical Communist statement. "We have unfurled the crimson banner," says Mr. Hillman. Communist? Hillman not a Communist? He is one of the leading Communists in America today. His language was the language of Lenin, Marx, Stalin, and other Communists in the world.

In 1922 Hillman went to Russia. Let me read what Pravda had to say on October 29th, 1922: Comrade Hillman the man who is the boss of one wing of my party and from the looks of things is the boss of the Republican Party. This is what Pravda said about him:

Comrade Hillman expressed his confidence that the Russian-American Industrial Corporation—

Which Hillman founded in order to handle money from Russia—

is "the first step toward a real practical help of the international proletariat of Soviet Russia, and that the corporation will play a great political role in the future.

A political role, said Mr. Hillman in Russia, as reported in the official news publication in 1922.

Mr. President, a suit was filed to deport Harry Bridges. The Supreme Court said that there was not sufficient evidence against Bridges to deport him. I submit that there is more evidence against Hillman than there ever was against Bridges, and I cannot understand for the life of me why an attempt has not been made to send him back to Russia and stop the agitation and the attempts to destroy our country.

In 1922 Comrade Hillman also visited Italy and it should be remembered that at that time there was a strong Communist movement in Italy. Northern Italy is industrialized, and in areas there the Communist Party had taken over industries and had raised the Red flag with the hammer and sickle, above factories, and was attempting to set up a Communist government. What did Hillman say in Rome?

I was doubly welcomed. The secretary of the metal workers' union gave me a letter, the only key to open the gates of the factories. With my Italian comrades I landed in front of the factory, which looked attractive—

Why did it look attractive?—

because the Red flag which adorns the building and the Red statement—

The Communist sentinel—

who was keeping watch.

My God! If that is not communism, what is the name for it? Does anyone tell me that a man who would openly and avowedly support the Communist cause should not be deported? Instead, he is giving orders to the Congress of the United States.

Listen further:

I stayed for lunch with the members of the factory council. The council then took me through the factory. The first thing that attracted my attention was a series of inscriptions on the walls, including the Soviet emblem.

Let me read that again.

The first thing that attracted my attention was a series of inscriptions on the walls, including the Soviet emblem.

Sidney Hillman, the Communist, is the leading supporter of this measure. Sidney Hillman is the organization which are putting on the heat, and which have hundreds of representatives here to do his bidding in order to rape the American Constitution and change our way of life.

I repeat that when communism enters a country it makes the classes conscious. It makes races race-conscious, in order to weaken the internal structure of the country and pave the way for communism. Sidney Hillman is doing that in America today. Many God-fearing, patriotic American citizens belong to the CIO; but I state that they are being used by a rotten Communist leadership bent upon the destruction of America and the creation of a Communist state.

I spoke a few moments ago of the conduct of Negro soldiers in Europe. They disgraced the American flag. They constituted only one-twelfth of our forces; yet I believe me, and the Congress, that they committed more than half the crimes. By the proposed measure we are giving them a preference in securing employment and are discriminating against the white worker.

There happened recently another thing which I think the American people should know. It was not American Negroes who were involved. They were not constituents of any Member of this body. However, all races have certain racial characteristics, wherever their members may be found. I relate this incident to show that the Negro race is most assuredly an inferior race.

I was informed by generals and high ranking Government officials—and other members of the committee were so informed—that in the city of Stuttgart, when the French Army moved in, several thousand Christian German girls from good families were rounded up and placed in the subterranean cells, or during 4 or 5 days they were kept there and criminally assaulted by Senegalese soldiers from Africa. It was one of the most horrible occurrences of modern times. White soldiers would not have been guilty of such a thing. The white soldier has attempted to maintain American standards. The American Army is neither a party nor a racial amalgamation. I read further:

The powers—

In other words, the League of Nations—

were staggered at this indictment of Liberia. One of their own League members, too. Even an "ally" who had "declared war"
upon Germany and suffered a salvo or two in consequence of the five-inch gun of a submarine—until its amazed commander realized it was a tropical craft and withdrew for very shame. Yet a Christian country was his target; one settled in the long ago by dusky Puritan exiles who set up a primitive banner that bore this device: "Love of liberty has brought us here."

So the League scouted as slander all the evil which this dream from bastions of the bush frontiers. In Geneva's Council Chamber, State Secretary Grimes and Mr. Sottile gave it their earnest belief that Liberia (her delegates vowed) had nothing to hide but her own lack of loans. There was a growing suspicion on the part of Americans to help the "Amero-Cris"s.

Moreover, if white snoopers were to be sent there to inquire, they must respect the President's office, and also "the political, intellec-
tual, and political independence of Liberia." All such investigators should be under the chief executive. It was a wise advice which were named by the League, he must take his advice from the "palace," from Monrovia's learned Council of justices of this Penetian purity. Furthermore, any experts in accounts and finance which the powers might select would find Liberian examinations on landing to make sure they were up to west African standards in their several jobs.

Mr. President, I shall show in a minute what west African standards were. Those west African standards are about the same as African—standards in the United States today.

I read further:

Foreign Minister Grimes made quite a hit as he laid down the republic's law to these foreigners in their own language.

But who was to pay the expenses of the investigation?

Mr. President, there the League of Na-
tions was. It had proved that the King of Liberia was a robber, a murderer, and was engaged in the slave trade, and the League was sending investigators there to investigate. But who was to pay the expenses of the investigation? I read further:

"Mr. Eastland. I yield."

"Mr. Tunnell. I am asking the Senator is condemning the selling of Negroes at $300 each for white men, women and children."

"Mr. Eastland. I yield."

"Mr. Tunnell. As I understand, the Senator is absolutely wrong. I am reading a League of Nations report concerning conditions which the Republic of Liberia and their White House there during their stay."

"Mr. Tunnell. I am asking the Senator about conditions in the United States as found therein during an early period of its history. Slavery during that period was not unheard of in this country, was it?"

"Mr. Eastland. It was unheard of in this country in the 1920's. Eighty years ago my State and the State from which the Senator comes, were slave States, if that is what the Senator means; but the Senator certainly would..."
not say anything that would uphold slavery at the present time?

Mr. TUNNELL. Oh, no. But what the Senator is condemning is the sale of slaves in Africa because it was done by Negroes.

Mr. EASTLAND. I am simply showing, as I told the Senator, the conditions in Liberia today.

Mr. TUNNELL. But that is not any worse than what the whites did with the slaves in the United States when slavery was permitted.

Mr. EASTLAND. The white people of the United States have never embarked, on a program of robbery, murder, rape, and looting, as Liberia did, as she is now doing; and I shall show in a moment many worse things than that.

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

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes; I yield.

Mr. TUNNELL. We hear of murder and raping and lynching and a great many other crimes in this country.

Mr. EASTLAND. Is that an official Government policy in the United States?

Mr. TUNNELL. It is something that happens.

Mr. EASTLAND. Will the Senator answer my question? Is that an official Government policy?

Mr. TUNNELL. I think that I can say that it is in some places.

Mr. EASTLAND. It is?

Mr. TUNNELL. Yes.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator has been told that. I know he is sincere, and he knows I have a great confidence in him, but I do not believe that is the policy anywhere in the United States. I know it is not the policy in Mississippi, and I know it is not the policy of the South, if that is what the Senator is talking about.

Mr. TUNNELL. I am talking about the fact that there are crimes that are winked at by Government in every section of the United States.

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes; but there is no State that will send an army out for the purpose of murder and robbery and loot.

Mr. TUNNELL. I am not so sure about that.

Mr. EASTLAND. I am sure of it; I am very confident that it is not the American system—God help America if it is—and, Mr. President, it is not my idea and my opinion of my country.

I read further from the League's report:

So these hapless savages were periodically rounded up, just as the native princes of India coral their jungle elephants for labor in the teak forests of Burma. President King had an ever-ready market for his army's catch. He took bids for his slaves, body and soul, from the coco planters of the Portuguese Isles of São Thomé and Príncipe. At a stroke, an arrogant Negro was selling 500 captives a month at the figure I named above.

What they had done was in accordance with the official Government policy, under the guise of collecting taxes, to go out and burn villages, murder people, capture men, sell them into slavery at $300 apiece and then embezze the money.

There is a typical example from our own knowledge of what is done in this country without the influence of the white man.

Well might the League ask what was to be done about Liberia? Britain's House of Lords gave a full-dress debate to the future of a "black baby" that nobody cared to nurse. I was told that Sir Scart's Chamber and caught exclamations of horror from the Archbishop of Canterbury. To His Grace, the Lone-Star Republic was "one of the most lamentable tragedies of history.

Think of it! The Archbishop of Canterbury said that Liberia was a blot on civilization, in addition to being one of the most lamentable tragedies in history.

Both Viscount Cecil and Earl Buxton—

Two great British statesmen, by the way, Mr. President—were for pitching Liberia out of the League forthwith. And as Sir John Simon's spokesman in the Lords, Earl Stanhope wound up the session for "drastic action.

Misery and misrule had long been Liberia's lot—

Misery and misrule—and in the past 2 years—

Two years before this report—

"things had gone from bad to worse." The republic was riddled with a plague: "Not only was she thus a danger to herself and the rest of West Africa, but also to the whole world."

Because of the plague there, and disease, the League said Liberia was a danger to all West Africa and all the world—this shining example of the capacity of the Negro race.

Yet this monstrosity, Lord Stanhope gloated to say, was "a foundation member of the League," together with Great Britain, France, and Italy. Truly, the irony of Voltaire is justified on the crazy governance of human affairs.

How does the Monrovian government take this torrent of scathing? With injured pride, blocking every measure of reform, and only asking for more and yet more "loans."

In other words, the League found these conditions and would demand that they be remedied, and the only action was typical of the Negro race, who want to borrow more money, and I will venture to say there never was paid a dollar of that money back.

Listen:

Dr. Cuthbert Christy's report spoke of "tragic" finances. Britain's Lord Privy Seal could assure the League Council that this shabby wreck of a state "had no budget, no accounts, no money."

Think of it! A government with no budget, no accounts, and no money. Yet, we will discriminate against white boys, who raised Old Glory on Iwo Jima, who have just won the most magnificent victory in the world's history, who have conquered the beast of nazism, we will discriminate against those returning heroes, in order to give jobs to such people as these jobs so as to obtain a few votes at the next election.

Listen to this:

Not only did Liberia take no steps to control murder and rape and misrule, she couldn't be bothered even to notice them.

No public-health system at all; no money, no budget, no tax-gathering system.

And so continued to wallow in vileness, more than pleased with her own estate.

Listen:

Did not this "abyssmal" Republic break off relations with the United States over a default on a loan? And to the French Chargé d'Affaires President Barney—

Who is President of Liberia—

complained of insult to his high office and person on the part of a very rude American Minister.

He claimed an insult by the French because the French wanted them to repay a loan.

Mr. President, let us see about the capital of that great country.

What is the metropolis of Monrovia like?

It is a nightmare; a foul, yet funny, purgatory of sickening smells and obscenity. Yet what a book that draughty massacre; a true best seller, if done by a master hand. Why has no great newspaper put a correspondent there?

That is another thing; there is not a newspaper in the world which has a correspondent in this great and shining example of Negro culture, where they show their capacity to govern themselves. There is a black Communist in New York named Robeson, an actor or a singer, who holds forth at great length about colored culture. Here are typical examples of that, which would show, if their drive in this country for social equality is not stopped, that our country will be destroyed and we will sink down into the depths, as Egypt did.

I digress a little. At one time Egypt was a wonder in world civilization, when its citizenship was Caucasian. Sitting on the bank of the placid Nile, next to the Mississippi delta the most fertile soil in all the world, they imported slaves, and later took them into their governmental affairs, and they had to cater to them, as the politicians cater to the Negro vote today. Then there was amalgamation. For 2,000 years the Nile has flowed as it always did, the same resources have been there, but in that time there has not been one single contribution to world culture, there has not been one single contribu- tion to civilization, there has been one single progressive accomplishment, and I say, Mr. President, the American soldier in Europe, thank God, knows of the dangers, and he will save America industriously, as he saved her upon the battlefields of the world.

Let us find out more about the capital, Monrovia. I have said that no newspaper in the world has said anything at all about its conditions. The League of Nations said that if they had, they would tell "droller and madder tales than were ever flashed" over the world.

An army mutiny, for instance, raging outside the tombouctoo treasury to get
a few dollars in exchange for soiled and
after his first trip. At that time the old door was
opening, and the minister steps out in a
cudgel suit and high hat.
Now let us see the Liberian system. Soldiers have mutinied in front of the
door of the treasury of the republic, and
the treasury minister comes out, and
what does he say?
"Soldiers of the republic," he bawls at the
swaying mob, "What courage, once
pattern—get in it!"
Those hungry troops shambling off to "predic-
tion" it.
Listen to this:
Four machine-gun barrels are now poked out of the broken windows.
The treasury of the country has not even panes of glass in the windows.
Weeks dragged on into months. Another siege threatened. The palace itself is in peril. (A
shove would overturn that ugly barn.)
That is what the treasury of Liberia is—just a barn, in a country which is a
great repository of Negro culture.
This time two gib Americas hustle around among the desperate men.
"We buy yo' vouchers! Five percent of face
value!"
Because of graft, and because money
they get from the slave trade and from
robbery, which is their source of income,
is embezzled, the Liberians do not even pay
their army. They do not pay the army and public officials, and then when
there is a mutiny, when they cannot stop it, when the people cannot be paci-
ied in any other way, they offer 5
percent of face value for their I O U's.
But the League of Nations says:
The offer is meaningless to these Negro
dupes. But when it is made clear that real
redemption is, for instance, half a cent on the dollar,
and let the treasury redeem the paper
at par, in the true Liberian
capacity, handle their law courts.
Those same vouchers a grafting Chancellor-
would show would overturn that ugly barn.
I want the lawyers who are present to
stand up and tell my distinguished friend,
the Judge Eastland, that is typical
African judgment.

The League report said:

Court hearings were a screaming farce.
The black judge, above all, with his pompous
English and still wrangie with his "prison-
aire." The latter was given 20 years in jail
for his heavy uppertact, plus a fine of $20,000.
Mr. President, the white man knocked
the Negro out, and he was
convicted of murder and given 20
years in jail and fined $30,000. What hap-
pened? How do they enforce their
judgments there?
The condemned man strolled home laugh-
ing with his counsel, and the case at least was
dead and buried.
It does not say so in the report, but
one can read between the lines and see
that a little something passed—the pay-
off on the side.
Then an Englishman was haled up for ex-
sceeding the speed limit in his car on Li-
beria's one and only public road.
Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President—
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the
Senator from Delaware refer to the
Senator from Delaware?
Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.
Mr. TUNNELL. In view of the terrible
conditions which he has pictured in Li-
beria, I should like to ask the Senator
from the Senate, I should like to ask the Senator
from Mississippi if he thinks it would
be a good place for the Negroes to be sent,
as is suggested by his colleague?
Mr. EASTLAND. That is an argu-
ment in which I am not involved. I am
quoted from the League of Nations
report respecting conditions in Liberia.
Mr. TUNNELL. But the Senator's
colleague has said that the Negroes be
sent to Liberia, as I understand.
Mr. EASTLAND. That is his busi-
ness.
Mr. TUNNELL. It would be the busi-
ness of the United States Government if
the Negroes should accept that proposal,
would it not?
Mr. EASTLAND. That bill is not be-
fore the Senate.
Mr. President, I continue to read:
When he (the Englishman) proved he was
doing only 10 miles an hour, the magis-
trate nearly choked.
Listen to this, Senators. This is in a
country with a population of more than
four million. In the richest section of
Africa, which per square mile has more
natural resources than any other portion
of Africa, selected because it had greater
resources than any other part of
Africa for settlement by Negroes, and yet
it has but one public road. This is what
the judge said:
Haf' silence, sah: I mistah hee-yeer! Nevah
yuh unshahb' Republic's law? Haf' yo'
cults?
Of course he did not, by Liberian
standards.
Hed yo' no fat'er, no mo'ter to git' yo'
cults? Max'mum speed hee-yeer is 15 miles,
sah!
That is the speed limit on the Repub-
lic's only road, which I understand runs
for 8 or 10 miles and is impassable most
of the year.
An' yo' espec me let yo' off by confessin'
10?
The judge said, "You confess you were
going 10 and the speed limit is 15.
And because of that confession I am not
going to acquit you." That is typical
African judgment.
No. sah. Twenty dollars fine. Soldiers of
the Republic!
This is what the League reports.
Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the
Senator yield?
Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.
Mr. LUCAS. Is the Senator making an
argument that there ought to be
greater speed in Liberia or on the floor
of the United States Senate?
Mr. EASTLAND. I am presenting the
conditions in Liberia to show the inca-
cacity of the Negro race.
Mr. LUCAS. I understand that, but, the
Senator was talking directly about the
speed allowed there.
Mr. EASTLAND. So far as speed on
the floor of the Senate is concerned, I
will tell my distinguished friend, the
Senator from Illinois, that I think we
are making fine progress toward the
passage of this bill.
Mr. LUCAS. I regret I cannot agree
with my distinguished friend, but it oc-
curred to me that he is making about
the same speed with this bill that people
make in Liberia on the road he speaks of.
Mr. EASTLAND. I hope so. We have
plenty of time. We can continue till
Christmas. We can continue for 15 more
months or 18 more months. There is no
filibuster.
Mr. LUCAS. Of course, I know there
is no filibuster.
Mr. EASTLAND. No.
Mr. LUCAS. But compared with the
speed which is being displayed in the
Senate at this time in connection with
the pending legislation, driving on the
road in Liberia at 15 miles per hour
would seem quite fast.
Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator thinks
I might be convicted by that Liberian
for speeding?
Mr. LUCAS. The Senator might be
so far as I am concerned.
Mr. EASTLAND. Then the judge
called the soldiers, what was said?
At the stem call, four scarcerowes moved
upon the victim—who promptly moved out,
leaving 60 cents as a dovecot for his prospec-
tive juries.
A 50-cent tip. That is the court pro-
cedure in that country, a country in
which there are no roads, no health sys-
tem, no budget, no system of tax collec-
tion, but the system of justice we find
is that set forth in this report, and then
there is all this talk about equality. Lis-
ten to this, Senator:

Seen from the sea, this awful town showed
nothing but a flimsy customs shed, flying the
Imperial flag which not one in a million
could identify.

That is correct, Mr. President. There
is not one person in a million who would
know the flag of this country, which for
its area has as great natural resources as
every other country in the world.
Your ship lies afar off, safe from all con-
tact with a poisonous coast. The new-
comer is ashore at Monrovia's "Broadway." 
Broad it is, a wide swath cut in a jungly
place, with a narrow strip in the center,
trampled flat by slouching, half-naked
Americas.
Mr. President, a modern liner will not even call it a port. A modern passenger ship cannot even dock within the harbor because of the contagious diseases there. And the main street of town is just a path cut down through the jungle where a bunch of half-naked people walk about naked and ragged. And negroes, remember, they were selected as the very cream of the African race in America and sent there under a white government and under whose government they were capable of development and of improving their conditions. And here we find a report of those conditions officially made by the League of Nations, which I submit conclusively shows what the capacity of this people is.

The sides form thickets of rank weeds and noisome gutters bridged here and there with broken gin cases. Even big rocks crop out on Monrovia's main street as when the world began.

No improvements, no pavement on the main street of the capital of the country—not even gravel—and a road on which one time, a speed of 15 miles an hour can be attained—perhaps.

What kind of houses do the people have in that country, which is so rich in natural resources which can be blighted with natural resources to a greater extent than almost any other area of the earth? Listen to this:

Abject huts of rubble or unhewn stone, crumbling to bits and with yawning thatch, form teeming lanes full of black humanity and fearful smells.


We hear a great deal of talk about racial pride, and condemnation of the idea of racism in America. It is said to be bad. It is said that when one is a racist he is a fascist. Mr. President, a man bereft of racial pride is weak. There is something wrong with him. I say frankly that I am proud of the white race. I am proud that the white blood flows in my veins. I know that the white race is a political genius and capacity of the white race. Mr. President, the writer of the article, who is a外籍writer, would not stay; what shall he eat, how escape these frightful odors, from which our house dogs would flee?

The odors are so bad on the main streets of the town, Mr. President, that the house dogs of America or of any other country, say the writer of the article, would flee; they would not stay in such a place, I read further:

The consider corps are very kind to callers, and so are the missionaries. And always there is the nearby jungle.

So, to get away, they have to go out into the jungle, the writer says.

And always there is the nearby jungle, where at least one can breathe without retching. One may even encounter wild beasts that are clean, and stark savages who are not “Amerikans”, but men and women of self-respect and soul.

Truly this Liberia is a haunting memory; it is also proof positive—if any were needed—that the Negro nation is a contradiction in terms. Look at Haiti’s incredible record since Napoleon’s legions sickened and died there long ago. I was in Port-au-Prince in 1915 when raging citizens dragged their President limb from limb, and then paraded past the legations, waving bits and scraps of their late Chief Executive, who had fled for refuge to the Minister of France.

So, Mr. President, the writer of the article proceeds to tell of conditions in another typical example, the Republic of Haiti. I read further:

Yet, how beautiful a land is Haiti! A tropic Switzerland, where coffee and cotton grow wild. But that Carib paradise is hopeless, that the free Negro nation in terms, which calls itself Liberia?

As a political problem—

Just as the Negroes have become the great political problem of America, the League of Nations says that on the world scene Liberia is a political problem—

As a political problem, this lurking repub-, partisans, the League wants to wash it out of Liberia, once and for all—

In other words, they are like we in the United States are; the League has Li-
Mr. President, the very first step a League of Nations, that the League is quite humanitarian grounds or business approaches the United States. The British usually do those things.

Now, listen to what the British said:

"It is the view of His Majesty's Government," Mr. Eden told the full Council in Geneva, "and I state it with the utmost sincerity, that Liberia has so completely failed in her obligations as a member of the League of Nations, that the League is quite entitled to consider her expulsion under paragraph 4, of article XVI."

Very well. But the Black Orphan—like the devil—is still there. Who is going to care for it? The British Minister goes on to tell us, "On humanitarian grounds" it was proposed "to approach the United States Government."

Mr. President, there is always some ground for turning to us when England gets her hands full. When she has something she wants to get rid of, on humanitarian grounds or business grounds, she approaches the United States, and we are generally gullible enough to do whatever the British want.

The writer said further:

"Since that power—

Talking about us—seems to be most closely associated, both historically and economically, with Liberia.

Of course, Mr. President, no country can be economically associated with Liberia, because Liberia has absolutely no economy. Its principal industry is the collection of taxes by murder, robbery, loot, and the sale of human beings into slavery.

I read further:

There you have it. A back door is to be opened in the White House for a black wench that nobody wants. The French Foreign Minister agreed to this.

Oh, yes; Mr. President, the French Foreign Minister agreed with the British that we could take over Liberia and put up several million dollars a year to run it.

I read further:

So did Baron Aloisi on Italy's behalf. The League Rapporteur said ditto, and the entire Council concurred. So Europe was through with this cingling curse. To America these "Ameriques" properly belonged. Over there was their open door. State Secretary Grimes and Mr. Street put up a strong protest at this slur upon their sovereignty,

Nobody heard them. Neither has anybody heard from President Roosevelt about a new code of conduct for the founding which the League would push into his all-embracing arms!

Mr. President, what more proof could be required of the incapacity for self-government, for advancement, for social relationships, than the experiences of the Republic of Liberia?

I have no prejudice against the Negro. I believe in economic equality for him. I believe in equal pay for equal work. I believe in the Negro being given a fair chance, just, and considerate treatment. I have defended Negroes in court on numerous occasions. Several of them are personally employed by me in my business. I know their shortcomings. I know what they can do. I am speaking in behalf of racial harmony in America. There is an attempt being made by the Communist Party, which knows the desire of the Negro for social equality, to inflame them, and by step, tear down the safeguards and segregation practices which have been established to show that my country is in danger. I have discussed Liberia not for the purpose of criticizing the Negro race, but for the purpose of warning the American people of the limited capacities of the Negro race and what will happen to us if the safeguards to which I have referred are destroyed, and if the races in this country are constantly brought into conflict with each other. History will repeat itself in America as it has in every country of the world which has permitted the crossing of the color line.

Mr. President, the very first step down the road to amalgamation and social equality is the granting of political equality. The Negroes vote as a unit. They place their votes upon the auction block and sell them to the politicians who promise them social rights and social privileges. We talk about economic privileges and economic rights.

Those are secondary with the agitators and with the colored leaders. They seek social equality in America. A few minutes ago the Senator from New Mexico, my good friend [Mr. Chavez] I asked him if I could cite a single case on the question of constitutionality in connection with this subject, and of our inability, because of the Constitution, to make the requested appropriation. We do not have the constitutional authority to appropriate money to the agency established under the Executive order to which reference has been made, and as a result of this, no legislative safeguards were provided, and no standards set up. The authority granted was a pure delegation of legislative authority, and therefore it was unconstitutional.

The case of the Wichita Railroad and Light Company v. the Public Utilities Commission (260 U.S., p. 69) is a case in point. The Supreme Court of the United States said:

In creating such administrative agency, the legislature, to prevent its being a pure delegation of administrative power, must enter upon a certain course of procedure and certain rules of decision in the performance of its functions. It is a wholesome and necessary principle—

Listen to this, Mr. President—

that such agency must pursue the procedure and rules enjoined, and show a substantial compliance therewith, to give validity to its action.

The Court further said:

That to prevent there being a pure delegation of legislative authority which violates article I of the American Constitution, we must enjoin upon it a certain course of procedure and certain rules of decision in the performance of its functions.

A certain course of procedure and rules of decision. The Supreme Court of the United States has said that it is necessary. Otherwise we would be delegating legislative authority. However, by making the appropriation which we have been requested to make, we would be laying to rest all talk of Executive order which clothes a commission with blanket authority to write any rules, follow any course of procedure, prescribe any punishment, or do anything which it desires to do just as it sees fit. It results in taking white men out of jobs and giving them to members of minority groups so that votes may be obtained next November. That is the bug under the chip. It is the vote; it is politics.

This is a long step toward the destruction of the American system, and by giving Government the control of management we take a long step down the road to communism.

The success of any business, Mr. President, depends upon the ability of the management to select competent, loyal employees. On that principle we have built the greatest industries in the world; we have created the greatest industrial machine in the history of the world. And now, in order to get Negro votes, we are destroying it and turning over to a board here in Washington controlled by Sidney Hillman, and crackpots like this fellow Ross, the power to say who is qualified for a certain job, by conferring that authority; we are taking it away from management. We are depriving the labor unions of the right to say who can belong to them and lodging it in the board.

Mr. President, let us see who these employees are, let us see what kind of people they are. In the first place, the very least thing we could do would be to see that the white man is given the right to go up to Ross, the American, should get justice. Justice is all he wants; but under this set-up, could he get justice?

I have to hold my nose when I read some of these names.

Washington office, Malcolm Ross, chairman, $8,000 a year.

No one knows anything about Ross except that he associates with Communist groups, and we can judge him by his associates. He went to New York a few nights ago and made a speech to a radio audience in order to bring pressure on Congress, to control us from New York.

Deputy chairman, George M. Johnson, colored, salary, $8,000 a year.
Mr. President, I am reading the personnel of the Committee on Fair Employment Practice:

Maceo Hubbard, $5,800 a year.
Emanuel Bloch.

I shall have something to say about this Bloch later. We are placing Communists in every business and every labor organization in the United States. Bloch gets $5,800 a year. He is a hearings examiner.

Evelyn Copson, hearings examiner, $5,600.
Mary Wilkerson, assistant to chairman, $3,800.
Dorothy Alexander, secretary to chairman, $2,900.
J. Jeanne Clifton, secretary to deputy, $2,000.
Mary Brooks, clerk-stenographer, $1,800.
Myra Basting, white, $1,800.

Dorothy Alexander, J. Jeanne Clifton, and Mary Brooks are Negroes, and John-son is a Negro.

The Washington office is just a mixed up affair, and I am going to show in a few minutes that is a menace to American industry and American labor.

Field operations.

They go out in the field and stir up complaints, send Communists out, send troublemakers to go out and get complaints, to subpena people before them. I merely ask for unanimous consent that I do not lose the floor by yielding?

Mr. President, I ask to insert an article which is sent over the country. Both Negroes. The white race is not represented. Here we have the Fair Employment Practice Committee, to prevent discrimination, and yet the committee itself discriminates against the white race. Mr. President, an Anglo-Saxon does not have a chance there. And, seriously, that is becoming truer every day in Government departments in Washington. We are discriminated against in most departments. Frequently young ladies, Government employees, come to my complaints of discrimination and say they are mistreated, that they do not obtain a square deal because some minority group wants special privilege. The way things are handled by the Civil Service Commission works in their favor, and the CIO has a union—I do not know what it is called, a union of Federal employees, which always steps in against a white person in disputes which arise in the department. I make that statement seriously and I will say that down deep in the hearts of two-thirds of us we know that to be true from our own experience and information we have received from employees in the department.

There are scouting operations in the backwash of the American advance on Japan.

These were scouting operations in the backwash of the American advance on Japan. Only one shot was fired during these landings. However, the Japanese used their pilots to eliminate a Japanese who refused to surrender. After clearing about 24 Japanese civilians and residents from the six islands—Anatahan, Saipan, Alamagan, Agrihan, Ascension, and Maug—the two platoons of Negro Infantry and White Marine Rangers returned.

The small islands were scouted for possible emergency landings by Marianas-based B-24s now operating from Guam, Tinian, and Saipan. The Japanese still have forces on Rota and Pagan Islands, also in the Marianas.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, let us now consider the legal division.

Frank D. Reeves, attorney, colored, $4,600.
Simon Stickgold, attorney, white, $4,600.
Jernuevo Gordon, clerk-stenographer, colored, $1,800.

Senators will note that in the Legal Division there are two Negroes and one white man to pass upon the validity of complaints.

Let us now consider the Information Division. Here is where one may obtain information concerning this outfit.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, which helps to propagate Congress. It is handling the propaganda which is sent out across the country. Both Negroes. Mr. President, an Anglo-Saxon does not have a chance there. And, seriously, that is becoming truer every day in Government departments in Washington. We are discriminated against in most departments. Frequently young ladies, Government employees, come to my complaints of discrimination and say they are mistreated, that they do not obtain a square deal because some minority group wants special privilege. The way things are handled by the Civil Service Commission works in their favor, and the CIO has a union—I do not know what it is called, a union of Federal employees, which always steps in against a white person in disputes which arise in the department. I make that statement seriously and I will say that down deep in the hearts of two-thirds of us we know that to be true from our own experience and information we have received from employees in the department.

There are scouting operations in the backwash of the American advance on Japan. Only one shot was fired during these landings. However, the Japanese used their pilots to eliminate a Japanese who refused to surrender. After clearing about 24 Japanese civilians and residents from the six islands—Anatahan, Saipan, Alamagan, Agrihan, Ascension, and Maug—the two platoons of Negro Infantry and White Marine Rangers returned.

The small islands were scouted for possible emergency landings by Marianas-based B-24s now operating from Guam, Tinian, and Saipan. The Japanese still have forces on Rota and Pagan Islands, also in the Marianas.
We have seven employees, and not a white person among them. And yet the object of the agency is to prevent racial discrimination. Justice? Fair play? Oh, no, Mr. President, these minority groups are not seeking justice. They are not seeking fair play. They are seeking and securing special privilege. And when we provide this appropriation and set up this agency it will result in discrimination against every white soldier who returns from the war. As I have said several times this afternoon—and a number of Senators are not present who were not present when I said it before—there exists an agency to see that the Negro or other minority individual gets a job, but what have we to help the white boy who is the boy who was on the war, the boy who did the fighting?

Let me digress a moment from reading the list of employees of that agency. The other day I read an article from the city rights for all and special privileges for minority groups. It was founded on the basic principle of equal discrimination to minority groups.
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We are asked to set up and condone a system of private enterprise, which has built up sufficient industry in that one State to provide work for all of its Negroes and three are whites—Mildred Greenblatt, fair-practice examiner, colored, $3,200. William McKnight, regional director, colored, $4,600. Lethia Glore, clerk-stenographer, colored, $1,620. C. S. Brown, fair-practice examiner, colored, $3,200. No one white person. Is the white race discriminated against?
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people with radical organizations, subversive organizations, that are enemies of my country.

Now let us consider the Cincinnati office, the city from which comes my good friend the able senator from Ohio (Mr. Taft). I am sure the office there is not his patronage. I will bet he would have made better appointments than these made.

![Harold James, fair-practice examiner, white, $4,600.](image)

There is a vacancy for a clerk-stenographer at $1,620. I am going to show some matters, in a few minutes, about the background of Harold J. for the at least, I think I am. As I remember, he has quite a background, although I might be mistaken about that.

But let us consider now the Detroit office:

Edward Swan, examiner in charge, colored, $4,600.


So they have a colored man and a Jap there. I certainly know that the business and labor men of Detroit are grateful for the consideration which they receive from those two individuals. So far as I have gotten out of the number of the employees in those regional offices, and in the office in Washington, it will be noted that not one of them would give a white man a chance. Not one of them would give an Anglo-Saxon a chance. The offices are established for the purpose of granting special privileges to minority groups and to discriminate against and mistreat the members of the white race in order that a few Negro votes may be won next November.

Mr. President, let us consider the Chicago office:

Einer Henderson, regional director, colored, $6,500.

Harry H. Gibson, fair-practice examiner, colored, $3,800.

Joy Schultz, fair-practice examiner, white, $3,800.

Lefty Williams, fair-practice examiner, colored, $3,800.

Penny Zeidman, clerk-stenographer, white, $1,620.

Marguerite S. Ingram, clerk-stenographer, colored, $1,620.

Yes; the Chicago office has five Negroes and two whites, and I may say that I know at first hand something about the functions of the Chicago office. Today I talked to a friend of mine from the city of Chicago who has had trouble with the organization there. He was compelled to discharge some white employees in order to afford jobs to members of a minority group which he did not wish to employ, and about whose loyalty he felt rather dubious. Yet, the FEPC is an organization which, according to some, is for the purpose of eliminating discrimination. It is an organization for the purpose of taking employment from white persons and giving it to members of minority races. It is an organization for the purpose of discriminating against the white race, a movement which is under way to win some Negro votes next November.

Let us consider Atlanta, Ga., a city of the South. Mr. President, it was disgraceful to put this agency in a Southern State. I digress long enough to state there is no discrimination in the South against the Negro. I make that statement on the strength of what has been said by a man by the name of Ross, who is the head of the FEPC. He stated that less than 10 percent of the complaints which were made to the FEPC came from the South. He further stated that it is a group of Negro-hating southern Democrats who are fighting the FEPC. Yet, the head of the FEPC stated that that agency had experienced very little trouble in the South, and received few complaints from the South. Most of the complaints come from the North. What we of the South are doing, Mr. President, is to fight in order that we may preserve the American system.

Let us consider the disgraceful conditions existing in the Atlanta office. The first thing which was done there was to provide employment for the colored women in wash rooms. The crowd in control there insisted upon tearing out the partition separating the whites from the blacks and bringing the two races into direct contact with each other. It was claimed that the tearing out of the partition was done on the ground of economic equality and the elimination of discrimination. Mr. President, such a program as the one established in Atlanta, Ga., has followed the Communist line from the very start.

I ask Senators to listen to the names of those who constitute the personnel of the office in Atlanta:

Witherspoon Dodge, regional director, white, $4,600.

John Hope, fair-practice examiner, colored, $3,800.

Sally Chubb, clerk-stenographer, white, $3,800.

George D. McKay, fair-practice examiner, white, $3,200.

Thelma Ingram, clerk-stenographer, colored, $1,620.

Mr. President, what was done in Atlanta, in the heart of good old Georgia, that great American State which is one of the seats of southern culture? I am proud of southern culture, and I believe it is superior to the culture of people anywhere else. Those in authority at Atlanta established a mongrel outfit consisting of two Negroes and three whites, and then tried to fly in the face of social customs of the southern people.

Let me read the names of the personnel at Kansas City:

Roy A. Hoglund, regional director, white, $5,600.

Eugene Ormabee, fair-practice examiner, white, $3,800.

Mildred Jones, clerk-stenographer, colored, $1,620.

Helen G. Schilen, clerk-stenographer, white, $1,620.

Kansas City has been treated better than has any other city. In the office there are approximately one-twelfth Negroes and whites employed. It will be noted, however, that, generally speaking, the Negroes compose more than half of the employees of this organization. In fact, they compose approximately two-thirds of the total number of employees. However, in relation to the total population of the United States, the Negro race comprise approximately one-twelfth.

It will also be noted, as my friend the distinguished Senator from Arkansas has pointed out, the Negroes have good jobs, some of which are the cream of the office. In spite of that fact, some will say that the FEPC does not practice discrimination against the white race.

Now let us go to St. Louis. Theodore Brown is in charge, a Negro, $3,800.

Leece Morris, examiner, colored, $1,620.

Armasttha Jackson, clerk-stenographer, Negro, $1,620.

There are two Negroes and one white, who have been selected, I do not know where, but I have been troubled as long as I have been in the United States Senate about this.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I wish to ask consent of the Senate that I be recognized the first thing tomorrow, and that the Senator from Georgia has finished with his speech this evening or tonight.

Mr. EASTLAND. I shall be through.

PRÉSIDING (Mr. SMITH in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. EASTLAND. There is somewhere in the Government a powerful unseen force that places Communists and fellow travelers in key positions, and what has troubled me is who constitutes it and where is it located. I know of a case, and I said that in all seriousness and in all candor to my colleagues in the Senate. I think I now what the source is, but I should dislike to make an irresponsible statement here and charge someone who is not guilty, but somewhere in this Government, in some dark and secret place, there is a powerful force which fills the departments with Communists and fellow travelers, and I believe, in my judgment, by a majority of the membership of the United States Senate.

Those people could not get in these positions by the favor of the directors, and the employees of FEPC belong to subversive organizations. Who hired them? It was some powerful, radical force. In my judgment, the greatest service the Senate of the United States could render the American people would be to ferret out that source, turn the light on that power, and see that it is exterminated.

I digress again from reading the list and turn to the current appropriation for the OWI. That organization is absolutely filled with Communists. Why? Because they get their appropria­tion from the people.

Mr. President, two Communists wrote a book entitled "The Races of Mankind," every page of which is false. The Army has to circulate that book, but, because of opposition on the part of the Committee on Military Affairs of the House of Representatives, withdrew it. It was a book written by Communists—a book on social equality and racial amalgamation. Then what happened? One of the authors of the book turned up in a responsible position in OWI. I protested to the Director of OWI, and from conferring with him.
I could see that his hands were tied. Down through decades, lengths, from what source I do not know, the orders came that she was to be protected, and she is there today in the Overseas Branch.

Mr. President, I have stated time and again, and I repeat, there is a drive on in this country for social equality. The statement was made that OWI had never put out false information. That statement was made repeatedly on the floor of the Senate. Their representatives come before the committee and talk about the fine work they are doing, work free from communism, and no controversial subjects being discussed. Yet they did not tell of a picture they are circulating all over Europe entitled "A Better Tomorrow." During the speech on the Charter this morning I heard some reference to the better tomorrow. I saw OWI's conception of a better tomorrow, and a good part of it was entitled "An Academy of Democracy." It was nothing in the world but false propaganda for social equality, showing an alleged mixed school and horrible conditions in the city of New York, holding that out as typical of America.

Mr. President, let us get back to the Dallas office of this organization. I have been digressing.

Carlos Castenada, regional director, white, $4,600.

There is a vacancy in the office of fair practice examiner at $3,200. I venture to assert that it will not be filled by a white person, but that it will go to some radical Communist.

Willetta Gutehken, clerk-stenographer, white, $1,900.

Mr. President, that is some crowd to control the business and labor destiny of the great Southwest, the fastest growing and fastest developing section of America. This organization is a disgrace, its personnel is a disgrace, and as a high public duty, in my judgment, we should deny this appropriation.

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

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. I send to the desk an amendment to House bill 3358, under rule XXII, and ask that it may be received, printed, and read at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be read.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 4, line 18, it is proposed to strike out "$2,500,000" and to insert in lieu thereof "$3,370,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

NATIONAL DEFENSE HOUSING

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, a few days ago the Senate Committee on Education and Labor, with almost the full membership of the committee in attendance, unanimously house bill 3278, which provides an additional authorization of $30,000,000 for carrying on essential public services under the original Lanham Act, but only for essential public services such as child care, some health work, and things of that kind.

I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that House bill 3278 be considered at this time.

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

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me say that since the Senator from Alabama spoke to me about the bill I have talked with all the minority members of the Committee on Education and Labor, and I find no objection voiced to the bill by any one of them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?
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The PRESIDING OFFICER. I ask that the nominations in the Marine Corps be confirmed en bloc.
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