

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE
APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR CORPS

To be assistant sanitary engineers, effective date of oath of office

John R. Thoman
Richard J. Hammerstrom

To be senior assistant sanitary engineers, effective date of oath of office

Richard S. Green	Ralph C. Palange
Leonard B. Dworsky	Graham Walton
Francis B. Elder	Howard W. Chapman
Conrad P. Straub	Gerald W. Ferguson
Elroy K. Day	Richard S. Mark
Charles T. Carnahan	

IN THE ARMY

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be major generals

Eugene Lowry Eubank
Grandison Gardner
Thomas Dresser White
Frederick William Evans
William Donald Old
Charles Franklin Borh
William Evens Hall
William Henry Tunner
Laurence Carbee Craigle
George Clement McDonald
Francis Hopkinson Griswold
Edward Sedley Bres

To be brigadier general

Herbert Norman Schwarzkopf

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be major generals

Charles Hartwell Bonesteel
William Hood Simpson
Wilhelm Delp Styer
John Kenneth Cannon
Harold Lee George
Charles Phillip Hall
Lewis Hyde Brereton
Stephen J. Chamberlin
Willis Dale Crittenger
Geoffrey Keyes
Harold Roe Bull
Henry Spiese Aurand
James Alward Van Fleet
George Edward Stratemeyer
Clarence Ralph Huebner
William E. Kepner
Willard Stewart Paul
Saint Clair Streett
Muir Stephen Fairchild
Nathan Farragut Twining
Ennis Clement Whitehead

IN THE NAVY

APPOINTMENT IN THE NAVY

Albert L. O'Bannon to be ensign in the line of the Navy.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JULY 17, 1946

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art the sovereign ruler of the universe, grant that during this new day with its new demands and opportunities we may have the insight to discern and the heroism to follow Thy leading which transcends and transfigures all our own feeble plans and desires.

We pray that we may be encouraged in the great enterprise of building a more brotherly world on the foundation of the

spiritual ideals and principles. Fill us with a dauntless faith in the wisdom and power of Thy spirit, for Thou alone canst touch to finer issues the creative and curative forces of our civilization. Thou alone canst bring to fulfillment our deepest yearnings and highest hopes.

We humbly confess that again and again our faith is eclipsed and shadowed by doubt and we become disheartened and discouraged and feel that we have been deceived by delusions. God forbid that we should ever be guilty of that pessimistic cynicism which believes that human nature is basically brutal and selfish and that we cannot expect anything better from it than greed, hatred, revenge, and war. Help us to conquer our doubts and discouragements upon our knees.

Hear us in our Saviour's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6689. An act to extend, for an additional year, the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1937, as amended, and the taxes with respect to sugar.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6685. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, to provide appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. McKellar, Mr. Hayden, Mr. Russell, Mr. Overton, Mr. Thomas of Oklahoma, Mr. Brooks, Mr. Bridges, and Mr. Gurney to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1477. An act to authorize relief in certain cases where work, supplies, or services have been furnished for the Government under contracts during the war.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFeree ON OPA LEGISLATION

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] was named as a conferee on the so-called OPA bill. The gentleman from Michigan is now in the Pacific and unable to serve. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that he be excused from serving as a member of the committee of conference.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered, and the Chair appoints the

gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH] to act as a conferee in place of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] and the Senate will be notified of the action of the House.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RIVERS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include an editorial from the Mobile Press-Register, and in the other an article by Mr. Frank A. Godchaux, president of the Louisiana State Rice Milling Co.

Mr. LARCADE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article on the subject of rice.

Mr. BARTLETT asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. ELLIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper editorial.

Mr. BLACKNEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject Flint Rent Control Orders.

Mr. CELLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, after the completion of the legislative business and any other special orders, I may address the House for 25 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

TAX REFUNDS

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to call to the attention of the House the fact that I am today introducing a resolution asking the Treasury Department to furnish the House of Representatives, through its Ways and Means Committee, certain information relative to the carry-back clause, subsections (b) and (d) of subsection 122 of the revenue act, relating to excess-profit taxes.

I note in a publication of the Washington Star of yesterday that a council has been set up to begin consideration of refunds, and that out of a total of \$20,-348,000,000 paid in 1944 and 1945, refunds in excess of \$8,000,000,000 are now pending. I think the House should know the details of who is asking for these refunds and the nature of them.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

[Mr. GAVIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

THE NATIONAL DEBT

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, we see by the morning's papers that the United States reduces its national debt one and a quarter billions of dollars. Trying to fool the people again. Let us cut the debt down by \$10,000,000,000. There is in the Treasury now cash to the extent of \$12,281,000,000. We should have done this several months ago and stopped the interest on outstanding bonds.

We had this subject up a few weeks ago. You will remember that we went in the red \$21,000,000,000-and-over last year. You are going in the red over \$10,000,000,000 this year. Now, let us stop fooling the people, let us cut down our expenses and let our income equal our outgo. Then we will be doing something worth while. Where are you going to get the money for this great foolish spending you continue to do? It is time to cut out many functions and departments now not necessary in this wild spending administration. It is time for good sound business in government. It is time to stop fooling our people. Think and act for a sound financial administration.

OPA INFORMATION SERVICE

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 712) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. Is a similar resolution pending before any committee?

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. A resolution was sent to the Banking and Currency Committee. Every member of the Banking and Currency Committee received a letter from me enclosing a copy of the resolution. The resolution I introduced at that time to investigate propaganda put out by the OPA was not similar to this one. I think, Mr. Speaker, that the resolution should be read by the Clerk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk may read the resolution, if there is no objection, but it is not a privileged resolution and the Chair will not recognize for its consideration at this time because it is not privileged.

If the gentleman desires, and if there is no objection, the Clerk may read the resolution.

There was not objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Office of Price Administration be, and it is hereby directed and required to report to the House of Representatives on or before December 1, 1946, the substance and relevant details of all radio broadcasts, press releases, magazine articles, pamphlets, booklets, and other forms of propaganda prepared or participated in, by said

agency; together with a full statement of expenditures of money for the said broadcasts, press releases, and other propaganda, since February 18, 1946.

The SPEAKER. The Chair holds that the resolution is not privileged, and therefore cannot recognize the gentleman at this time for the purpose of calling it up.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LEFEVRE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial by Mark Sullivan.

Mrs. LUCE asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks she intends to make in the Committee of the Whole today on the bill S. 1717, and to include extraneous matter; also to extend her remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include several editorials.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

[Mr. MILLER of Nebraska addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. COLE of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mrs. BOLTON asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include a statement made by the Chancellor of the Exchequer in London after the passage of the British loan bill.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances, in each to include a letter or article.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow at the conclusion of all business on the Speaker's desk and after any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, as you all know, reorganization plan No. 1, which had far-reaching consequences, did not become law because it was disapproved the other day by another body.

Unfortunately, however, reorganization plans Nos. 2 and 3 do not have the force and effect of law. In my opinion, a great mistake was made when those plans were not disapproved in accordance with the provisions of the Reorganization Act of 1945. They were disapproved by tremendous majorities in this House.

It is a dangerous state of affairs when we undertake to legislate by executive decree. I have today introduced a bill to repeal reorganization plans 2 and 3.

Very briefly, Mr. Speaker, it should be noted that reorganization plan No. 2 seeks to abolish the United States Employees Compensation Commission, and, in my opinion, that sort of procedure is not in the interests of proper administration of the Government. The United States Employees Compensation Commission has been an outstanding Government agency with quasi-judicial powers. Its abolishment will not reduce the number of Government employees, nor will it reduce Government expenses, and these are the main factors to be considered in getting rid of Government agencies which have no functions to perform or which duplicate the work of other agencies.

Vast numbers of Federal employees are directly interested in the reorganization plan No. 2 and they are opposed to the abolishment of the United States Employees' Compensation Commission. There is more I can and will say on this subject, but I do not think the time has arrived when an Executive decree should have the effect of a repeal statute.

In connection with reorganization plan 3, the shipping interests, the marine inspectors, the people interested in the grazing problems in the far West, the people interested in the General Land Office, have all objected to this plan. In addition, the merchant seamen are also opposed to reorganization plan 3. Very briefly, I think there are many and valid reasons why the Marine Inspectors Bureau, the shipping interests, and the merchant seamen should not be permanently kept under the United States Coast Guard. They were placed there merely as a war measure. Now that the war is over, they should go back to the Department of Commerce, which formerly had jurisdiction over them.

It should also be noted that there was vigorous opposition to changing the status of St. Elizabeths Hospital in reorganization plan No. 3.

I think legislation being enacted by the administration issuing reorganization plans is the wrong way to proceed about these matters. I think Congress should assert its jurisdiction and pass legislation as such legislation is needed, after the appropriate committees have had a chance to study and act on bills introduced, either at the request of the departments or by some Member of Congress who is interested. I expect to have some more to say about this bill which repeals reorganization plans 2 and 3. In the meantime, I hope the Members of Congress will have the time to look into these matters and study them, and I have no doubt that in both bodies of Congress appropriate action will be taken to restore the status of the United States

Employees' Compensation Commission and to permit the Department of Commerce to again have jurisdiction over marine matters.

When these plans were under consideration there was testimony to the effect that instead of decreasing the number of Federal employees, the sum total of the results achieved would be to increase in many instances the number of Federal employees, and that the expenditures involved would also be increased. This was not the purpose of the Reorganization Act of 1945. It seems to me that the bureaucrats who have apparently framed the proposed reorganization plans 2 and 3 are still living in a great wonderland of bureaucracy where they think in terms only of spending Federal funds and in increasing their own importance by adding to the existing cumbersome rules and regulations, additional powers and duties in a bureaucratic New Deal regimentation philosophy of government.

It is frankly admitted that the reshuffling in reorganization plan No. 2 will lead to another Cabinet position and another Cabinet officer and so the story goes. I supported the bill which resulted in the Reorganization Act of 1945 because I realized then, as I know now, that we have a lot of wartime agencies as well as some agencies that were created before the war, that ought to be abolished. You are never going to get a decrease in Federal expenditures unless such steps are taken. Whoever is responsible for the blueprints of reorganization plans Nos. 2 and 3 did not have in mind any reduction in Government bureaus or any saving to the taxpayers. They simply had in mind, in my opinion, the golden opportunity of reshuffling the different agencies so that they could either create new jobs and get rid of some of the present experienced employees, or else add to the number of employees in their respective bureaus.

Those of us who believed that an honest effort would be made to carry out the wishes of Congress when we passed the Reorganization Act of 1945 have been sadly disillusioned. In my opinion, only those who drew those Alice in Wonderland reorganization plans really know how far reaching they may be. Certainly, they were drawn in secrecy and submitted to Congress without any opportunity being given for those agencies that were directly concerned to make any objections, they might have against these plans, known to the committees. I charged before the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments that instructions had been issued in connection with reorganization plan 3 forbidding anyone connected with the marine inspectors work to oppose permanently placing the marine inspectors under the jurisdiction of the Coast Guard.

No one denied the truth of my statements. The reason why there was no denial was because what I said was true. I saw copies of one of the orders which forbid any employee from having any opinion. I repeat that this kind of legislation is no legislation at all. Congress should not turn over to the arbitrary

authority of an irresponsible Government agency the right to pass legislation merely by having the administrative official prepare a reorganization plan. It behooves Congress to look into these matters because I understand that more reorganization plans may be anticipated.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

HOPEWELL VILLAGE NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE, PA.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3533) to authorize revisions in the boundary of the Hopewell Village National Historic Site, Pa., and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 11, strike out all after "area" down to and including "Congress" in line 14.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman from Florida to explain this amendment?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the Senate amendment strikes out the provision which would make this subject to the surplus-property law. It is in the form which our own Public Lands Committee had originally reported it, and we feel the amendment should be concurred in because these recreational demonstration areas do have a method of disposition provided under the act of 1942. The Congress has already provided a formula. This would leave it that way, and it would come under the regular act of 1942 instead of the Surplus Property Act.

Mr. LECOMPTE. The Hopewell village historic site is an effort to preserve the site of the first charcoal furnace in this country?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Yes.

Mr. LECOMPTE. The amendment places the bill back in exactly the same form in which it came out of the Public Lands Committee?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Yes; by unanimous agreement.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, is this property that has been declared surplus?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. No; it has not been declared surplus and it is not contemplated being put under the Surplus Property Act.

Mr. RICH. All of the property has to come under the Surplus Property Act.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. No. Under an act passed in 1942 there is specific provision by which demonstration areas will be offered to States and Federal agencies first. If it goes under surplus property they might destroy the trees and so forth.

Mr. RICH. It comes under the classification where the cities and States have the right to acquire it?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. The State would have the first right; yes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection?

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. THOM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Ed O'Neal.

Mr. SABATH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Raleigh (N. C.) News and Observer, written by the Honorable Josephus Daniels, relative to the convention of 1886.

Mr. HAVENNER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the San Francisco Call-Bulletin.

Mr. DELACY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by six rabbis from Seattle.

COMMITTEE ON IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the subcommittee of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation be permitted to sit for 1 hour this afternoon during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

VETERANS' DOMICILIARY INSTITUTIONS

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to inform the Members of the House that I have filed discharge petition No. 30 which, if it is signed by the adequate number of 218 Members, will bring before the House H. R. 5549, which will give you an opportunity to abolish the practice of withholding pensions from veterans in hospitals and domiciliary-care institutions. I am sure that many of the Members of the House agree that this practice should be abolished. You have an opportunity to sign this petition now. True, we passed a bill the other day which suspends this practice for a period of 7 months, but that, in my opinion, is not adequate, and I would appreciate it if every Member signed the petition.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California [Mr. McDONOUGH] seems to be unduly exercised. The

matter to which he refers was taken up by the Veterans' Committee, of which I am chairman, and was written into the bill that has just passed the House and is now pending in the Senate. We went into that matter thoroughly. We had before us the representatives of the various veterans' organizations. We had before us various Members of Congress. We had before us the representatives of the Veterans' Administration, and we worked out what we think is a proper solution of this problem.

Therefore it seems unnecessary to be bringing a bill out here to try to overhaul or to undo what the Congress has just done in respect to this matter.

The servicemen who are interested, and who know what it is about, seem to be satisfied with the bill we passed the other day, and which, as I said, is now pending in the Senate.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include certain letters.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

[Mr. HINSHAW addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include an address by ex-Senator Harry B. Hawes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I am today placing in the RECORD an address which was delivered last July 4 by ex-Senator Harry B. Hawes, a great American, a great Missourian, and a great patriot. For many years during his service in the Congress of the United States he was a friend of the Filipino people. He played a major part in the bringing about of Filipino independence. I think it was largely through Senator Hawes' efforts that the 4th day of July was fixed as the date upon which they would celebrate their national independence, a day which is so dear to the hearts of all Americans. The final consummation of the dream of independence for the Philippines I know brings joy to the heart of Senator Hawes.

CARS FOR AMPUTEES

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation has just spoken of the fact that the bill with reference to not cutting the pensions of the men in the hospitals was reported out of our committee, was considered, and passed the House. I was not satisfied with the bill as it passed. I

had a bill in the committee which authorized full pay for single men in hospitals, but this is the best that was done. I hope the Senate will amend the bill. I am very anxious that the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation report not necessarily my bill, H. R. 6304, but some bill to give the amputees automobiles. It is a part of their rehabilitation program. If this bill is not approved by the Veterans' Administration, I shall feel their program for amputees a failure. A subcommittee has been appointed, and I have hoped for at least 2 weeks that the subcommittee would report to the main committee in order that the bill might be passed. There is a petition on the desk to discharge the committee from further consideration of that bill. It is petition No. 32. If the committee reports out the bill, it is all right, and the leadership will bring it upon the floor for action; but if it does not, the veterans will have no relief. A petition then will be necessary. I shall object to adjournment until the bill be passed.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RYTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a report of the British parliamentary delegation to Poland.

Mr. GREEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Philadelphia Record.

GEN. DRAZA MIHALOVITCH

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, a little more than 4 years ago—to be exact, on June 25, 1942—a young man with a delightful accent stood beside the Speaker of this House and received the plaudits of this body. It was His Majesty, King Peter II, of Yugoslavia. He was introduced by our illustrious Speaker as "the head and ruler of a great people who for centuries have stood in the forefront fighting for what they conceive to be human liberty."

The young King spoke with emotion. He spoke of the sanctuary which he had found in London. He spoke of the cruel twist of fate by which he had never been able to address representatives of his own people. And then he said soldiers of the United Nations are all fighting the same battle:

They may never have seen each other or even heard of each other but they are all united by the same testimony—the warriors of General Mihailovitch who fight in our gorges, the gallant British soldiers and sailors who die in the defense of freedom, the brother people of Russia who have stirred the imagination of the entire world by their heroic resistance, and the brave American fighting men who are giving their lives in every ocean and on every continent of the globe.

And then he said:

Many who were not killed or enslaved by the Germans, Italians, Bulgarians, and Hun-

garians continue to fight under the indomitable leadership of my first soldier and devoted friend, Draza Mihailovitch.

Yesterday the first soldier of King Peter and his devoted friend, General Mihailovitch, was executed. What a stain upon the honor of a country.

GEN. ALEXANDER PAPAGOS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order for the Speaker to declare a recess this afternoon at 3 o'clock in order that the Members may have the opportunity to meet a most distinguished visitor to our shores, one of the outstanding military leaders of the recent war and a great Greek hero, Gen. Alexander Papagos.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

THIRD DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1946

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6885) 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 year ending June 30, 1946, to provide appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. CANNON of Missouri, O'NEAL, RABAUT, NORRELL, WHITTEN, TABER, WIGGLESWORTH, and DIRKSEN.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House on the third deficiency appropriation bill may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report and statement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 225]

Adams	Byrne, N. Y.	Crosser
Allen, Ill.	Camp	Curley
Allen, La.	Cannon, Fla.	Daughton, Va.
Anderson, Calif.	Clements	Davis
Andrews, N. Y.	Cochran	Dawson
Arends	Coffee	Earthman
Baldwin, Md.	Colmer	Engel, Mich.
Beckworth	Cooper	Fallon
Bennet, N. Y.	Courtney	Fernandez
Boren	Cox	Gardner
Boykin	Cravens	Gibson
Bunker	Crawford	Gillespie

Goodwin	McKenzie	Rogers, N. Y.
Gossett	McMillan, S. C.	Rooney
Hall	Mahon	Sabath
Edwin Arthur	Mankin	Sadowski
Harris	Mansfield,	Sasscer
Hébert	Mont.	Sheridan
Hendricks	Mansfield, Tex.	Slaughter
Hoffman, Mich.	Mason	Sparkman
Holifield	Marrow	Stewart
Holmes, Wash.	Miller, Calif.	Stigler
Hook	Monroney	Sumner, Ill.
Johnson,	Morrison	Talbot
Lyndon B.	Norton	Tarver
Johnson, Okla.	Patrick	Tolan
Jonkman	Peterson, Ga.	Torrens
Kerr	Pfeifer	Vinson
Kilday	Plumley	Vursell
King	Powell	Weaver
LaFollette	Priest	Welch
Ludlow	Reece, Tenn.	West
McGehee	Reed, Ill.	Wickersham
McGlinchey	Robinson, Utah	Woffenden, Pa.
McGregor	Roe, N. Y.	Wood

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 329 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

AMENDING THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT AND THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE

Mr. CLARK, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 710, Rept. No. 2530), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7037) to amend the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the bill shall be considered as having been read for amendment. No amendment shall be in order to said bill except amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means, and said amendments shall be in order, any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding. Amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means may be offered to any section of the bill at the conclusion of the general debate but such amendments shall not be subject to amendment. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

DEVELOPMENT AND CONTROL OF ATOMIC ENERGY

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY].

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, in view of the transcendent importance of the legislation before us, which quite literally will affect the destiny of nations and the security of millions of lives, it may well be that the time allotted for the debate is inadequate. Moreover, there are many Members, I gather, who would like to make remarks but cannot do so in

the time as now fixed. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the time for general debate be extended two additional hours.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, if the chairman of the committee wants to ask unanimous consent to extend the time 1 hour, that is perfectly agreeable, but we have other important matters which must be disposed of.

Mrs. LUCE. There is no matter more important than this. Millions of lives may be affected by this legislation.

Mr. McCORMACK. Most Members know how they are going to vote on this matter.

Mrs. LUCE. If they do, they know almost more than those of us who have been working on this matter for 6 months, because we are confused, and we have studied it thoroughly.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentlewoman recognizes that I said we were willing to extend the time 1 hour. The gentlewoman has that concession.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time for general debate be extended 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentlewoman withdraw her request?

Mrs. LUCE. I accept the exceedingly gracious compromise suggested by the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I do not intend to object, if you look at the program for this week you will find that on Thursday, Friday, and Saturday we have a very full schedule, with the Social Security Act put as the last part of the schedule, to be considered Saturday afternoon or Saturday night. I am not going to object to the request, but I hope nobody else will try to extend the debate, because on the British loan at times there were not 40 Members on the floor to hear that important discussion.

Mr. KEOGH. I object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I hope the gentleman from New York, my good friend, will not object to having an extra hour of general debate. If the gentleman from New York will not object to this request, I think we will save time. Let us compromise on 1 hour.

Mr. KEOGH. I withdraw my objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANDOLPH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio program in which four Members of Congress, including himself, participated.

DEVELOPMENT AND CONTROL OF ATOMIC ENERGY

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the

bill (S. 1717) for the development and control of atomic energy.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill S. 1717, with Mr. JOHN D. DELANEY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] is recognized for 2½ hours and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] is recognized for 2½ hours.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, due to the great importance of this legislation and the legislative history back of it, I feel impelled today to use some of the time I have on this subject in making an explanation of some of the misrepresentations, false rumors, and reports that have been circulated throughout the city of Washington and throughout the country and in the public press with regard to my position on the legislation.

I do not think there is any member of the House Committee on Military Affairs that will accuse me of ever willfully obstructing important legislation before that committee. This legislation came up early last year. There was sent to the House of Representatives through the Speaker's office a burning, zealous message from the President of the United States asking for the prompt and effective enactment of atomic energy legislation. That message came to the Speaker and was promptly referred to the House Committee on Military Affairs, when I immediately called committee sessions in order to hold hearings. We conducted hearings on what was then known as the May-Johnson bill. That bill was no more a May bill or a Johnson bill than it was a Jones bill. It was written in the War Department after long study and very careful consideration of the subject involved. It was sent by the President to the Speaker, as I have said, with a recommendation for speed. In order to give speed I called hearings on it on October 9, 1945. The War Department sent a very able, very conscientious, and very distinguished officer as a spokesman of the Department to present the legislation to the committee. That officer was none other than the then Under Secretary of War, now Secretary of War, Hon. Robert P. Patterson, a man who has the confidence, esteem, and admiration of the entire Congress, and deservedly so. When he came to the committee he came as he always did, with a frank, open, and plain statement of where he stood and what he wanted. For the purpose of justifying the position of my committee, which has been bludgeoned, maligned, and criticized, particularly myself, and I know, falsely, and make us right with the House, with the country, and with the public in general, I am going to read Judge Patterson's opening statement. He said, and I quote:

The bill that is before your committee today reflects the views of the men who were

most responsible for the wartime development of atomic energy as to the most effective method of controlling and carrying forward development in this field within the United States. It embodies all the points on domestic policy recommended by the President in his message to the Congress last week.

The manner in which this legislation was prepared will be of interest to you. In May of this year, 2 months before the test in New Mexico showed conclusively that the atomic bomb would work, Secretary Stimson, with the approval of the President, appointed an interim committee to recommend legislation that would insure that this discovery would be controlled and developed in the best interests of the people of this country.

The Secretary—

Meaning Secretary Stimson—

served as chairman of the committee, with George L. Harrison, former chairman of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York and present president of the New York Life Insurance Co., as his alternate. Mr. Harrison is here today. The other members of the committee were Secretary James F. Byrnes, then a private citizen; Ralph A. Bard, Under Secretary of the Navy; William L. Clayton, Assistant Secretary of State; Dr. Vannevar Bush, director of the Office of Scientific Research and Development and president of the Carnegie Institution of Washington; Dr. James B. Conant, chairman of the National Defense Research Committee and president of Harvard University; and Dr. Karl T. Compton, president of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and Chief of the Office of Field Service in the Office of Scientific Research and Development.

General Groves was present in an advisory capacity at all meetings of the committee. The members were also aided by the advice and experience of eminent scientists who had rendered invaluable service in the atomic bomb project—Dr. J. R. Oppenheimer, Dr. E. O. Lawrence, Dr. Enrico Fermi, and Dr. Arthur H. Compton. Representative industrialists who had taken a prominent part in the project also assisted the committee in its work.

The drafting of the bill, in line with the principles and policies established by the committee, was done by Brig. Gen. Kenneth C. Royall and Mr. William L. Marbury.

Let me add at this point that General Royall spent 2 weeks in the committee room working with the committee in drafting, redrafting, doctoring, amending, and changing the bill. Then on the 8th day of last November we reported that bill to the House of Representatives. We thought we had done what the armed forces wanted, and I think yet that we did. The bill provided not only for the protection of the military secret of the atomic weapon as a military weapon but it provided also for adequate facilities for the dissemination of knowledge, information, scientific research, and development on atomic subjects through colleges, universities, schools, and industrial laboratories throughout the country. We did everything we could to make it a workable bill in order that we might do two things: Carry forward the policy of the War Department in that they were to have control of all our military secrets, and at the same time to make the most possible liberal provisions for the development and research program that they outlined to us. Now, that bill has been on the House Calendar, and is still on the House Calendar, but about 8 months

later the Senate Atomic Bomb Committee reported a bill that is now pending before you and debated it briefly and sent it to this House, and it was referred to the House Military Affairs Committee, of which I am chairman.

Now, here is where the rub comes, if you want to call it that. I was charged by the press, by radio commentators all over the country, with being guilty of obstructionist tactics in trying to defeat the report of Senate 1717.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. And I was charged with you, and it is a dirty lie—a dirty lie.

Mr. MAY. I will say in answer to my colleague's plain and emphatic statement, which is not susceptible of misunderstanding, and with which I agree heartily, that I made three different proposals to my committee that this bill be reported to this House without amendment under a wide open rule, so that every man could express his views in the form of amendments and debate. I did it because I felt that the House of Representatives would do what it wanted to do with this legislation in any event. That is what I think you will do. However, the committee pursued the other course. What is that course? That is the wise legislative procedure that has been adhered to by committees of Congress from its beginning.

That way is to take the bill up and read it for amendment. While that was going on I was besieged and beset by both sides of my committee, one side charging me with rushing it too much and the other side not necessarily backing me up with attendance; and I was handicapped and crippled, and it took me a long time to get it out of committee, not a long time but a couple of weeks that we worked upon it. I wanted to justify myself before this House of Representatives as not being an obstructionist.

The committee pursuing the usual and customary procedure of reading the bill section by section for amendment did adopt several amendments. The first amendment adopted is the bone of contention. The bill sets up a commission composed of five members to be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, as usual. They were all possibly to be civilian members. The Committee in an effort to give the military establishment, the armed forces, if you please, the group of people to whom when war comes again, should it come, we would run like birds for shelter, for protection and defense, the committee decided that they ought to have something to say on that commission. While I think we wrote a defective amendment, I know what it intended. The amendment merely provides that at least one of these commissioners and not more than two shall be representatives of the armed forces. A civilian could of course be a representative of the armed forces. What the committee really intended to do was to say that he should be a member of the armed forces; but the phraseology is "representative of the armed forces" and that is where the issue will come in this House. When

that question is settled I believe practically everything else except section 11 relating to patents will be easy going.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. Inasmuch as the atomic bomb, at least at the present time, is a war instrument why should not the armed forces have something to say about it?

Mr. MAY. If the gentlemen can answer his own question in any way but the affirmative he can do more than I. I believe they should have; but I want this House to have its own say about it, and whatever this House does, of course, binds me.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. In view of the fact that the bill as it came from the other body contained a provision for a military advisory commission or committee, why the necessity for adding the provision which the gentleman admits is the controversial item in the bill?

Mr. MAY. You can give advice, but if you can not enforce it, the advice amounts to nothing.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. But it does provide for enforcement.

Mr. MAY. Just a moment. It provides for a liaison committee with a director. The House Committee on Military Affairs went even further than I have already stated by providing that that director, or the member of that committee having to do with the military application of atomic energy, should be a representative of the armed forces; and that is the elaboration or extension of the provision that I first stated.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MAY. I yield; yes.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. I understand that this liaison committee has a means of directive through the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of War applying to the President of the United States; so there is directive power in the hands of this liaison committee.

Mr. MAY. What I would say about this liaison committee is that it has no power to settle anything. It is supposed to consist of representatives of the Departments of War and Navy. The commission is required to advise and consult with the committee and keep it informed on all atomic energy matters which the committee deems to relate to military applications, and the committee can make recommendations to the commission. If the commission acts adversely to the interests of the War or Navy Departments, the liaison committee may refer the matter to the President.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I have read in the papers and heard it expressed on the radio that this committee wants the military people on this commission to dominate it. Was that ever expressed by anybody in our committee meetings, either executive or open?

Mr. MAY. It never was by any member of the committee and that was never the spirit or intent. All the committee had in mind was it wanted some representation of the armed forces on the commission and on the committee. If there is anyone here who can file a valid objection to that I would like to know what you are going to do when the next war occurs for relief and for protection.

Mr. GAVIN. If that idea was not conveyed to the committee it should have been conveyed to the committee.

Mr. MAY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, another one of the things that nettled me a little bit was the fact that a distinguished Member of another body went on the radio without ever asking me a word about it during the House committee hearings and without asking about the facts and called the attention of the American people to the fact they were about to be betrayed and destroyed by the action of the House Committee on Military Affairs, just as though if a bill is passed by one body, never presumed in either body to be absolutely correct, the body receiving it must unquestionably take it, swallow it, hook, line, and sinker even without bait.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Is it correct to say that the person who went on the radio, as the gentleman mentioned, was the person who introduced this particular bill?

Mr. MAY. Well, I think everybody heard the radio address. I have brought this bill here as the chairman of the committee as a result of the work of that committee, after cool consideration and judgment, and I forget everything that happened in the committee, all the differences and controversies we had, because we always have them. It is proper that we should have them. If everybody were of one mind there would be no issue to settle. When there are issues and they are debated, discussed, and finally concluded, I feel it is nothing more than the duty of the chairman of the committee to present the views of the committee to the House of Representatives and let the House work its will with the legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I want to appeal to the Members today, not necessarily to support my views, not necessarily to oppose my views, but to use their conscience and their judgment in the face of the responsibilities that fall upon their shoulders in these changing times. Under the law as it is today the atomic-bomb secret is protected by the War Department. Under the law as it may be changed I do not know what will happen. I hope for the best, but I believe my position on the subject is accurate and right.

Here is what it is: I think we ought to maintain and keep this military secret just as sacredly and carefully as we keep any other military secret we have, regardless of what it is, and this one in particular, until such time as diplomats,

statesmen, and our representatives in negotiations with the other nations of the earth may arrive at an agreement, a treaty, compact, or whatever it is they arrive at, to eliminate the atomic bomb as a military weapon.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BARDEN. As a matter of fact, officially we are still at war, is that not correct?

Mr. MAY. That is true.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHURCH. The gentleman stated that under the law today this secret is definitely in the military and we are protected. For how long?

Mr. MAY. Well, in my view and according to my understanding of the great War Department and our Army and its great leadership, I think it will be there just as long as they think it ought to be kept there, and it will be safe while they keep it.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I am delighted to yield to my colleague from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Is there any provision in any law or act passed by parliament or congress of other nations, other than Great Britain or Canada, that yields any of their war secrets to us?

Mr. MAY. I do not know of any.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. The gentleman's contention is that we ought to retain this great military secret of ours until we know what the world is going to do in settling these matters about the atomic bomb?

Mr. MAY. I think that the atomic bomb, as a weapon, ought to be outlawed, just exactly like we outlawed poison gas and other things that destroy the human race. But until that is done by a foolproof, bombproof arrangement, I am opposed to giving the secret away. However, I do favor the most extensive experimentation and research and discovery of all the civilian uses of atomic energy in every field and for every purpose for which we can better the human race. That is my position.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. What is the term of office of those as defined in section 2?

Mr. MAY. Five members will serve 5 years each, I believe, in the Senate bill. In the May-Johnson bill we had nine members, which I thought was four too many. It was stepped up until it became nine.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LANHAM. By the terms of the bill itself this is a matter which is going to be capable of very frequent changes because of new inventions. Does not the gentleman think that the whole act

should be limited to a period of, say, 3 years, and then new legislation, if needed, could be enacted to meet the changed conditions?

Mr. MAY. There are provisions in both bills and both reports from the Senate and the House calling attention to the fact that legislative changes will, of necessity, have to be made from time to time. No longer than last Sunday one of the principal officers of the Navy called me and asked permission to see me at my home at 3 o'clock in the afternoon, which he did, and presented me with an amendment which would limit the operation of this act to 3 years. He had to leave for the Bikini experiment or he would probably have been here yet.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman said 5 years. What interpretation can be placed on subparagraph (A) on page 4:

The terms of office of the members first taking office after the expiration of 2 years from the date of enactment of this act shall expire, as designated by the President at the time of appointment, one at the end of 3 years, one at the end of 4 years, one at the end of 5 years, one at the end of 6 years, and one at the end of 7 years, after the date of enactment of this act.

Mr. MAY. He would serve 5 years before being reappointed at the end of 5 years. That is a step-up provision.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. The gentleman, in giving the language of the bill with reference to who should participate on the part of the military, indicated that it was not clearly defined that the person to represent the military should be a military man; in other words, an Army man. Would there be any objection to correcting that language so that it would be clear that somebody on this Commission would be a military man? Personally, I have great confidence in the Army and the Navy, and they have kept our military and naval secrets without any condemnation, anyhow, any real condemnation, and why would it not be right to clarify that so that we would always have on that board a military man and a naval man or somebody that would be in that category without any question?

Mr. MAY. My views are that my committee really intended that the term "representative" should mean a military man.

In view of that, I would have no objection to its being changed to that extent. Of course, I am supporting the bill as reported by my committee.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. I have seen some correspondence raising the same question in regard to patents. Would the gentleman mind clarifying that?

Mr. MAY. I would not be able to clarify that at this time. That is section 11 of the bill. It is so far-reaching and wide in its scope that the American Bar Association and many of the business

interests of the country have objected to it. The naval officer who came to see me on Sunday presented me with a new version of it, which I understand will be offered as an amendment by the gentleman from Texas who is chairman of the House Committee on Patents. If it is, we will then have a chance to debate it and understand it.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. I am in thorough sympathy with the gentleman's contention that the military should be represented on this Commission. I wonder if we would be as unfortunate with the civilian board as Canada has been. The leaks that took place in Canada all came from civilians. I fail to find the name of a single officer of the armed forces who in any way betrayed his trust.

Mr. MAY. We put really heavy penalties in this legislation against any man who betrays his trust or fails to do his duty, and I am sure the average military man, subject always to court martial, will be true.

Mr. KNUTSON. What do you do, shoot him?

Mr. MAY. I think the fine goes as high as \$20,000, and 5 years in jail.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. As I understand, the secret of the atomic bomb is perfectly safe at the present time. Is that correct?

Mr. MAY. I would hate to think it is not. I am sure it is.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. If that be true, just what is the need for this legislation at the present time? The war has not been declared over. That is a vast subject. I think you could debate it for a whole year and not be very much further along than you are right this moment. It seems to me this matter could wait a while. I do not see any need here under the circumstances for stirring up the matter.

Mr. MAY. It will not hurt to have the legislation on the statute books, and I think it ought to be enacted. I think the bill ought to be passed, but I doubt very much that it ought to be made permanent with the vast powers the Commission will have and the widespread facilities it will have available. This bill turns over to this Commission and takes away from the War and Navy Departments \$2,250,000,000 worth of property that has been utilized in the development of the bomb and the other things in connection with it.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BARDEN. There are two things I want to mention. One is the question of penalties for turning traitor on this country and giving away the bomb secret. Instead of its being a fine of \$20,000, the penalty should be death.

Mr. KNUTSON. That is correct.

Mr. BARDEN. That should be definitely known to those who handle these things.

Mr. MAY. I quite agree with the gentleman, that such an act would be treason in its vilest form and ought to receive a death penalty.

Mr. BARDEN. May I ask the gentleman if the atomic bomb secrets are not now being kept just as are the secrets concerning all the rest of our military and secret weapons at this time?

Mr. MAY. I am sure they are, because if any had leaked out it would have been found out, with the publicity facilities we have in this country, because I think they are adequate, from what has been happening around here the last 10 days.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Is it true that if this bill is passed and if this Commission is appointed, the general understanding is that David Lilienthal, the head of TVA, is to be the chairman of this Commission? If so, does the gentleman feel that it is in the interest of the United States that we should cut such a caper?

Mr. MAY. I think my colleague understands my position and views as to that gentleman. I prefer not to reexpress them here. I would not want to see him chairman of that Commission.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. If this secret is perfectly safe at the present time, would you not think that if it remains where it is over a period of time it would still be as safe there as it would anywhere else?

Mr. MAY. I have no doubt in the world that the Army of the United States will never reach the low state of giving away their military secrets about anything, and I believe that any man who would give such secrets away would receive speedy, just, and severe punishment.

Mr. REED of New York. What I am getting at is that the secret is known by a rather limited number of pretty high-grade military men; is that not true?

Mr. MAY. That is correct, together with a few top scientists.

Mr. REED of New York. If you want to keep a secret, military or otherwise, are you not more apt to keep that secret when only a few people know it than you are with many knowing it?

Mr. MAY. That is correct, and that is illustrated by the old saying that if you want to keep a secret, never tell it to a woman.

Mr. REED of New York. The point I want to bring out is that by this legislation more people would know it.

Mr. MAY. Correct.

Mr. TABER. I understand there is a provision here for the setting up of an enormous propaganda organization. Is it the understanding that Elmer Davis is going to have charge of that? If so, would the gentleman warm up to that kind of proposition?

Mr. MAY. The only thing I know about is what I hear in the hearings and

what I read in the newspapers, and I do not believe that part of it. I know nothing about who are to be the members, not having been consulted, and I do not anticipate that I will be consulted.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. The thing that worries me about this whole question is the talk we hear and the things we read in the newspapers about giving this secret away. I have never been able to understand why anybody should want to give this secret away. It is safe where it is. Why turn it over to this Commission that will be set up under this bill and run the risk of losing it? That is the thing that worries me.

Mr. MAY. I think that is a repetition of what we have been discussing here for the last 5 minutes. I have stated my position on that question and I would want my colleagues to take their position as to where they want to stand.

Mr. DONDERO. The gentleman made some reference about keeping the secrets of the Government in a secure place. Do you not think the secrets of this atomic bomb should be kept much more carefully than our confidential and highly secret files which were stolen out of the State Department and Naval Intelligence during wartime when they took 151 files out of the Department and found them in a Communist office up in New York?

Mr. MAY. I agree with my colleague as to the necessity for keeping absolutely secret the mechanical construction of the atomic bomb and that that will be the greatest move for peace that the world has ever known.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, there is an old adage, "Fools rush in where angels fear to tread." I certainly feel like a fool today, because I frankly confess my abysmal ignorance of the pending legislation. And the more I listen to these scientists, chemists, physicists, and mathematicians the more confused I become.

I started out really in favor of this bill in spite of a lousy, dirty, stinking editorial charging me with trying to obstruct it. I voted for the United Nations organization. I think it is the only hope in this world. I want to implement it. I think we must do that.

Science is knowledge, and Francis Bacon once said, "Knowledge is power." The trouble with us today is that we have more power than we know how to use. It is misguided and misdirected. Dynamite can construct highways or it can blow men's brains into the mud. Unless we learn from human problems, all of our science, knowledge, and highly boasted twentieth-century civilization is going to destroy us. Let us wake up.

The purposes and aims of this bill, no doubt, are laudable and praiseworthy. I would like to vote for some measure to help us out of our dilemma, but it contains certain provisions that are very dangerous. I would like to vote for a measure that is not unconstitutional or threatens to destroy our Nation.

Nothing was said in the hearings or so far on this floor about the cost of this thing.

Do you know what we are going to do? We are going to set up an Atomic Energy Commission and give it the power of life and death over private industry in this country. I do not like such a blanket, broad delegation of powers run riot—taking it out of the hands of the people of our Nation. I have the highest regard, of course, and the greatest respect for our professors, our economists, and our teachers. I was one once. Thank God, I stopped before I became a member of the "brain trust."

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. Yes.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I would like to ask the gentleman, first of all, speaking as a person who is not ashamed of the fact that he has been a school teacher, whether he believes that the provision in the bill which assures to every single American business that may arise in the future, an equal opportunity to the benefits of atomic energy, is destructive of private enterprise.

Mr. SHORT. No, but—

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is what the bill does.

Mr. SHORT. Well, that is state socialism. I ought to be a Communist. I have nothing, and want to share it with everybody. All that is horsey, horsey stuff. I cannot use stronger language in the House.

Now, what does this bill do? It sets up a commission of five members, the chairman drawing \$17,500 a year, and the others \$15,000. I insisted upon that provision, because no doubt they could earn much more in private industry. But they have got a general manager who is going to get \$15,000 a year. They have a division of research, a division of production, a division of engineering, a division of military application. They each get \$14,000 a year. There is no end to it! The sky is the limit. Then, of course, they have got a general advisory committee. They get \$50 a day, for sitting wherever they want to sit and hearing whatever they want to hear, putting a halter on you and tightening the rope around your neck. You do not want this?

The point is, we are elected by the people and we are responsible to them every 2 years. They can hire and fire us this November. You cannot hire and fire any bureaucrat down here in the OPA, the CPA, or any other bureau. They are "appointed."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I will yield myself five additional minutes.

They can hire and fire us. You cannot hire and fire them. The only way you can get rid of them is to get rid of the guy who appoints them. I think the American people will look after that little task a little later on. Destroy the New Deal—a rotten steal.

Now, the other day we voted \$4,400,000,000 to Great Britain. It is not \$3,750,000,000. There was an additional \$650,000,000 to Great Britain. Why did we vote \$650,000,000? To cancel over \$25,000,000,000 worth of lend-lease, and before they can pay us the \$25,000,000,000

in lend-lease we had to loan them \$650,000,000 to pay us with. What suckers we are. We have given away everything except the dome of this Capitol. It is sickening to me. I faint when they laugh. I should not perhaps bring this in the debate, but I do not care. It is in the pattern and we cannot ignore it. The only thing I can say—and I do pray—is God help us.

You propose now to hand your enemy a pistol with which to shoot you. Oh! You are smart people, are you not? We will get it because we asked for it.

The United States and our people have paid, the taxpayers of this Nation have paid, over \$2,000,000,000 to develop this atomic bomb. You talk about mutual transactions, intercourse, trade; we have got everything to give, we have got nothing to receive. Go on being Santa Claus, but help our people first.

Now, I want to say I do not know how I am going to vote on this bill. I never was so confused and befuddled in all my life. I mean it. Do not laugh—you are, too. We spent long days of study and we spent sleepless nights upon it.

I have always thought that science, knowledge, was international in its scope. You cannot hamstring the mind of man; you cannot corner his spirit by putting up artificial barriers. This atomic bomb was the product of many minds from many countries. I do not think there are so many secrets about it if you want to know the truth.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield.

Mr. DURHAM. Is not that one of the reasons why it cannot be kept a secret?

Mr. SHORT. I think the gentleman made a point; and I want to argue that science and knowledge are universal, and no people, no nation has a monopoly on the discovery of truth. This is the product of many minds from many lands. The gentleman knows it and perhaps certain supposed enemies of ours—I do not think we have any—we should not have any, although we have not a friend left on the face of the earth—our enemies perhaps know as much about this as we do, or even more; but I do not think, they have the methods of manufacture, the know-how production, as far as the integral parts are concerned. Uranium, plutonium, and the nuclear fission theory have been described to the committee. I heard words used before our committee that you cannot find in Webster's Dictionary. I think your ignorance is about as profound as mine. I admit it.

I know that this thing called science and power can save or destroy mankind.

I do not know how I am going to vote, but I am going to listen to the very charming and persuasive and delightful gentlewoman from Connecticut. After all, you have your own war departments, we all have our private war departments. They give orders and we usually obey. I have listened to the testimony in the hearings but I am going to listen to this debate today. Every seat in this Chamber should be occupied today. The future not only of this Nation but of mankind hangs in the balance.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has again expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 12 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM].

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I am always glad to follow the gentleman from Missouri and to listen to him in debate. The chairman of our committee has outlined to you the history of this legislation. Our committee was the first one to take it up in the Congress and the first to consider it.

We devoted much time and study to atomic energy. We had extensive hearings and during the hearings we listened to practically all the scientists connected with this work. We also listened to the War Department and other officials in an effort to seek advice and to seek some way to control this weapon. Hearings began some 30 or 40 days after the first one was dropped.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to make some remarks on the subject of the atomic energy bill, S. 1717, which is before us.

We saw, nearly a year ago, the victorious conclusion of a war whose end was greatly quickened by the use of atomic bombs. To produce those bombs, a great array of scientific talent was concentrated on the problem for several years and about \$2,000,000,000 of the public funds were spent. Now we are confronted with establishing through legislation a public policy with regard to the further development and control of atomic energy to the end of serving the common good of our people in peace and of assuring the common defense.

While the first use of atomic energy was a military one, our scientists have assured us that important peacetime uses of atomic energy and of the by-products of atomic power plants are already known and that others will surely be developed as research goes on in this field. The Nagasaki bomb was made of a brand new chemical element, plutonium, manufactured in the uranium pile at Hanford. We are told that for every pound of plutonium produced there were about 10,000,000 kilowatt-hours of heat energy released by nuclear fission and carried away by the Columbia River. Now work is proceeding on a pilot plant for the utilization of such energy. It is obvious that, because a power pile produces plutonium as well as power, controls are necessary in the public interest.

In the bill that came to us from the Senate after months of hearings, with the approval of both parties and of the President, it seems to me that adequate protection of the interests of the military was provided for in the Senate bill. The top policy-making body, whose task is both to provide controls and to promote the further development of atomic energy, is to be an Atomic Energy Commission of five full-time civilian members, responsible to the President. This Commission is to be advised on all matters relating to military applications of atomic energy by a military liaison committee. A proposal to give the Army and

Navy a greater degree of direct control was rejected by the Senate Special Committee on Atomic Energy after a great expression of public opinion in favor of civilian control and after the heads of our War and Navy Departments had testified that the necessities of the military, in order to discharge their responsibility for the national security, were adequately provided for.

My distinguished colleagues on the Military Affairs Committee have thought it wise to make several amendments whose aim is to increase the amount of direct military control in atomic energy development. I refer particularly to (1) the amendment requiring one and permitting two members of the Commission to be military men on active duty; (2) the amendment requiring the Director of the Division of Military Applications to be a military man on active duty; and (3) the amendment permitting the armed forces, with the approval of the President, to maintain their own facilities and manufacture atomic weapons, independently.

I wish to state now that I do not believe that the three amendments just mentioned constitute desirable changes in the bill, and I intend to vote for their removal.

Referring to the first of these amendments, it must be evident that membership on the Commission is a full-time job and that no military man could be on the Commission and have, at the same time, any other military responsibility. However, he could not have an undivided loyalty to the Commission nor could he exercise independent judgment since, as an officer on active duty, he would be responsible to his superiors in the Military Establishment. It is clear that the purpose of this amendment is to increase the amount of direct military control in the top policy-making body which our military leaders tell us they do not require and which the American people do not want.

In connection with all of these amendments, we should recognize the necessity of maintaining our military strength, but we should also recognize the fact that our Government is participating in discussions about international cooperation. We should take care not to prejudice the chances of success in those discussions.

Without the discovery of new ideas and inventions there would have been no discovery of a new world. Thus we see discoveries and inventions of mechanism become the dynamic controls in our modern economic system and make it necessary for political and social adjustments in the structure of the modern world.

Speculation gave us investigation in the field of atomic energy. Experimentation and research by our scientists has given us this problem. This discovery of nuclear fission has caused man to change his conception of the earth and universe.

This is a domestic bill we are dealing with today, and our problem is to work this revolutionary discovery into a self-balancing, self-regulating economic system subject to the natural laws of supply and demand so that it will not tram-

mel or destroy our industrial liberty or our energy that has created our private business enterprise system. After many trials and errors this system has proven to be the best system on earth.

We here in America must take the lead. As the home of the atomic bomb America has a great moral responsibility. And let us pray, we in making our choice will not fail mankind in this tragic hour but will shoulder our responsibility and opportunity and give fresh hope to the stricken world.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. In the information presented to the gentleman's committee, is it true the Army and the Navy both stated that the amendment with reference to military representatives on the Commission is not necessary?

Mr. DURHAM. I am not sure whether they made that statement or not before any committee. Our hearings were held long before the Atomic Committee was set up.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMASON. It is safe to say that the record discloses that the Secretary of War in person and the Under Secretary of the Navy both stated that they favor the bill as it passed the Senate.

Mr. DURHAM. That is correct.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. That is the question I wanted answered.

Mr. DURHAM. The gentleman asked me if they appeared before our committee.

Mr. SHORT. Of course, they know as much about the bill as we do.

Mr. DURHAM. I think so, yes.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Is it not true that the hearings disclose that the reason the Secretary of War said he wanted the Senate bill acted on promptly was his anxiety to get some sort of legislation promptly, and he had no objection to the provision for military representation on the Commission?

Mr. DURHAM. That is correct. Of course, the President sent us his message, as the chairman stated to you, last October, urging us to enact this legislation immediately. Also at that time the War Department appeared before us. General Groves himself appeared before us, and asked that we expedite this legislation. Now here we are here 9 months later.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. In those hearings they advocated a bill that provided for the very representation the gentleman from Ohio mentioned.

Mr. DURHAM. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. The other day they repeated their confirmation of that legislation.

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mrs. LUCE. I have here the statement of Mr. John Kenney, Assistant Secretary of the Navy, which he made before our committee on June 12. He says, and I quote from his own testimony:

The bill in its present form satisfactorily covers the Navy's primary interests in having a voice in the affairs of the Atomic Energy Commission and in being able to conduct its own research and development programs without undue interference from the Commission.

Mr. DURHAM. That is correct.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS].

Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and four Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a brief question?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. Does not the gentleman feel that until the war is officially declared ended, until the peace treaties are written, we certainly should hold onto the secret weapon we now have?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I certainly do. I think there is no necessity for rushing this legislation through. I believe the security of the Nation will be better protected under the present set-up than it would be under this bill.

Mr. Chairman, this measure is a threat to free government. It grants more complete and sweeping power and authority to an executive agency than any other proposal ever considered in the United States Congress. The bill literally places in the hands of a five-man commission complete and absolute authority over American industry and the lives of our entire population. It is shocking and frightening that this proposal could advance as rapidly and get as far in this Congress. I implore the House to reject the bill and send it back to the committee.

Let me call your attention to section 11 (c) of the act, which provides for compulsory licensing of patents. That is to say, instead of giving the inventor an exclusive right in his inventions, in other words, the right to exclude others from the manufacture, use, or sale of an invention, a patentee's invention shall be made subject to the right of others to make, use, and sell the invention upon the payment to the patentee of a reasonable compensation.

Before considering the advantages and disadvantages of compulsory licensing, it is well to point out three distinct accomplishments of the present system of granting exclusive rights to patent owners.

First. By granting to the inventor an exclusive right for a limited time, an incentive is given to him to invent and disclose, not conceal, his invention so that after such period of limited time the invention enters the public domain.

Second. A very important advantage is the encouragement of risk capital to undertake the exploitation of an invention, frequently resulting in new industries arising or old industries expanding.

Third. By granting exclusive rights for inventions there inevitably arises competition in developing inventions. That is to say, inventors get to work inventing a substitute for, or a new way of accomplishing, that which is already patented. Many important inventions have resulted from such competition.

Each of these three advantages will either be completely lost or seriously impaired if a system of compulsory licensing is adopted.

Compulsory licensing of patents has long been a controversial subject. Bills have been introduced at various times, especially since 1912, directed toward encouraging this feature in our patent system despite the fact that it is the negation of the exclusive right provided for in the Constitution. Those bills which originally included compulsory licensing of all patents were promptly amended to include only future patents, since it was realized that compulsory licensing of patents already issued was depriving the patent owner of a property right without due process of law.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNES of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. LANHAM. May I say to the gentleman that the Committee on Patents of the House of Representatives has held steadfastly to the opinion that he has expressed and has consistently refused to endorse or report anything that smacks of compulsory licensing of patents which goes to the very fundamental basis of our progress.

Mr. HARNES of Indiana. I thank the gentleman for that comment, and would add that the Congress as a whole has steadfastly adhered to that program, because it is one of the fundamentals of a free-enterprise system under a free government.

Many and extensive hearings have been held by congressional committees to determine the advisability of legislation in one form or another for compulsory licensing. Such hearings were held in 1912 and 1914 on the Oldfield bills, in 1922 on the Stanley bills, and in 1938 on the McFarland bill. At all of these hearings, patentees, inventors, and manufacturers almost unanimously opposed compulsory licensing mainly on the grounds that it would discourage invention and that it would favor large corporations over smaller corporations and over individuals.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. HARNES of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. Here is a release that all Members of the House should listen to:

"The McMahon atomic energy bill (S. 1717) reflects the blind arrogance of bureaucracy gone mad," declared John W. Anderson, spokesman for small business, today. "The bill would drive American inventive diligence underground. It would create a vast black market in dangerous atomic inventions. Secret agents of foreign governments would find United States inventors cringing from the harsh treatment threatened by their own

government. Fear and resentment would lead to secret deals in which alien agents would get the inventions for black cash."

Mr. HARNES of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, this bill if enacted into law, will surrender the sovereignty of the people of this Nation to a five-man Commission appointed by the Chief Executive.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNES of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I read the bill last night and I could not find any place where there were any criminal penalties that could be invoked against the Commission. While the Commission was given the power to make regulations, the violation of which would be a crime punishable by fine and imprisonment, I found no criminal penalties that could be invoked against the Commission for disclosures or for any other reason. How about that? What does the criminal provision provide as far as members of the Commission itself are concerned?

Mr. HARNES of Indiana. I think this bill would remove all security provisions that we now have against disclosure of secrets that are in the national interest. There is no provision as far as I can remember in this bill that in any way prevents this Commission from disclosing any of the secrets they might get when the Manhattan Project is turned over to them. Moreover, bear this in mind: This Commission is given the authority, believe it or not, of reciprocating information with any foreign nation, and the Congress has no authority to stop it.

Mr. SHORT. Would the very able lawyer from Indiana, one of the finest Members of this House, tell us what the other nations have to give us in reciprocity.

Mr. HARNES of Indiana. Even trying to be generous and fair in reply to that question, I believe the rest of the world has comparatively little to offer now, and that it is hardly likely to have comparatively more anytime in the next several years.

Mr. SHORT. It is all give and no take?

Mr. HARNES of Indiana. That is right. We are habitually on the giving end. Judging from our record, this proposal would keep us there. There is no basis here for dealing, or reciprocating, quid pro quo.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNES of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. ELSTON. As far as this bill is concerned, the Commissioners would have the power and authority to turn over the secrets of atomic energy for industrial purposes, and in return get nothing but good will?

Mr. HARNES of Indiana. That is right.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNES of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. The gentleman has come to the defense of the patent laws of this Nation and the competitive system under which we operate; and I commend him for it. Does he not think, perhaps, Emerson had that in mind when he wrote that when a man builds a better

mousetrap than his neighbor the world will make a beaten path to his door?

Mr. HARNES of Indiana. Absolutely. Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNES of Indiana. Let me proceed with my prepared statement; then I shall be pleased to yield if I have the time.

Witnesses testified that many worthwhile inventions require years of research and experimentation before an invention is attained; and that it ordinarily takes many years to perfect an invention even after the patent is granted. Often such research results in failure before an invention to accomplish the desired purpose is made. Therefore, for a corporation or an individual to obtain by compulsion a license from the patentee or the patentee's official backer would manifestly be unfair, since the person seeking the license does not share in the expense of unsuccessful research and development. Those willing to risk capital in the development of new enterprise would hesitate to do so if, when he is successful, others could come in and share his success by obtaining a license against the will of the patent owner. On the other hand, if the patentee is unsuccessful, he would have to bear his own loss. In short, the testimony of those familiar with the subject has been almost unanimous to the effect that such legislation would discourage invention and new enterprise. Not only would it discourage invention because of lack of incentive such as would be given by an exclusive license, but compulsory licensing would render it unnecessary to compete in making inventions since in the main those wishing to go into a new enterprise would be content to force a license for inventions already made rather than make their own inventions; that is, to create a new and different way of accomplishing the same result. Why take the risk with possible failure when by paying a reasonable royalty he can share the fruits of others' efforts?

The testimony in the above-mentioned hearings has fully brought out the fact that compulsory licensing would lessen the incentive to invent, would discourage the introduction of new enterprises, and would, to a large extent, remove competition in invention. It would, in fact, socialize our patent system.

The question of compulsory licensing, like the provision in the bill for taking away from present patent owners all rights in the field of research and development, involves a highly important constitutional question. Mind you, I have been discussing only one section of this bill. There are many other sections that infringe individual constitutional rights.

Where a serious question of constitutionality is involved, as it apparently is in this issue, there is never any valid excuse for hasty and ill-considered action. But in this question there is utterly no reason whatever for us to act in haste as though we were confronted by a critical emergency, for technically at least we continue to be in a state of war.

Under the circumstances, the President still holds in his hands extraordinary war powers. These proved adequate to provide security in the field of

atomic energy during the period of actual hostilities. They should certainly, therefore, be adequate for the temporary period until peace is formally declared, if the President will exercise them as wisely and firmly as we have the right to expect that he will.

I know it is argued that our failure to take definitive action leaves the rest of the world doubtful and suspicious of America's intentions and that it leaves the field of atomic research and development under military dominance.

Neither argument is valid. In the first place, we have time and time again gone far more than half way to prove to the world that no decent nation, large or small, has reason to doubt or fear us. The Baruch proposal for international controls, standing alone, is sufficient evidence of that. If other nations are not disposed to accept it as such, it is hardly clear how this proposed action could win their confidence and trust.

As for military dominance in the field, the simple fact remains that the President is, in fact, Commander in Chief, and as such is directly superior to this military influence which some people profess to fear. If the President is not disposed to prevent undue military influence in this field now, would you expect him to appoint civilian members to this commission who would be less favorably inclined toward the military viewpoint?

The present controls are purely temporary in nature, and can be quickly terminated or altered. This proposal would establish a permanent system of controls far less subject to change or remedy. A hasty error at this point could easily result in permanent damage.

It cannot be too strongly emphasized that these controls we are asked to adopt are sweeping and all-inclusive in character. Even if any doubts as to their constitutionality are resolved, they are still, in my opinion, too broad to impose upon a free economy without serious results.

I am just as anxious as anyone to protect atomic research and development from military domination. I am deeply concerned that this new force be turned as completely as possible from destructive purposes, and as fully as possible to creative and constructive ends.

But in seeking that end, I certainly do not want to see this new science fall under the blight of bureaucracy, which might be the surest way to defeat the very ends the proposal professes to seek.

I urge that this measure, therefore, be returned to the responsible committees with specific instructions for further and more careful study than the whole question has so far received.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I agree heartily with what the gentleman said about the Baruch proposal to the United Nations Commission on Atomic Energy. I believe that proposition ought to prove to any nation the sincerity of the United States in seeking peace, but I think it

important that our action correspond to that proposal. The gentleman will agree, I hope, those people who are responsible for the preparation of the Baruch proposition were in favor of this bill as written by the Senate?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. That would not influence my feeling on this bill at all. I am frightened at this proposal, I am fearful for my country and our free republican system of government. I do not want to see any commission set up with such sweeping powers over the American people's lives.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. Does the gentleman agree with me that under the provisions of this bill which authorize the appointment of employees, servants, and agents by the commission, they could probably build as large a bureau as the Department of Agriculture if they wanted to?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. The Department of Agriculture would be insignificant compared with what they could do under this authority. There is one section in this bill which would give the commission the authority to set up one of the greatest propaganda bureaus we have ever heard of in this Nation. Why, we voted down funds for OWI, but this would be a super OWI with authority to establish libraries, publish communications, magazines, newspapers, and other kinds of propaganda. It simply is too sweeping and too much power for a commission to have.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has again expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE].

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, it is claimed by those proposing the amendment requiring the President to appoint a representative of the military to the Commission for the Control of Atomic Energy and the amendment permitting the President to appoint two active or retired officers of the Army or Navy to the Commission, that the amendments are necessary in order to give the military adequate representation in atomic energy matters.

Now, everyone will agree that the military should have representation on atomic energy matters.

Everyone will agree that the military should have representation adequate for our national defense.

If S. 1717 as passed unanimously by the Senate does not already provide that adequate representation, then, of course, it should be incorporated into the act.

The only question, then, is: Does S. 1717 provide adequate military representation?

The bill establishes a special military liaison committee of unlimited number to be appointed by the Secretaries of War and Navy. The Commission must advise and consult with this committee on military applications of atomic energy, specifically including all matters affecting bombs, the control of information relating to bombs, and the allocation of materials for military research. Should this

committee be dissatisfied with the Commission's action, proposed action, or failure to act, it may refer the matter to the Secretaries of War and Navy, who may, if either feels the matter is of sufficient importance, refer the question to the President, whose decision will be final.

The act also sets up a military applications division which will specifically carry on military research as directed by the President. This will in no way interfere with military research by the Army.

It is provided in the act that the quantities of fissionable material and bombs to be produced, and the disposition of these bombs are to be determined by the President who, presumably, will act on the recommendations of his military advisers in the War and Navy Departments.

Do these provisions give the military adequate representation in the control of atomic energy?

Who is in the best position to know?

The Commander in Chief of our armed forces?

The President has said:

A Commission established by the Congress for the control of atomic energy should be composed exclusively of civilians.

Only the other day, while this act was before our Military Affairs Committee, the President reaffirmed his support of S. 1717 and said that "it suited him exactly."

The Secretary of War?

Secretary of War Patterson testifying before the House Military Affairs Committee on this act was asked:

Would the War Department be opposed to any amendment to this bill authorizing one or possibly two members of the Commission to be representatives of the armed forces?

He replied, and I quote:

We did not advocate and we do not advocate it. We believe that the national defense aspects—and they are important on atomic energy—are adequately cared for by that paragraph in section 2, providing for the military liaison committee.

The Secretary of the Navy?

Secretary of the Navy Forrestal wrote to the chairman of the Senate Special Committee on Atomic Energy:

Please accept my congratulations on the passage Saturday of your bill for the control and development of atomic energy. It is well drawn and accomplishes what I know you were after from the beginning—a proper balance between civilian and military control. This is not merely my own view but that of the professional people in the naval service.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Can the gentleman tell the Committee the date of Secretary Forrestal's letter?

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. It was the day after the passage of the bill in the Senate. I do not remember the exact date.

The Assistant Secretary of the Navy?

W. John Kenney, in testifying before the House Military Affairs Committee on this bill, said:

In the opinion of the Navy Department, this and the other provisions of section 2 (c) constitute an effective mechanism whereby the armed services will be informed of, and will participate in, the work of the Atomic

Energy Commission having to do with military applications in the atomic energy field. Therefore, the Navy Department strongly supports those provisions of the bill and urges that they be reaffirmed by the committee and by the House of Representatives.

The Chief of Staff?

General Eisenhower has approved this act as it unanimously passed the Senate.

The Chief of Naval Operations?

Admiral Nimitz has approved this act as it unanimously passed the Senate.

I submit, gentlemen, that if the President of the United States, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, the Chief of Staff, and the Chief of Naval Operations—all men responsible for the military defense of the country—if all these military officials are satisfied that S. 1717 provides the military with adequate representation in the matter of atomic energy, who is there among us who will insist on being more patriotic than the defenders of our country?

Who is there among us who would wish to be more militaristic than the military?

There are those who have said, and who will say again: "If this is the legislation which the War Department really wants, why did Secretary of War Patterson first endorse the May-Johnson bill? Can it be he now asks for S. 1717 because he is a good soldier and must follow the lead of his Commander in Chief?"

The best answer is given by Secretary Patterson himself in his testimony before the House Military Affairs Committee. He told the committee:

This bill, S. 1717, was drafted after months and months of work by an able committee in the Senate. Naturally enough, with all of that study devoted to it, and with some 6 months more of development in the background for this bill, it has a number of detailed provisions of a valuable character, I believe, that neither the Stimson committee in the War Department nor this House committee had time to consider. * * * This bill goes further in dealing with the national defense aspects of atomic energy than the earlier bill did. There was nothing in the May-Johnson bill creating a military liaison committee, no specific provision in it at all as to how the Army or the Navy would keep posted on what was going on in atomic energy. This bill does, and it is better in that feature.

It seems perfectly obvious that the only reason the War Department and the Navy Department ask you to pass S. 1717, without any crippling amendments is because they are convinced it is in the interest of national defense to do so. I want a chance to support the Senate version because I believe it is a step toward control of atomic energy. I want to see Congress do something to promote international control of atomic energy. I hope we will avoid giving encouragement to international rivalry for atomic power.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, much has been said here today about the history of this particular bill. The last speaker mentioned something about the various Secretaries of War and the Navy and admirals and generals who are supporting this legislation. I want to say that 8 months ago Secre-

tary of War Patterson supported the May-Johnson bill. He said it was the best bill we could possibly get. Eight months later he came out and supported S. 1717. What happened in the meantime? I will tell you a little bit about what happened in the meantime. On January 29, Secretary of War Patterson, the Secretary of the Navy, and almost all of the leading military and naval men received a directive from the President of the United States. I checked on that directive the other day and called the Under Secretary of War and asked him if he would not give me a copy of it. He said, "No; you have to go to the President"; but a directive was received. As a result of that directive, the Secretary of War and Navy and the Under Secretaries and admirals and generals all supported this particular legislation. Something was said yesterday about who helped to draw up this legislation. Naturally, we do not know the name of every person who helped draw up the legislation, but I am going to name three of them. One is James R. Newman, who is now the special counsel for the Atomic Energy Committee of the Senate. Another is Dr. Edward V. Condon. It is interesting to know in connection with Dr. Condon that he is an appointee of Henry Wallace. Prior to VJ-day when the Russians invited a group of American scientists to visit Russia and attend a conference there, Dr. Condon was one of those invited. It was not until the last minute—and some of these scientists were going over in a Russian plane—that Dr. Condon's permission to leave America was revoked, so he did not make the trip. He is one of those who helped write S. 1717.

The third person is a member of a group at the University of Chicago. This third person is Dr. Harold C. Urey. I have here a letter that Dr. Urey sent to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. LUCE] on November 24, 1945, when we were considering the May-Johnson bill. I want to quote just one sentence from this letter. Dr. Urey said to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. LUCE]:

In addition to your proposed amendment, I personally would like to see all of the penalty and security violations deleted from this bill.

Now, he is one of those who helped draw up S. 1717 and he wants to see all of the penalty violations taken out of the bill. You can just imagine from this what would happen if this civilian commission ever got the atomic-bomb secret or if Dr. Urey became one of the commissioners.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Would the gentleman care to read further to show the reason Dr. Urey gave for wanting to have the penalties withdrawn?

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Yes. He said:

I believe that the Espionage Act of the United States is sufficient to cover violations of many security regulations.

S. 1717, the so-called atomic energy bill, which we are considering today, may turn out to be the most dangerous bill ever introduced in Congress in the history of the United States. Should we

enact it into law, and should it not live up to the high ideals of its sponsors, it could destroy America. A vote in favor of it, therefore, may be a vote to give a potential aggressor nation the atomic-bomb secret. Believe me, it is not worth the risk. I hope, with all the strength at my command, that we can defeat this most vicious measure, and thereby delay action, at least until we have real peace in the world.

S. 1717 is the creature of impractical idealists. I do not say that these one-world-minded persons are unpatriotic. I say that their intense ardor for a better world has blinded them. Their faith in Russia is indicative. And yet, when they advocate a free exchange of atomic secrets with Russian scientists, they completely overlook the fact that all Russian scientists are but tools in a dictatorship of the proletariat. The starry-eyed individuals who molded S. 1717 will strive just as energetically to slack the Atomic Civilian Commission, called for under this legislation. As proof of this, I quote from a document dated June 8, 1946, and picked up at Oak Ridge by the chief investigator for the House Committee on Un-American Activities. The document states, and I quote:

Our next problem is suggesting the right men for appointment to the Atomic Energy Commission.

In this connection, I also desire to read a preliminary report from Mr. Ernie Adamson, chief counsel for the House Committee on Un-American Activities. The report is based on a visit of our colleague, Representative JOHN WOOD, chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities, and Mr. Adamson, to Oak Ridge, June 4 of this year.

The report is as follows:

PRELIMINARY REPORT

JUNE 26, 1946.

Since about the middle of January I have been conducting an investigation concerning subversive activities at, or in connection with, the operation of the Government reservation known as Oak Ridge, Tenn.

It appears that scientific and engineering personnel who have been separated from Government service in connection with the Manhattan District project have organized various small groups in Chicago, New York, Detroit, and other cities and they in turn continue to cooperate with scientific societies whose headquarters are located inside the reservation at Oak Ridge.

About 4 weeks ago Chairman WOOD and I visited the Oak Ridge Reservation and interviewed the Army officers in charge of security, and other persons, including the officers of two scientific societies above mentioned. We took the statements of these people but have not yet received the transcript from the stenographer. The substance of the testimony will show:

1. That these Oak Ridge societies are composed of young men who are classified as scientific researchers or engineers.
2. The activities of these societies are devoted to the creation of some form of world government.
3. These societies are very active in support of international civilian control of the manufacture of atomic materials.
4. These societies are definitely opposed to Army supervision at Oak Ridge and are just waiting for the day when military administration will be thrown out.
5. The society officers whose statements we have taken not only admit communication with persons outside of the United States

but in substance say they intend to continue this practice.

6. The security officers at Oak Ridge think that the peace and security of the United States is definitely in danger.

7. I have obtained a list of active members of these two societies, also copies of literature distributed by them.

8. The CIO is now making a desperate effort to unionize all workers of the reservation. We took statements from the CIO and A. F. of L. organizers. The CIO organizer was very militant and seems to be in close contact with the members of the scientific societies.

9. If jurisdiction and control of the Oak Ridge Reservation passes into civilian hands, the political plans for exploiting the place are well advanced and there would undoubtedly be trouble in the reservation within 6 months.

10. One of the most surprising comments was an expression from one of the young scientists to the effect that the power of the atomic bomb was much greater from a political viewpoint than from its physical aspect.

11. Chairman Wood has in mind a bill which would create Oak Ridge as a permanent Army reservation, separate and apart from the atomic control legislation.

12. My conclusion, based upon the investigation up to date, is that the Army should exercise permanent control over the manufacture of atomic weapons.

ERNE ADAMSON, Counsel,
Committee on Un-American Activities.

Supposing our present President or some future President should be influenced by such a "world government—share the secrets with Russia" contingent and the Atomic Commission should have appointed to it one or more persons of the same pink stripe who in turn would influence the hiring of personnel. Can you imagine the kind of personnel we would get? I want to tell you if this should happen I would not give 10 cents for our ability to retain the atomic-bomb secret another year.

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. I yield.

Mrs. LUCE. With reference to his remarks on the difficulty of getting the proper personnel on the Commission, I would like to draw the attention of the House to the testimony, with which I am sure the gentleman is familiar, in part II of the Senate hearings, page 172, in which Dr. Shapley describes the all but impossibility of finding five men of the proper caliber to serve on this Commission.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. I appreciate the observation of the gentleman. I am not just referring to the Commission, however. I am likewise referring to the persons who will be called upon to guard the secrets down at Oak Ridge, in that we cannot call on the Army as we call on the Army today.

Mr. SHORT. And you have got an advisory committee, a general manager, a division of research, division of engineering, and division of military application. Heaven only knows what sprawling, spawning bureaucracy will be set up if this bill is passed. The sky is the limit.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. As it is now, the atomic-bomb secret is relatively safe. Anyone, from General Groves down, will tell you so. Although they

may admit that attempts have been made and are still being made to get the secret away from us. If the atomic-bomb secret is safe now, then why pass a bill which goes out of its way to endanger such security?

On the question of security, section 10 of the bill, having to do with control of information, not only encourages the dissemination of scientific and technical information to foreign nations but it places emphasis on security regulations indicated by the proverb: "When the horse has been stolen, the fool locks the stable."

Is it any wonder that every Communist and every Communist-front organization is rooting for the passage, without amendment, of S. 1717. I dare say there are many good Americans also rooting for its passage, but I am likewise positive that not 1 out of every 100 Americans know what S. 1717 contains, and I am equally confident that 99 out of every 100 Americans want the atomic-bomb secret kept by us for a while longer.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA. Will the gentleman agree with me that there has as yet been no set-up agreed upon by the United Nations for inspection or limitation of armament, which would include the atomic bomb?

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. That is right. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. O'HARA. Is there any great rush to give our secrets away? When it comes to the time where the nations of the world may want to agree upon a limitation of armaments, inspection of atomic energy, and so forth, can that not be arrived at by the Congress by delegating that authority either by treaty or to our representatives upon the United Nations Organization?

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. There is no doubt about that, no question at all. I wish some Members of this House, including some of the majority members of the Military Affairs Committee, would tell the House just what this rush is all about.

If you want to get the cue of who is pushing hard for the passage of this bill, read the Daily Worker, official organ of the Communist Party in the United States, or read, in the New York papers of last week, the suggestion of the Russian delegate, Andrei H. Gromyko, that "he favors exchange of data at once." If Mr. Gromyko, the Russian, had drawn a bill for American control of atomic energy and the atomic bomb, he could not have drawn a better bill for Russia than S. 1717, under consideration by us today. Further, it is my opinion that Mr. Gromyko is stalling the atomic negotiations in New York until he sees what this Congress is going to do about atomic control. Is it any wonder, therefore, that I ask you to vote "no" on the bill and let us get on to business more helpful to the welfare of this Nation?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM].

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, the many official duties which have been demanding my time have not permitted a thorough study of all the provisions of this measure, but some time ago my attention was called to section 11, with reference to patents, and I have studied that particular section very carefully.

It would be much more than a poor pun or a facetious observation to say of the patent section in this bill for the consideration of a bomb that it is "a-bomb-inable." It would sovietize our American system of patents upon which our prosperity and our progress have been founded.

In his Farewell Address, George Washington, speaking of our fundamental institutions, admonished that the time would likely come when those who were opposed to those institutions and their proper and adequate operation would seek to undermine what they could not directly overthrow. I am inclined to think that these patent provisions, by whomsoever devised, go far beyond the mere mild purpose of undermining.

In our parliamentary system, unfortunately, we do not have a proper jealous regard for the functions and jurisdictions of our respective committees. It is no more the province of the Committee on Military Affairs to deal with patent matters than it is the province of the Committee on Patents to deal with military matters. The subject of patents is a very technical and detailed one. I have been a member of the Committee on Patents for more than 20 years, but I do not profess to be an expert.

Here we have a provision to make obsolete our patent laws and to turn the administration of patent matters over to a commission, the identity of the members of which is still unknown, without any provision that a single member of that commission have any familiarity whatever with our patent laws or our patent system.

The founding fathers of this country were so impressed with the importance of American ingenuity and American inventive genius that for the protection of the inventors of this Nation in making their important discoveries they wrote it into our organic law that for the promotion of science and the useful arts this system should be a fundamental part of our whole governmental philosophy. Thomas Jefferson had as zealous a regard perhaps for this particular provision of the Constitution as for any other, because he realized, as did all of his compatriots of that time and as we, their governmental successors and followers, should realize, that the new republic then and the older republic now depended for its security, depended for its progress, depended for its prosperity, upon the protection of this American genius and American ingenuity which have made our country the outstanding Nation of all the world.

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from Connecticut.

Mrs. LUCE. Is the gentleman familiar with the testimony of Conder C. Henry, former Assistant Commissioner of Patents, which I inserted in the RECORD?

Mr. LANHAM. Yes, I am. I shall call to the attention of the gentlewoman also the testimony and the recommendations of those who from the beginning have been primarily interested in these patents as applied to atomic energy and who have had charge of the operation of atomic energy from its very beginning.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. I am sure the gentleman knows I am not out of harmony with his views on the subject; however, I do feel that he has criticized the House Military Affairs Committee unnecessarily in that we did not assume jurisdiction of the Patent Committee. The thing came to us in a Senate bill.

Mr. LANHAM. I appreciate that fact, but I appreciate the fact also that the Committee on Military Affairs might well have done what the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds did on this very day in considering a bill which, among other provisions, had to do with some affairs within the jurisdiction of the Committee on the District of Columbia; we invited the District Committee or a subcommittee to sit with us in the consideration of those important provisions. You are dealing here with the one fundamental thing that has to do with our progress, and our prosperity, upon which it has depended through the years.

Mr. MAY. I would like for the gentleman to tell my colleagues here and his own colleagues that I invited him to come and testify before the committee and waited on him.

Mr. LANHAM. That is true, because I went to the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs—I am not censuring the chairman of that committee—and told him we of the Committee on Patents were interested in this matter. On the day that it was heard there was a meeting of a committee of which I am chairman and I could not attend. But we did send a man to testify versed in patents, a man who has served as Assistant Commissioner of Patents for many years and also as an examiner, a man who is one of the advisory council of the House Committee on Patents to help us look after patent legislation.

I want to bring to the attention of the committee how much the people who are interested in patents and who know something about them regard this patent provision. I have here a letter received just today from Mr. John W. Anderson, president of the National Patent Council. What is the National Patent Council? That, my friends, is an organization of the small manufacturers of this country; 59 different groups of industries in 38 different States. Surely, we are concerned about their protection, for let me remind you that inventions do not come, in the main, from the high and mighty; they come from the lowly and obscure,

and the very thing which led to my sponsorship of the law to keep patents primarily useful for national defense secrets during the war was the filing of an application for a patent by an elderly gentleman who had never invented anything else in the course of his entire life. Eighty percent of our patents come from individuals and from small operators.

Mr. Anderson has written me as follows:

NATIONAL PATENT COUNCIL,
Washington, D. C., July 17, 1946.

HON. FRITZ G. LANHAM,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LANHAM: We wish to confirm, in behalf of National Patent Council, its approval of the attached draft as a substitute for section 11 of the McMahon atomic energy bill, S. 1717, which we understand will be debated in the House this afternoon.

It is understood that there are to be offered a number of other amendments to the bill. Some have been discussed with National Patent Council and seem desirable, particularly the amendment limiting the duration of the proposed law to 3 years.

Section 11, the council believes, is totally bad in intent and effect. In addition to discouraging invention in the atomic energy field, we believe it would tend to drive American inventive diligence underground. The harsh treatment provided for American inventors it seems certain would increase our exposure to secret disclosures of atomic inventions to undercover foreign agents. This council would deplore thus forcing a black market in inventions relating to the field of fissionable materials.

It is respectfully suggested that Congress examine other sections of this bill carefully to determine the extent to which the entire field of invention, and all industry, would at once be placed automatically within the conclusive control of a presidentially appointed five-man commission in the event that copper, for example, should be proven to be fissionable by any process or under any conditions whatsoever.

National Patent Council, as such, does not presume authority or competence to discuss phases of the bill not relating to research invention, patents, and the patent system. We believe the bill, as it stands, is un-American and contrary to constitutional concepts which have given our country its overwhelming strength.

In the interest of national security section 11 should be deleted from the bill in favor of the substitute provisions hereto attached, which provisions have been the result of many conferences.

Respectfully,

NATIONAL PATENT COUNCIL,
JOHN W. ANDERSON,
President.

Mr. Anderson enumerates some of the reasons why this section should be revised and amended and modified. As a matter of fact it should, in my judgment, and I believe in the judgment of all versed in such matters, be stricken out and referred to the Committee on Patents. But I am going to offer an amendment to supplant section 11 as it is in this bill and try to provide for the protection of American ingenuity and the people primarily interested in promoting our fundamental patent system.

I have also a letter from the chairman of the patent section of the American Bar Association, Mr. Robert C. Watson, addressed to the gentleman from Alabama, the Honorable FRANK W. BOYKIN, chairman of the House Com-

mittee on Patents, calling attention, in addition to the compulsory licensing features of section 11, to the various ways in which the adoption of section 11 would affect deleteriously those who are interested in the progress of America. Mr. Watson writes:

AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION,
July 15, 1946.

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN,
Chairman, Committee on Patents, House
of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BOYKIN: The section of patent, trade-mark, and copyright law of the American Bar Association of which I am the present chairman recently transmitted to the Committee on Military Affairs of the House of Representatives a resolution disapproving the principal patent provisions of the proposed Atomic Energy Act of 1946, S. 1717. While this bill has apparently not been referred to the Committee on Patents of the House of Representatives, of which you are chairman, it nevertheless seems to me to be appropriate to inform you of our views and to express the hope that the members of your committee as individuals may sympathize with the position which we have taken and express their views to others when the proposed act is under discussion on the floor of the House. The resolution, which is quoted below, is applicable to the bill as it now stands since the patent provisions against which the resolution is directed have not as yet been changed.

"Resolved, That the American Bar Association approves the principles of S. 1717 to establish a civilian commission for the control of atomic energy, its materials, material sources, production, and weapons, and the dissemination of information thereof for insuring national security; and further that the association disapproves the bill: (a) insofar as it fails to provide for the review, in camera if necessary, by a constitutional court upon petition of an aggrieved party of any act, declaration, or failure to act of the Commission; and (b) furthermore disapproves the patent provisions of the bill: (1) relating to compulsory licensing, and (2) to prohibiting the creation of patent property for certain subject matter."

This resolution of disapproval originated in the 23-member committee on patent law revision of our section, was approved by the section council of 10 additional practicing patent lawyers, and was submitted with the knowledge and approval of the board of governors of the American Bar Association.

There has just been directed to my attention a draft of a proposed amendment to the pending bill which, if adopted, will have the effect of wholly removing from the bill the patent provisions against which our resolution was directed and substituting therefor a series of new provisions dealing with inventions and patents. This proposed amendment follows:

"Pages 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40: Cancel all of the patent provisions commencing with line 7 on page 34 down to and including line 18 on page 40 and substitute in lieu thereof the following:

"(a) The Commission is authorized to purchase, for the manufacture or use by or for the United States Government, any and all rights in and to any invention or discovery, or application for patent or patent thereon, relating to research on or the production of fissionable material or the utilization of fissionable material or atomic energy.

"(b) The Commission is authorized to condemn, and to determine and make just compensation for, any and all rights in and to any invention or discovery relating to research on or the production of fissionable materials or the utilization of fissionable materials or atomic energy that affects the

national defense and security: *Provided, however,* That upon the determination by the Commission that the national defense or security is no longer involved, any and all rights in and to such invention or discovery shall revert to the owner, subject to a non-exclusive, irrevocable and nontransferable license in favor of the Government.

"(c) When any person who has made an invention or discovery relating to research on or the production of fissionable material, or the utilization of fissionable materials or atomic energy and shall have filed an application for a patent thereon and shall have tendered his invention or discovery to the Government of the United States for its use, he shall, if and when he ultimately receives a patent, have the rights to sue for compensation as provided for in this section, such right to compensation to begin from the date of any use of the invention by the Government: *Provided,* That the Commission is authorized to enter into and effect an agreement with said applicant in full settlement and compromise for the use of his invention by the Government.

"(d) If any person is dissatisfied with the determination of the Commission as to just compensation, he may have his remedy by filing a suit in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, if filed within 6 months after such determination; and such court, on notice to the Commission and other due procedures had, may thereupon determine the amount of the compensation to be paid such person, as the facts in the case may appear; *Provided,* That in any such suit the United States may avail itself of any and all defenses, general and special, that might be pleaded by a defendant in an action for infringement, as set forth in title 50 of the Revised Statutes, or otherwise. Any final judgment rendered against the Commission under any provision of this section shall have like force and effect as a money judgment rendered against the United States by the Court of Claims in a suit in respect of which the United States has expressly agreed to be sued; and the amount of any such final judgment shall be paid out of any appropriation applicable to the case, if any such there be; and when no such appropriation exists said judgment shall be paid in the same manner as judgments rendered by the Court of Claims in cases under its general jurisdiction.

"(e) Any party aggrieved by any final judgment in a proceeding under this section may appeal therefrom to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and upon such appeal said court shall have power to review said judgment and affirm, revoke, or modify the same as upon appeals in other action at law.

"(f) Attorneys appointed by the Commission may appear for and represent the Commission before any Government agency or judicial tribunal with respect to any and all invention, patent, and research matters in which the Commission is involved.

"(g) Any person who has made, or hereafter makes, any invention or discovery utilizing fissionable materials or atomic energy designed or especially adapted for use as or in a military weapon, shall file with the Commission a report containing a complete description thereof. The report covering any such invention or discovery shall be filed on or before whichever of the following is the latest: (1) The sixtieth day after the date of enactment of this act; (2) the sixtieth day after completion of such invention or discovery; or (3) the sixtieth day after such person first discovers, or first has reason to believe that such invention or discovery is especially useful as or in such a weapon."

The principal purpose of this letter is to state to you, on behalf of the section of patent, trade-mark, and copyright law of the American Bar Association, that the pro-

posed amendment is, in my opinion, entirely consistent with the previously expressed views of our group and acceptable to it, and that, if the amendment is adopted, our resolution of disapproval of the patent provisions of the bill will no longer apply. The newly suggested patent clauses do not contain those provisions which we originally found to be objectionable but nevertheless appear to amply protect the interests of the public and to insure the national safety while at the same time recognizing and preserving the rights of inventors, research groups, and those who bear the financial risk involved in the exploitation of new inventions, to the end that the advancement of the art of the utilization of atomic energy will not lag behind the advancement of other arts.

Respectfully,

ROBERT C. WATSON,
Chairman.

I have a similar letter—and these I shall incorporate in the Record—from Mr. John A. Dienner, president of the American Patent Law Association, past chairman of the patent section of the American Bar Association, and he has also held a number of other offices of importance. His letter follows:

BROWN, JACKSON, BOETTCHER
& DIENNER,
ATTORNEYS AND COUNSELORS,
Chicago, July 5, 1946.

Re: S-1717, Atomic Energy Act.

HON. FRITZ G. LANHAM,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am writing to call attention to a fundamental mistake which is being made in the patent provisions of the above bill.

It is apparent to me that those provisions were drafted on the erroneous assumption that a patent confers on the grantee the right to practice the invention, and hence it was assumed that if the Government granted a patent to someone on some phase of atomic energy, it would be conferring upon him the right to practice that phase of atomic energy.

This is fundamentally wrong. The patent does not confer upon the patentee the right to practice the invention covered by the patent. It confers only the right to keep others (excepting the Government and its contractors and subcontractors) from practicing the invention without the permission of the patentee.

This basic error pervades the entire section on patents and inventions (sec. 11), pages 32 to 38 of the draft of June 5, 1946, and leads to numerous inappropriate provisions.

The bill should be referred to the House Committee on Patents where this error and its consequences may be rectified by suitable amendment. I should be glad to appear before the House committee to assist it in its consideration of the bill.

Yours very truly,

JOHN A. DIENNER.

Let me climax this opposition to section 11 with this statement: There have been conferences in the last few days among those who are specially informed concerning the significance of patents as they relate to atomic energy. I refer primarily to Capt. Robert A. Lavender of the Navy. Now, who is Capt. Robert A. Lavender? He is the adviser on patent matters to the Office of Scientific Research and Development, and he was designated also by the War Department as the adviser to the commanding general of the Manhattan District in carrying on this atomic energy project, and

he has, from the very beginning, been connected with this organization and its operation in that regard. He has recommended the adoption of the amendment which I shall offer to supersede the committee provision of section 11 with reference to patents.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. The very able gentleman from Texas has hit the nail right on the head because under the provisions of this bill no individual or corporation can really go ahead and work and experiment and produce until they get a license from the Commission.

Mr. LANHAM. Absolutely, and if you want to kill the goose that laid the golden egg, that hatched into our golden prosperity all through our American history, just adopt section 11 in this bill.

You have heard a good deal about black markets in recent days. Of course, primarily we are all interested in food, for we need its nourishment and its sustenance to continue our lives and our activities. But from the standpoint of governmental philosophy, if you want to encourage a black market that will drive a dagger into the heart of American progress and American hopes, then adopt this section 11 as it came from the committee.

Why do I say that? Because if there is to be such regimentation as provided in section 11 of any inventor or any discoverer of something primarily useful perhaps in military affairs and also in our civilian life, he must turn it over willy-nilly to this Commission and let this Commission do whatever it may please with it. It is not unreasonable to suppose that there may be some who will be influenced to a slight extent at least by the profit motive which has characterized so much of our American life. Can you not very readily perceive that, with the destruction of our American patent system and turning it over to those absolutely unversed in this fundamental law and its important consequences, we furnish a very fertile field for the agents of foreign governments to divert the discoveries of American genius to those who are hostile to our American purposes and to our American philosophy?

In accordance with permission given to insert in the Record the amendments suggested by the conference hereinbefore referred to, I append these amendments, with the exception of the proposed substitute for section 11 which is included in the letter from Mr. Robert C. Watson:

Page 15, line 24, after "material" insert "owned by it."

Page 16, line 4, cancel "pursuant to a license issued."

Page 18, line 5, cancel ", are unimportant" and insert "do not constitute hazards to national health or security."

Page 18, line 11, cancel "inconsistent with the national welfare" and substitute therefor "constituting a hazard to national health or safety."

Page 18, line 21, cancel "are unimportant" and substitute therefor "do not constitute a hazard to national health or safety."

Page 19, lines 2 and 3, cancel "to the extent it deems necessary to effectuate the pro-

visions of this act" and insert in lieu thereof "upon determination that such action is necessary in the interest of the common defense and security."

Page 19, line 17, after "inspections" insert "with or without the consent of the owner thereof."

Page 19, lines 20, 21, 22, and 23, cancel the following sentence: "Such exploratory operations may be conducted only with the consent of the owner, but such investigations and inspections may be conducted with or without such consent."

Page 22, line 7, after "materials" insert "owned by it."

Page 24, line 23, substitute "(a) or (b)" for "(A) or (B)."

Page 25, line 2, after "device," insert "when such manufacture or use constitutes a hazard to national health or safety."

Page 25, line 17, after "facts" insert "and its opinions."

Page 25, lines 18 and 19, cancel "the Commission's estimate of the social, political, economic, and international effects of such use."

Pages 26 and 27, cancel lines 22, 23, and 24 on page 26 and all on page 27 down to and including the word "results" in line 17 on that page and substitute in lieu thereof the following: "the Commission in issuing such licenses shall grant them for such periods and under such procedures as the Commission may establish. The granting of such licenses shall be in such a manner as to encourage competition, and where licenses are granted the Commission will not as a condition precedent require the licensees to disseminate technical information and data concerning activities carried on pursuant to such licenses."

Page 48, line 11, cancel "or" and insert "or 11 (g)" after "6 (b)."

Page 50, insert the following between lines 16 and 17: "(b) The term 'nuclear fission' shall be construed to mean that process which takes place in nuclei wherein the nucleus is split into fragments, at least two of which contain a substantial fraction of the mass of the original nucleus."

Page 50, line 17, substitute "(c)" for "(b)."

Page 50, line 24, substitute "(d)" for "(e)."

Page 51, line 8, substitute "(e)" for "(d)."

Page 51, line 11, substitute "(f)" for "(e)."

Page 51, line 18, substitute "(g)" for "(f)."

Page 51, line 25, substitute "(h)" for "(g)."

Page 53, insert a new section between lines 7 and 8, as follows:

"Sec. 21. This act shall expire 3 years after the date of its approval."

Page 53, line 9, substitute "22," for "20, 21."

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. JOHN J. DELANEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 1717) for the development and control of atomic energy, had come to no resolution thereon.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The Chair declares a recess of the House subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock p. m.) the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

GEN. ALEXANDER PAPAGOS

The SPEAKER. The Chair designates the gentleman from Massachu-

setts [Mr. McCORMACK] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] to escort the distinguished guest into the Chamber, who will take his place in the well of the House, where he may be presented to the Members individually.

At 3 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m., the Doorkeeper, Mr. Ralph Roberts, announced Gen. Alexander Papagos, commander in chief of the Greek Armies and the British Expeditionary Forces during the war in Greece.

The SPEAKER. Members of the House, it is my very great pleasure, and I deem it a distinct honor, to have the privilege of presenting to you this great citizen of the world, the general of the Greek Armies, Gen. Alexander Papagos.

General Papagos stood in the well of the House, where he was introduced to the Members of the Congress individually.

At 3 o'clock and 13 minutes p. m., the general retired from the Chamber.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order at 3 o'clock and 14 minutes p. m.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANHAM asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole and to include therein letters and a copy of a proposed amendment.

THE ATOMIC ENERGY ACT OF 1946

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (S. 1717) for the development and control of atomic energy.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, S. 1717, with Mr. JOHN J. DELANEY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mrs. LUCE].

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Chairman, if a man, in order to get home safely, must walk along the brink of an abyss, he does well to take that trip with his eyes open and in clear weather. We want, if we can, to avoid the abyss of atomic warfare. It seems that the only road home does skirt that abyss; and unhappily, it is the totalitarian road of the legislation before us. Let us take it if we must. But, in the name of all our liberties, let us take it with our eyes wide open.

I arise in support of S. 1717, an act for the control and development of atomic energy, with a very heavy heart, indeed. We all remember—I believe somewhat unpleasantly—the President's recent emergency strike-control bill. Well, that bill was a tender affirmation of pre-New Deal rugged individualism compared with the socialistic character of this bill. Some sections of S. 1717 might have been written by the most ardent Soviet Commissar. Indeed, the patent provisions—section II—are paralleled nowhere except in Soviet patent law. I urge upon my colleagues, whose legal training

equips them to do so, to give their sharpest attention to the amendments offered on this section of the bill.

I am not alone in my opinion of the bill's politically revolutionary character. Through the entire course of the Senate debate on June 15 the author himself, the brilliant and able Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] candidly stated that it was unique in American history.

This is a distinct departure from our way of doing things—

he said, speaking of the bill's compulsory licensing provisions. And—

included in this bill are some things which the committee accepted only reluctantly. * * * I would be less than frank with the Senate if I did not emphasize that in some respects we have departed from all our former methods of handling public questions.

And again:

This bill is full of provisions which I would not subscribe to in any other connection (but atomic energy). * * * These extraordinary measures (should) not be considered as a precedent for other legislation.

A study of the McMahon committee's lengthy hearings will reveal how profoundly disturbed all the Members were by the socialistic implications of this unprecedented piece of legislation.

The deceptive language of the declaration of policy to the contrary, there is not one single provision in this bill which will be of substantial aid in promoting world peace, except as it allows for the integration of domestic with international control of atomic energy. Nor is there in it—to quote the New Deal jargon of the preamble again—anything that will increase the standard of living. And as for strengthening free competition in private enterprise—another favorite preamble phrase of the New Dealers—there is many a section which does precisely the opposite. Provision after provision muzzles free competition and depresses incentive and production in all mining, industrial, patent, and invention fields which impinge at any point on the manufacture of nuclear energy.

Why then did the Senate support it so unanimously, and why must this House support it after amendment?

We must support it because nuclear energy, still in its infancy, contains horrible powers for mass destruction. And we dare not, in these oppressive and troubled times, leave the raw materials and processes of nuclear fissions, which even if developed in all good faith for peaceful purposes, are rapidly convertible to bomb manufacture, in the hands of private citizens.

S. 1717 is a tragically necessary defense measure in a world which may again, in 5 or 10 years, flame into total war.

Let me quote a paragraph from the so-called Acheson or State Department report on the international control of atomic energy:

Today, the United States has a monopoly in atomic weapons. We have strategic stock piles; we have extensive facilities for making the ingredients of atomic bombs and for making the bombs themselves; we have a large group of people skilled in the many arts which have gone into this project; we have experience and knowledge obtainable only

in the actual practice of making atomic weapons; we have considerable theoretical knowledge of the field which may appear inadequate in future years, but which enables us to evaluate not only the performance of the past, but also what the future is likely to hold.

The chief merit, if not the only merit of this bill, is that it allows our Government to maintain and protect our monopoly of atomic weapons by seizing, operating, and using all available source materials, stock piles, facilities, installations, information and know-how for making bombs.

Atomic energy today is preponderantly a weapon—a weapon of catastrophic character. This bill controls and safeguards for the United States of America all atomic weapons of the present, and permits the development of bigger and better—or one should say—worse ones, if this Nation should, in spite of all its sincere efforts in the direction of international control, be forced into a world-wide race in atomic armament.

It seems to me that there is nothing to be gained by this House trying to deceive itself, or the American people about the true intent of this legislation, which is to secure and promote, for so long as we can, or until international atomic control is achieved, our national monopoly of this fearful weapon. Moreover, even if we deceived ourselves today into believing that this is preponderantly a bill for the peaceful development of atomic energy, we should not in the least deceive our world neighbors who will see at once right through the sweet and peaceful language of the preamble to the explosive heart of the matter: the bill's intent is to enable our Nation to amass an adequate stock pile of bombs for the purpose of defense and attack in war—should war again be suddenly thrust upon us, and to keep pace, in the research, and experimental fields with new processes in nuclear fission. It is the latter urgency which above all requires civilian control and civilian participation. That is why we must not leave the matter in the hands of the military who, while they can preserve the atomic status quo, can never make advances in this field. Under a civilian commission alone can such advances, in this twilight peacetime be made.

I do not support the House amendments which require one, and permit two, military members on the Commission, because it seems to me that their presence there is superfluous. The Military Liaison Committee provided for in the Senate version adequately safeguards Army and Navy interests in the program of a committee, which in spite of its all civilian character, must be, until world peace is assured, chiefly devoted to military, or defense and security, considerations. Moreover, the assumption of those who offered these amendments is somewhat illogical. They seem to believe that the President may err in the choice which is his, under the bill, of five wise and patriotic civilians, but will be able to pick, among the military, with inspired wisdom.

These amendments provide a straw issue, which if too long or passionately debated here, will distract the House

from a useful consideration of the sections of the bill concerning compulsory licensing and patents, and its other unique and socialistic features.

The same holds true for the argument against the committee amendment requiring a military officer to be director of the Military Applications Division. I, personally, favor for several reasons keeping an all-civilian facade on this Commission, if for no other reason than that the appearance of military men on the Commission is sure to discomfort our own people, who are traditionally alarmed when members of the armed forces are given undue prominence in peacetime. Americans are wont to view them as omens of war, and an attempt to reverse the historic American policy, which is to keep everyone visually, if not psychologically, "in civies", until a split second after the first shot is fired at us.

I am also against the amendment which permits the President to authorize the armed forces to manufacture atomic bombs. Unless we are to assume—surely a most unpatriotic assumption—that the President will deliberately choose five subversive civilians bent on leaving this country weak and defenseless, this provision may result in either an exhausting duplication of effort, or in a constant wrangle between the armed forces and the Commission, as to which shall make the bombs, and how many.

There are only two consoling features about this socialistic, though I repeat necessary, legislation:

First. It gives scientists and technologists, and those who may be able to use fissionable material in medical therapy, and other scientific investigations of Nature's beneficial secrets, every freedom consistent with its major concern: The complete control and improvement of bomb manufacture, in order to secure our country's defense.

Second. The legislation permits, though it does not promote, the integration of domestic or national control, with a world plan for atomic control.

When—or rather, if—a reliable and effective mechanism for the international control of atomic energy can be formed in the UN, the domestic controls provided by this bill can be quickly and smoothly geared into the controls of that authority.

To be sure, the best opinion, as reflected in the State Department and Baruch reports, holds that it may be several, or even many years before such a world authority can be set up, and made effective. Every provision of this domestic bill will have to be duplicated on an international scale. Any world authority to be effective must begin with world ownership of all atomic raw materials, and provide rigid international inspection and licensing systems. The acceptance of these prime conditions may call for a greater abandonment of national sovereignty than some nations will endure. Still, the creation of an effective world authority, along the lines laid down by Mr. Baruch, is not impossible, though I confess it seems to me unlikely. Nevertheless, to this noble task we must dedicate all our efforts.

We must pray, in the name of survival itself, that the UN can be employed for atomic control.

But, until that day comes, it is plain that this Nation must embrace, however, reluctantly, the legislation before us, which is a complete device for domestic control of a highly expensive, highly complicated, highly industrialized, and highly dangerous process, which is rapidly convertible to the purposes of war.

And now, while I support this bill, as a defense measure in a world which is no nearer peace than it was 10 years ago, I feel that there should be laid before you the very real dangers to our American way of life involved in keeping this bill on the books as permanent legislation.

If all peace treaties had been signed and agreeably accepted; if the desperate political chaos of Central Europe and Asia had begun to resolve itself into democratic order; if Soviet Russia showed a sincere inclination to retire to her prewar borders, and to disband her Trojan horse political parties in our own and other countries; if the United Nations were really one big happy family; and if there were not, according to the State Department report, "the already launched international armament race"; in short, if we entertained the heart-warming hope of world peace, instead of the soul-sickening fear of a third world war, I should fight this bill to the last ounce of my strength. For in such circumstances, this bill could, and perhaps would, then be used as a perfect instrument for the socialization of America.

Let us for a moment indulge in an act of imagination. Let us suppose that some American scientist, in the year 1776, had not only discovered electricity, but had managed to run it through a high voltage cable. Imagine that this was the first way that electricity had ever appeared on the world scene. Let us then suppose General Washington had been able to spread this secret invention before the path of a regiment of Red Coats, who in crossing it, were fried to a cinder, every man jack of them. In short, let us imagine that the first known application of electrical energy was for the electrocution, in war, of a thousand men. The fear and horror aroused by this sizzling incident throughout the civilized world of 1776 would have been quite as great as the fear and horror caused by our bombing of Hiroshima.

"Americans discover ghastly weapon for mass destruction," every paper in the world would have proclaimed. And: "New and revolutionary form of energy threatens to destroy mankind." And so on. And then suppose we had been able to keep "the secrets of electrical energy" until the First American Congress assembled. That Congress would have been, in those circumstances, I believe quite justified in proclaiming—I now use the language of the bill before us:

The significance of electrical energy for civilian purposes upon the social, economic, and political structures of today cannot now be determined. It is a field in which unknown factors are involved.

And that First Congress would have been quite as justified as this one is for

patriotic and political reasons in passing a bill for the "development and control" of the new energy.

Is there any need to develop this thought? If you will read this bill, imagining that it had been passed, say in the year 1800, for "electrical energy", you will see at once how totally different the economic and political development of America might have been. As to whether or not our living standards would be as high as they are now, after a hundred years of Government monopoly of electric power, is for each man to decide according to his own political philosophy. It is also any man's guess as to whether our monopoly in the electrical energy field would have promoted peace or encouraged war. But one thing is certain: That Government monopoly of electrical energy would not have encouraged free enterprise. If that legislation had remained on our books, by this time we would be a fully matured Socialist state.

Let us get this quite straight in our own minds: It is not what men discover that changes the structure of society; it is how men legislate upon those discoveries which change the structure of society.

At one point in his debate on the Senate floor, Senator McMAHON said:

The committee became convinced that (atomic energy) wrote its own rules. It writes them out of the sheer necessity that is inherent in this tremendous force.

Now that is, I submit, nonsense. And Senator McMAHON must have thought so himself, for at the end of this very same debate, he concluded by saying:

Aware of their unique responsibility as molders of (atomic energy) the committee members labored long and arduously to forge in the fires of democratic action the finest instrument they could devise in the discharge of their grave assignment.

Neither Senator McMAHON, nor we, nor the scientists, nor anybody with a logical mind can have the proposition two ways: either atomic energy molds us, as he first claimed, or we mold atomic energy, as he afterwards stated. The latter is, of course, the truth. The plain fact is that this man-made law will mold the use of God-given atomic energy. Nor was this bill written, as the able Senator claimed "out of the sheer necessity inherent in that"—inhuman—"tremendous force." This bill was written out of the human horror and fear that gripped the Senators when they thought of the tremendous human forces in other lands that might one day be able to hurl atomic bombs in a surprise attack on us. Human fears alone—chiefly of foreign powers—devised this law, which is—or should be—a law for keeping us supreme in the field of nuclear fission, and at the same time keeping the knowledge of how to make bombs away from our enemies. The able Senator said that this bill was forged in the fires of democratic action. It was not. It was forged in the fires of totalitarian action which are sweeping toward the West, and have already begun to burn holes in the fabric of our democratic civilization. Our fears concerning the future intentions of aggressive totalitarian nations dictated this bill; and its provisions were born of a psychological neces-

sity, and not a scientific one: the dread of sudden attack, and the belief that one way, perhaps, to forestall it, was to be in a position to retaliate overwhelmingly.

We have devised this law, not to encourage the free enterprise system, or industrial research, or even the means of curing cancer and leukemia, but to protect ourselves so long as we can from greedy and lawless enemies.

But to return to the inherent threats in this necessary bill to our whole American way of life, in the event it should stay permanently on the books in a time of real peace in the world:

In chapter I of section III of the State Department report, there appears this significant phrase, which may or may not have been written by Mr. David Lillenthal, of TVA fame, one of the reputed authors; and, according to rumor, a man slated to be one of the five atomic commissioners. I quote:

Reactors for producing denatured plutonium will be large installations, and by the nature of the process they will yield large amounts of energy as a byproduct. As the technology of power development by this method expands, ways will be found for utilizing this power both as heat and electricity. The existing plants are not designed to operate at a sufficiently high temperature for the energy to be used for the generation of electrical power. One of the first research and development problems—of the Authority—would be to develop designs of reactors such that the energy released would be in form usable for the generation of electrical power.

And again, in chapter III of section II of the same report:

We believe that the development of rather large power units for heat and conversion to electrical energy is a program for the near future; that operating units which will serve to demonstrate the usefulness and limitations of atomic power can be in existence within a few years, and that only the gradual incorporation and adaptation of such units to the specific demands of contemporary economy will involve a protracted development.

If Mr. Lillenthal is correct, and I believe he is, in assuming that atomic energy could be used to generate electrical power, and if this legislation stayed on our peacetime books, the commissariat—which is what this commission would then become—could at vast public expense develop public power which could, and perhaps would, put all privately owned power plants out of business one by one, slowly or rapidly. Thus, in passing I call to the attention of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] that this bill offers the means of encompassing a cherished project of his: TVA.

I think that an awareness of the vast socialistic import, in the power field, of this legislation, may explain much of the violent left-wing enthusiasm for the bill and the fervent support that the Daily Worker has given this legislation until recently.

Here are some further clues which will perhaps help us to understand the hot-eyed support some left-wingers are throwing toward this bill:

On page 50, line 14, the definition of atomic energy is so broad that a commission of purposeful left-wingers could conceivably control practically all forms

of energy now in use, which is not surely the intent of the authors.

On page 11, line 17, and on page 12, line 3, the language makes the Commission the exclusive owner of all facilities for the production of fissionable materials, other than facilities useful in certain very limited fields of research. This completely does away with private enterprise and free competition in these fields, even where the production of fissionable material does not constitute a hazard to public health or national security. No such Government monopoly exists in any other field in America today.

On page 13, line 24, and page 51, line 25, in connection with manufacture of production facilities, the term "facilities" is so broadly defined that it can include equipment which may have been designed for other purposes, by or for industries having originally nothing to do with nuclear fission.

On page 26, line 8, the licensing powers for private use of atomic energy are so arbitrary and so cramping in time, that it is impossible to imagine any person or organization willing to risk funds in any enterprise making use of atomic energy. This further increases and entrenches complete Government monopoly of the production of atomic energy, even where that production does not endanger public health or national security.

Under section 10, called Control of Information, there are provisions for the dissemination of information which authorizes the Commission to establish libraries, newspapers, and employ all information channels, according to its own discretion. The type of information is not clearly defined. Such information services might make the OWI look like penny pamphleteering; and it is only reasonable to suppose that a vast permanent bureaucracy might use it for the dissemination of political ideas, under the guise of helping the common man to understand the atomic age.

I have already referred to the dangers inherent in the patent provisions, section 11. This section represents a complete departure from the fundamental and basic principles of the United States patent system, for it removes patent protection in the whole field of the production of fissionable material, and in the field of the utilization of fissionable material for military weapons, as well as for all inventions, to the extent that they are used in the conduct of research or development activities in certain prescribed fields. It revokes patents already granted, and would prevent the patenting of research instruments manufactured for the conduct of research in this field.

The patent provisions alone will affect thousands of patents. One has only to reflect on the immense variety of the industrial equipment used in the Manhattan project, to understand this. There are some of the socialistic features of the bill which might change the structure of our government in the event that in peacetimes, the Commission should ever be controlled by men of the mind, say of Harold Laski.

If, in view of the needs of national security, it should prove unwise to modify

by amendment all these socialistic features, I should then support any amendment calling for the expiration of this act at the end of a reasonable time. For while I do not view this sovietizing of American power sources, and all related facilities and inventions, as an imminent possibility, if there is not adopted an amendment for the expiration of this act at the end of a reasonable time, it becomes a possibility in the next two decades.

I repeat, there is nothing in the "logic of atomic energy" which requires that atomic energy must be used to sovietize America. Only a human mind is capable of logic, or for that matter, of illogic, as when a man speaks of the "logic of atomic energy." If America is eventually sovietized, as a result of the wartime discovery of atomic energy, it will be because the Congress, in fear and funk, allowed itself to be duped by the belief so dear to the heart of the mystical Marxian that logical matter disposes of mindless man, rather than that logical man disposes of mindless matter. Energy and matter, which we now know to be one, are both amoral. Man only is moral or immoral. We have only to reflect that if all the large nations of the world were led today by moral men, instead of immoral ones, atomic energy, like all the other power sources, coal, gas, oil, electricity, which we have developed in the ways of peace before, would not require such totalitarian legislation as this for their peaceful development.

The really immoral feature of this bill is that it implies, if indeed it does not state, that in time, atomic energy itself, can and will automatically provide "the answers to the atomic age" without any mental effort on our part; that it will one day solve all our social, political, and economic problems, like some powerful, alert, conscious genie out of a bottle. Well, it will not. Not any more than coal, or gas, or oil, or electricity, or radar, or radio, or television have solved in the past the recurrent problems of war and peace.

The plain fact is, that whether we pass this bill or not, we are still going to have to face, in the years ahead, the problem of industrial unrest, the problem of famine and revolution in Europe, and, above all, the problems created by Soviet ambitions and Soviet ideologies. The discovery of nuclear fission has not changed, and will not solve, one underlying problem in the world today. At worst, in the form of bombs it can aggravate them greatly. At best, in the form of heat or electrical energy, or cancer and leukemia cures, it can ameliorate them only slightly.

Moreover, today and tomorrow we will do well to remember that every scientist who testified before our committee, or the Senate committee, said that in from 5 to 15 years Soviet Russia, and any industrial nation with access to sources of uranium and thorium can make atomic bombs—and they insisted of a destructive capacity so much greater than the present bombs will look by comparison like fire crackers. So this bill, which can never solve our domestic economic prob-

lem, except as some in this House may imagine that communism is a cure-all, gives us only a temporary respite from the fear of atomic warfare, even as a defense measure. Only a wholly effective system of world nuclear control can guarantee us for the next two decades against atomization.

And even if we do achieve international control, we will not have solved the problem of war itself. I am sorry to be so realistic, but I think that the American people are at long last hungry for truth, however painful. V-1's and V-2's and large flights of B-17's and B-29's will still suffice for greedy or frightened nations which are driven by their greeds or fears toward mutual obliteration.

We have heard little to date of the existing new and terrible discoveries in biological and chemical warfare, even more frightful than atomic bombs. Senator McMAHON warned that this legislation must not become a precedent for new legislation. Those will require new legislation for which this legislation will possibly be a precedent.

No; we have not solved any fundamental problem of peace or war with this bill. But, nevertheless, I am for it, for its passage will give our beloved Nation a few more years in which to think through the problems of our international relations. And think hard and straight and honestly, like courageous, liberty-loving, and God-fearing Americans, is what we've all got to do, if we really hope to avoid another Armageddon.

Mr. Chairman, the real problem of the age is how shall we find economic and physical security, while at the same time safeguarding our political liberties. This legislation, S. 1717, epitomizes this crucial problem of our age. It does, without any shadow of doubt, promise us at least 5 years of security from atomic attack. But its essential principle, which is state monopoly and control in the hands of a few administrative appointees, strikes near to the heart of political liberty.

Patrick Henry said, "Give me liberty or give me death."

Perhaps before this debate is over many of you may feel inclined to echo Patrick Henry's noble words.

But let me point this out: If your choice were truly a personal one, that is to say, if you, as one individual preferred death to losing your political liberties—you would be justified and even honored for making it.

But your choice is not personal, unhappily. If you vote against this bill you may be choosing death for millions of your fellow citizens by atomization.

I, for one, dare not make such a ghastly choice. I support S. 1717, because I believe it offers the best possible solution to the problem of defending countless American lives in a world which is neither at war, nor at peace.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. LUCE. I yield to the able gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. The gentlewoman mentioned the witnesses we had before the committee on this bill,

Of course the gentlewoman recalls that we had only two witnesses on this bill.

Mrs. LUCE. That is correct, but as they represented the Army and the Navy and one of them was the Secretary of War himself, and they expressed themselves as quite satisfied with their representation in this bill, I am willing to believe that they are satisfied, and are sincere in not wanting any more representation than that afforded by the Military Liaison Committee.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Does not the gentlewoman believe, though, that we should have more witnesses in connection with this very important matter?

Mrs. LUCE. The gentleman has asked a most important question.

Let me assure my colleagues that since this atomic matter first appeared in the House as a legislative matter everybody, the War Department and all its witnesses, the scientists who appeared before our committee and the Senate committee, and every member of both committees, has changed his mind over and over as the subject unfolded before him. By that I mean that in our almost 6 or 8 months' effort to understand this evolved and still-evolving legislation, we find that every day, even every hour, that we consider it, we see some new angle or significance both in the legislation itself and in the world-wide implications of atomic warfare. I just do not believe that for some miraculous reason, at the precise end of the 5 months' Senate hearings, the Senators learned, felt, understood, and knew everything they or we would ever be expected to understand on the subject of atomic-energy legislation. If the Senate committee had gone on one more month this bill would have been a different bill. And if we go on two more months or three more months, it will also be a different bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. LUCE. I yield to my colleague from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. In one of the hearings the gentlewoman tried to develop the point with the Secretary of War that it might be possible to divide the problem up into two parts, one the military aspect and one the civilian aspect. Would the gentlewoman enlighten us on her ideas on that?

Mrs. LUCE. I will come to that if time permits me to develop it in my statement.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. LUCE. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. Of course, the bill itself in the first section states that this is a field in which unknown factors are involved; therefore any legislation will necessarily be subject to revision from time to time.

Mrs. LUCE. Obviously, I wish someone would tell me a field of any sort in which unknown factors are not involved. This statement, in the preamble, is naturally superfluous.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. LUCE. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DURHAM. May I call to the gentlewoman's attention that this bill permits research in weapons by the armed forces?

Mrs. LUCE. Yes; that is quite correct. I thank my colleague, and, as I said before, the military services appear quite satisfied with the atomic scope afforded them by the bill. What I am dissatisfied with is the socialistic scope which the bill would afford the civilian representatives in the power field in peacetime.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. LUCE. I gladly yield to our chairman.

Mr. MAY. I believe you stated that it gives every possible freedom to individuals in scientific research and that the Commission can prohibit the War Department from doing anything about it.

Mrs. LUCE. That is correct—every freedom is accorded to the scientists, as a category consistent with Government control and monopoly. In this connection, may I point out that the main element in the development of atomic energy is precisely scientific personnel. It is the heart of the problem, really. By the very nature of the subject all fundamental developments leading to further applications of sources of nuclear energy for war or peace must come from physicists, chemists, and mathematicians, and, to a less extent, inventors. All fundamental changes in the processes must originate in the minds of men—specifically, scientists. Mind molds matter, Marxians to the contrary. This is why civilian control is necessary if we are to make progress. The two or three hundred keymen in the nuclear field will, I fear, just not work for the Army, in an Army framework, or under Army regulations, in peacetime. This bill does give them a maximum of freedom, with which they may then be able to make maximum efforts in further research.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. LUCE. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I think the gentlewoman's analogy about the discovery of electrical energy in 1776 was very interesting, if one thinks about it, because, after all, in 1776 Benjamin Franklin, one of the authors of the Constitution, had discovered electricity. They all realized that it was a power that would change the whole world. What did they do? They buttressed the young Government with a policy of friendliness toward all and justice toward all, and they did not give the invention to one small group of people like the Lehman Bros., or whoever will compose this commission that Mr. Truman may appoint, but they let the people use it in the interest of freedom. It seems to me the way to handle this thing is to do it the way they did then. That has been proved a success. Let the Army use it for their purposes, and let the rest of the people use it for their purposes.

Mrs. LUCE. The lady will excuse me, but my own analogy somewhat breaks down when I compare electrical energy

with nuclear energy, for while it is not a difference in kind, it is a difference in degree. There is no shadow of doubt that the potential destructive force of electrical energy in the year 1800, or even now, cannot be compared with the destructive potentials of atomic energy.

THE "SECRETS OF THE BOMB"

And now, Mr. Chairman, under leave to revise and extend my remarks at this point, I would like to add a few words about this highly controversial question of the bomb's "secrets." Some Members speak as though there were one, or even a dozen, or 20 bits of paper containing atomic formulas which, if they could be "handed over," or "snatched," would destroy our national supremacy on atomic bombs. Anyone who has studied, even as a layman, this subject knows that there is no such manageable sheaf of formulae to hand over.

For the last 7 years every physicist in the world has realized that in principle, nuclear energy could be released from certain substances and practically all of them knew, broadly, how to do it. At the same time every atomic scientist realized that this would be a staggering job, many thought too immense to be practical, that there would be innumerable difficulties and hazards to overcome. Everyone knew that there were a number of ways in which the crucial materials could be made, each with its special difficulties, and that colossal efforts in manpower, brains, skills, and wealth would be required to design, lay out, and build up the vast plants necessary if success was to be achieved. But as to an atomic formula or a secret which should, or should not, be "handed over" it is just as silly to talk about this as to talk in the year 1946 about "handing over" the secrets of making airplane engines to a foreign power. Even I know that a mixture of gas and air explodes if ignited, and it is plain that this phenomenon is used to drive a propeller. But it is a long step from that knowledge to building a B-29, manned for action.

When this is realized, surely the silliness of cries like "Do not share the secrets" must be plain. As I say, we all know that you cannot "hand over the secret" of making even relatively simple things like airplane engines. Why, even if you handed over the engine intact the users have to be trained in manipulating and maintaining it. I do not know whether the Members who talk about "giving away the secret" really mean that the Commission intends to invite a host of technicians and engineers from Soviet Russia to come to Oak Ridge and Los Alamos for a complete course of instruction and training in all the complicated processes which it has taken hundreds of scientists and thousands of engineers years to develop. But, unless this is what they do expect the Commission to do, their talk about giving away our secrets is largely meaningless.

For example, in this war there have been instances of a piece of German equipment—a dive bomber, or a V-2—falling intact into our hands. Thereafter, it might have taken many months, even years, even with these complete

models, plus the essential scientific formula before us, to develop similar weapons of our own. And the machinery of Oak Ridge is infinitely more complicated. If, for example, we could conceivably export it intact to Soviet Russia tomorrow, without a thousand and one blueprints, without hundreds of skilled workers, and key scientific personnel, they might be many, many months making the equipment work to produce a bomb, and even years in duplicating or copying it.

I do not for a moment dare assert there are not many, many things foreign governments might like to know about Oak Ridge, for it would certainly speed up the time it will take them to perfect their own processes. But when we talk about giving away "the secret" we talk at cross purposes about this bill.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, it is one thing for a man to share with a married friend his "secrets of how to be happy though married"; it is quite another to share his wife with his friend. So long as we do not share our raw materials, our plant structure, our scientific personnel, and our skilled workers, and what might amount to a trainload of blueprints, and, above all, our bombs, with foreign powers, we need not worry too much about sharing "atomic secrets" with foreign powers.

This bill is necessary for one paramount reason: In order to facilitate the widening of our own field of atomic knowledge and know-how as rapidly as possible—in short, to get and stay well ahead in a field which several nations have already entered. If we leave this thing, as so many wish, in the hands of the military, while we may succeed in retarding atomic research in other nations, we will retard it even more in our own. And by seeking to deny others any advantage, we may deny ourselves even more—thus falling behind in the end in the atomic armament race that, according to the State Department, is already under way.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, it is not my intention to even attempt to answer the powder-puff arguments of the very delightful lady from Connecticut [Mrs. LUCE].

This is one of the most dangerous pieces of legislation that has ever come before the American Congress.

Our country today is standing on top of the world. The civilized world is looking to us for leadership. Everybody with any intelligence knows that America is not going to use the atomic bomb to destroy other nations. Then why should we plunge from the highest pinnacle to which we have ever ascended or ever climbed, at the expense of the toil and sweat and blood and tears of the American people and throw away the most powerful weapon on earth, which the enemies of this country are striving day and night to get into their hands?

This is one of the saddest days in the history of the world, when communism, the enemy of Christianity, the enemy of our form of government, the enemy of our way of life, murdered Mikhailovitch, that patriot that we heard praised on

this floor of this House by the head of his own country.

As you know, I am the ranking Democrat on the Committee on Un-American Activities. I offered the resolution that created that committee. I have taken more abuse from the Reds, the Communists and their fellow travelers in this country than any other man who has been in public life in my day, and I am going to speak so plainly that you and they can understand it.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. I want to challenge that last statement. I do not think the gentleman has had as much of it as somebody else.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman from Kentucky has merely had the first dose.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Permit me to say to the House that that committee is the only committee that Congress has to which it can go and find out information on these subversive activities in this country.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman from Michigan is correct.

I put the safety of my country first. My country comes first at all times, and I am opposing this entire resolution because I think it is one of the most dangerous measures that has been proposed since I have been a Member of Congress.

Leave this atomic energy, this atomic bomb, in the hands of our military authorities for 5 years. Why all this smear of our military authorities? You have never seen a traitor who graduated at West Point or Annapolis, and I don't believe you ever will. They have the interest of this country at heart, and they are protecting it from these alien spies who are after it, and holding it so that it may be used in case of attack.

You know that little Canada, glorious Canada, arrested those spies that had been down here, down to Oak Ridge, stealing the secrets of the atomic bomb, in order to use it against you and me and the rest of the American people.

There are spies down there now, and the investigators of the Committee on Un-American Activities are down there on their trails. Here you are proposing to do what they want us to do, proposing to do by legislation what they are attempting to do by stealth.

I am not criticizing the Committee on Military Affairs. I am not questioning the patriotism of any Member of this House. But, so help me God, I would rather see this bill defeated than anything else that could occur at this time. I suggest that we send it back to the Committee and say to the world, "We are going to keep this atomic bomb where it is today." We already have a plant built at Oak Ridge that cost us \$2,000,000,000. That plant covers 70 square miles. We know how to make these bombs. We have a supply already made. We know how to distribute them. We

have the planes already built for that purpose. We have the trained aviators, and if you do not believe it, go down to Trans Lux tonight and see that demonstration. Do not let anybody tell you that was a flop. You will not come back here with that impression.

Let us say to the world, "Behave yourselves, quit murdering innocent people all over the world. Quit raping the helpless Christian innocent women of Europe. Stop the robbing and murder of the helpless people of Europe."

A minister of the gospel in New Jersey wrote me and said, "Is there nothing that America can do to stop the raping of the innocent Christian women of occupied Europe by the Communists that are dedicated to the overthrow and destruction of everything we stand for?"

If the Communists had this bomb and we did not, this Capital would not last 60 days, and you know it. If the Communists had this atomic bomb and we did not, London would not last 60 days, nor would New York or Pittsburgh. They would use it to destroy everything that Christianity has built in the last 1900 years.

So I say the thing to do is send this bill back to the committee, stand where we are, go back to the American people and find how they feel about it, talk to those boys who fought and won this war.

I talked with a young man who had been to Nagasaki. I wish every Member of this House could talk to that young man and just find what he saw, and picture Washington if this bomb was in the hands of the gang that murdered Mihailovich today, and we had none.

This is my country. I have taken all the abuse I am going to take. I am going to answer back from now on, I can tell you that. I have taken all the abuse from these Reds that I am going to take. I propose to call a spade a spade. You are not going to wreck my country if I can prevent it; you are not going to take the only weapon we have now to protect ourselves and give it to our enemies. God forbid.

Jefferson warned us, and Washington warned us that our policy should be "peace, commerce, and honest friendship with all nations, entangling alliances with none." Let us say to the world, "We will lead the way into an era of peace, everlasting peace, but we are not going to hand you the gun with which to destroy the civilization of mankind."

Send this bill back to the committee, and you will be doing the will of the vast majority of patriotic Americans in every State in this Union.

You will be saving America for Americans and preserving the peace of mankind.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I notice the language on page 20 of the bill provides that the Secretary of the Interior

shall cause to be inserted in every patent, conveyance, lease, permit, or other authorization hereafter granted to use the public lands or their mineral resources, a reservation of certain materials to the United States. I wonder if it was not an oversight in drafting the bill to place that requirement simply upon the Secretary of the Interior. The Secretary of Agriculture issues a great many permits dealing with the location of mining claims; in fact, all the mineral lands in the national forests are under the control of the Secretary of Agriculture. If this is really intended to control those things, it would seem to me it would be necessary to include the Secretary of Agriculture in the language of the bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I appreciate the question, but I am not prepared to answer it now. I would rather reserve the answer until later in the debate, and proceed now with my own discussion of the bill.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I understand the gentleman wishes to discuss the bill, but I thought that question should be raised so that somebody could check up on it.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I thank the gentleman. Mr. Chairman, I have attended every session of the committee on this bill and I have a few observations to make that I think are important to bring out at this time.

ARMED FORCES REPRESENTATION AND PARTICIPATION

The bill, S. 1717, if enacted into law will be known as the Atomic Energy Act of 1946. This legislation has to do with the development and control of atomic energy both for civilian purposes and for military purposes. In both fields so many unknown factors are involved that we can hardly generalize or advocate fixed policies without tremendous risk of overlooking some factor or factors that may lead to the very destruction of the thing we are striving to defend or protect.

Because of my membership on the Committee on Military Affairs and because of the responsibility of that committee to the Congress and to the Nation in the matter of guarding and supporting the defenses of our Nation, I have given particular attention to the impact of the atomic bomb in the field of our national defense.

Every person in the United States who has heard about the atomic bomb is deeply impressed with its potential role as a weapon of aggression, and those people most closely connected with the development of atomic energy have displayed greatest concern over the danger to all life in any country upon which atomic energy is hurled as a weapon of attack.

America is not aggressor-minded, and the United States has proven to the world in both World War I and World War II that her people do not covet the assets or the territorial possessions or the form of government or any other nation on this earth. On the basis of our own conduct in international affairs during the past few decades we will have very little difficulty in convincing other nations that we will not likely start any war of the future. On the other hand, our con-

duct at the outset of World War I and World War II is ample proof to the world that we will very likely be drawn into any major war that is started anywhere on this earth, and of course there is always the possibility that we may be the first one attacked. It is, therefore, exceedingly important that we who are charged with the defense of our Nation give full consideration to the development of any possible defense against any potential weapon in any future war. The most important single duty confronting those of us who are charged with the responsibility for our national defense is to develop a defense against the possible use of the atomic bomb by any other nation against us in such a war.

Scientists have stated quite emphatically that there is no known defense, but if our Nation is to survive any future war those of us who carry this responsibility must not fold our hands and give up without trying to the utmost of our ability to develop a defense that will save our Nation from such disaster.

I have never looked to the inventors of potential weapons nor to the manufacturers of potential weapons as best qualified to govern or direct the military application of such weapons. We have approximately 1,500,000 professional soldiers and sailors in our Nation today who are devoting their entire talent and service to the defense of our Nation. At no time in history have the armed forces of our Nation been confronted with a greater challenge than confronts the armed forces today in the matter of the atomic bomb. I cannot subscribe to any program that disqualifies each and every one of our armed forces from active responsible participation in the control of this greatest of all known potential weapons in the face of the challenge the atomic bomb has created.

I do not advocate military control of the Commission, unless you assume that one or two members of a five-man Commission would control the Commission. I offered the amendment which the Military Affairs Committee adopted—section 2 (d) on pages 8 and 9 of the bill—to remove the disqualification of members of the armed forces from serving on such Commission and to limit the number serving on such a five-man Commission to not more than two members. This limitation is a guaranty against military control of the Commission. Another amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ELSTON]—section 2 (a) on page 3 of the bill—makes the appointment of one representative of the armed forces on the Commission mandatory, but my amendment leaves the appointment of the second member entirely within the discretion of the President.

My amendment also qualifies any member of the armed forces for appointment as Director of Military Application of Atomic Energy. You will find by reading the bill that this executive position is one of the four positions placed under the general manager, who is charged with the administrative and executive functions of the Commission. My amendment, section 2 (d), leaves the matter of appointment of a representative of the armed forces to this position

to the discretion of the President, but the committee adopted an amendment to section 2 (a), which you will find at the top of page 6 of the bill, requiring that the Director of the Division of Military Application of Atomic Energy shall be a representative of the armed forces. I supported this amendment which was offered in committee by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ELSTON] because I feel very strongly that military application of atomic energy should be under the direction of a person who has given much study and thought to military science and tactics. I sincerely hope and believe that the Director of Military Application of Atomic Energy can and will keep uppermost in mind his responsibility to our Nation in his direction of military application of this superweapon and especially the strategic plan of defenses against its use by any future enemy.

Opponents of my view will argue that the armed forces do not have highly qualified men available to serve as members of the Commission or as Director of Military Application, but I call your attention to page 11 of Senate Report No. 1211, about the middle of the page, as follows:

While the commissioners need not be scientists or technical experts, they must combine clear judgment with imagination and courage, and they must, like the members of the judiciary, be so divorced from private and competing concerns as to give complete, disinterested, and undivided attention to their tasks.

On that same page the Senate committee recognizes legitimate and important areas of atomic energy development and control touching on the responsibilities of the military departments and they state that—

Throughout the bill, wherever these areas are involved, provision is made for full military participation, and independent activities of the military departments, especially in research and development, are not infringed but expressly encouraged.

In what way could this objective be better achieved than by placing a man qualified in military science and tactics as Director of Military Application?

Some opponents to military membership on the Commission itself will cry out for the elimination of confusion that they claim such membership will create. But I believe I know the Army and Navy well enough to guarantee that the President by judicious selection from the armed forces can find men highly qualified to serve on the Commission and men who will not create confusion in such service. These same opponents of my view would probably predict dire results following the appointment of a member of the armed forces to head any governmental agency dealing with business matters, but a very distinguished constituent of mine, Maj. Gen. Philip B. Fleming, has served with outstanding ability in many important assignments of this kind and is today serving with great credit as Federal Works Administrator. They would also predict chaos and confusion if any member of the armed forces were appointed to an important post in our State Department, and yet I need only call your atten-

tion to the distinguished service that is being rendered today by Gen. George C. Marshall in China, by Gen. Douglas MacArthur in Japan, by Lt. Gen. Walter Bedell Smith as Ambassador to Russia, and by Maj. Gen. John H. Hilldring in his recent appointment as Assistant Secretary of State. Where do these critics of the armed forces suggest that we get men better qualified for such assignments than these members of the armed forces? We have a lot of talent today in our Army and Navy and we need them and we must use their talents in various fields of endeavor, but nowhere do we need them more than we do in the field of atomic energy that brings to our Nation the greatest challenge of the ages in the matter of its defense and its very survivorship.

We will rue the day that we blindfold ourselves by disqualifying all members of the armed forces from active, responsible participation in the defense of our Nation against the greatest potential weapon yet known to mankind.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. Certainly it is not unfair or unreasonable that one of the members of this five-man Commission be appointed from the armed forces of the country.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. That is exactly right.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. The gentleman might have added a number of admirals who have rendered very distinguished and outstanding service in various civilian posts, including ambassadorships.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Yes, indeed; I did not give a complete list of the Army or the Navy.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Is it not true that these distinguished men the gentleman has pointed out concerning which no one will disagree were all retired at the time of their service in civilian capacities?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Not all were retired. In many instances the gentleman will remember we passed laws which authorized them to serve in such capacity. The special authorization here in question is needed for members of the armed forces who are retired, as well as for those on the active list.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER].

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, in reading Senate Report 1211 on the bill for the control of atomic energy, S. 1717, it is interesting to note that in the summary of the testimony which was given before the McMahon committee the members state that—

The peacetime benefits of atomic energy promise to be great, indeed, particularly in medicine, biology, and many branches of

research. These benefits are immediate in their promise, but will require extended and unfettered development for full realization.

Note, gentleman, that the testimony indicated that there should be "unfettered development." It was agreed that the principle of atomic energy could be kept secret only temporarily and it was further agreed that legislation should facilitate, as far as possible, "the rapid scientific development of atomic energy, which would promote both the industrial prosperity of the world and the improvement of our instruments of national defense."

S. 1717 is supposed to be the answer to this problem, and in its declaration of policy section 1 of the bill states that the objective shall be "the development and utilization of atomic energy toward improving the public welfare, increasing the standard of living, strengthening free competition in private enterprise, and promoting world peace."

Note, especially, that one of the purposes of the bill is to strengthen free competition in private enterprise, and the Senate committee in this connection has explained that to carry out these purposes the bill provides for Government control over atomic energy and for Government programs for information, production, research, and development.

On the one hand, then, is the desire to "strengthen free competition in private enterprise," and, on the other, is the statement that to provide this there must be Government control. But there are controls and controls, and the form that this control is to take is further explained when it is said that provision is made for Government "production, research, and development." In other words, there is not to be control as we ordinarily think of control. There is to be direct Government ownership and operation. How this is consistent with the expressed desire to strengthen free competition in private enterprise in this all-important field it is difficult to see.

Let us examine the controls that are mentioned. First, the Commission which is to be created is to own all fissionable materials, but it must be remembered that under the definition of fissionable material there would be included ores only if they contain uranium, thorium, or any other material which is determined by the Commission, with the approval of the President, to be peculiarly essential to the production of fissionable materials and then only if in such concentration as the Commission may by regulation determine from time to time.

In order to exercise the control that is desired, it is further stipulated that unless authorized by a license issued by the Commission, no person may transfer or deliver, and no person may receive possession of, any source material after removal from its place of deposit in Nature. No license, however, is required for "quantities of source materials which in the opinion of the Commission are unimportant."

This provision is quite vague, for just what does unimportant mean? It is entirely proper that the bill should take into account the possible hazards to national health and safety that the use

of these source materials might engender and, from a reading of the Report No. 1211 of the Senate Special Committee on Atomic Energy, this was contemplated. However, because of the vagueness inherent in the word "unimportant," it should, in my estimation, be eliminated. Hence, it is urged that the words "in the opinion of the Commission are unimportant" should be stricken out and there should be substituted for these words "do not constitute hazards to national health and safety."

If this change were made, the vagueness created by the word "unimportant" would be eliminated and this particular control would be limited to definite types of hazards which are interpretable.

There is also vagueness in connection with the provision for the issuance of licenses for source materials. This part of the section reads:

The Commission shall establish such standards for the issuance, refusal, or revocation of licenses as it may deem necessary to assure adequate source materials for production, research, or development activities pursuant to this act or to prevent the use of such materials in a manner inconsistent with the national welfare.

The Commission should be empowered to establish the standards for the issuance of licenses for source materials, but when it is granted the power not to issue licenses in order to "prevent the use of such materials in a manner inconsistent with the national welfare," the Commission is given very wide latitude of interpreting a very vague phrase. It seems only proper that a bill which contains a provision as important as this should be definite in its language and, consequently, I believe that this phrase should be replaced by "not constituting a hazard to national health and safety."

It is also to be noted that in connection with reporting, the Commission is authorized to issue regulations requiring reports of ownership of source materials but may except from this requirement quantities of source materials which "in the opinion of the Commission are unimportant." Here, again, the word "unimportant" is vague and should be deleted and replaced with the wording "do not constitute hazards to national health and safety."

Further, with respect to source materials, the Commission is—

authorized and directed to purchase, take, requisition, condemn, or otherwise acquire, supplies of source materials or any interest in real property containing deposits of source materials to the extent it deems necessary to effectuate the provisions of this act.

The words "to the extent it deems necessary" could provide the basis for what might lead to arbitrary use of this power, a use against which the citizens of the United States might be more or less powerless, and therefore these particular words should be deleted and replaced by "upon determination that such action is necessary in the interest of the common defense and security."

But, aside from the control of source materials, the bill in section 4 further provides that—

The Commission shall be the exclusive owner of all facilities for the production of fissionable material other than facilities

which (a) are useful in the conduct of research and development activities in the fields specified in section 3, and (b) do not, in the opinion of the Commission, have a potential production rate adequate to enable the operator of such facilities to produce within a reasonable period of time a sufficient quantity of fissionable material to produce an atomic bomb or any other atomic weapon.

It is obvious that the intent of this section is to assure the Commission control over all production of fissionable materials. This is done by making it impossible for fissionable material to be produced in any quantity except in a Government-owned plant. This is further emphasized by the fact that the Commission is authorized and directed to produce or to provide for the production of fissionable material in its own facilities and it can make contracts with persons, obligating them to produce fissionable materials in facilities owned by the Government.

However, the degree of control which it is desired that the Commission have could well be obtained without making it necessary that all production activities be limited to Government-owned factories. The incentive of private enterprise to produce at the lowest possible cost is lost to the Government when production can be undertaken only under a management contract in a Government-owned plant.

A contractual arrangement such as is envisaged in the bill does not provide the encouragement for the creation and use of new productive methods that are always being evolved when production of any type is carried on under our normal competitive processes. The committee in its report on acquisition of source materials indicated that it did not intend that the Commission would engage in mining operations in competition with private mining activity and that—

The committee has been alive to the necessity of encouraging the activities of independent prospectors.

The committee has further explained that—

The principle of Government monopoly which the committee has adopted as essential in reference to the production and ownership of fissionable materials is not extended to the ownership, mining or refining of source materials. * * *

Wherever possible, the committee endeavors to reconcile Government monopoly of the production of fissionable material with our traditional free enterprise system. * * * Prospecting for and mining of source materials are at every stage to be encouraged and supported.

It seems to me that just as prospecting for and mining of source materials are to be encouraged and supported, every phase of the nonmilitary development of atomic energy should be similarly encouraged and supported.

Section 1 of S. 1717 has as one of its objectives strengthening free competition in private enterprise, but in section 4 there is no private enterprise and there is no free competition. I appreciate and sympathize with the desires of the framers of the bill to protect the public welfare, but I believe that it is unnecessary and undesirable to have the Commission the exclusive producer of fis-

sionable materials, except where production is incident to research and development activities.

It seems to me that the country would be adequately safeguarded if the Commission were given the authority to regulate and police the production of fissionable material and private ownership or operation were forbidden except under license by the Commission. Then the Commission would have adequate control and I consequently believe that that portion of this section which reads "the Commission shall be the exclusive owner of all facilities for the production of fissionable material other than facilities" should be eliminated and replaced by the following wording:

The Commission is authorized to own and operate facilities for the production of fissionable material. Private ownership or operation is expressly forbidden except under license by the Commission: *Provided, however,* That no license for operation or ownership is required for facilities which (a) are useful in the conduct of research and development activities in the fields specified in section 3, and (b) do not, in the opinion of the Commission, have a potential production rate adequate to enable the operator of such facilities to produce within a reasonable period of time a sufficient quantity of fissionable material to produce an atomic bomb or any other atomic weapon.

The bill in section 4 also provides for operation of other production facilities when it states that—

Fissionable material may be produced in the conduct of research and development activities and facilities which under paragraph (1) above, are not required to be owned by the Commission.

Then in paragraph (e) of section 4, under the title of "Manufacture of Production Facilities," it is stipulated that—

Unless authorized by a license issued by the Commission, no person may manufacture, produce, transfer, or acquire any facilities for the production of fissionable material.

In view of the limitations placed on the ownership of production facilities, the definition of the word "facilities" is very important. Turning to section 17, we find that this is defined as "any equipment or device capable of such production and any important component part especially designed for such equipment or devices, as determined by the Commission."

It is obvious that a facility capable of such production might not have been originally intended for the production of fissionable material and, therefore, it seems to me that this term is entirely too broad and I recommend that it be modified as follows:

(g) The term "facilities for the production of fissionable material" shall be construed to mean any equipment or device peculiarly adapted for and capable of such production and any important component part especially designed for such equipment or devices, as determined by the Commission.

I repeat, gentlemen, that the powers conferred on the Commission and the limitations on production of fissionable material and ownership of production facilities are inconsistent with the avowed purpose of facilitating the rapid scientific development of atomic energy or of "strengthening free competition in private enterprise."

Indeed, this expression of intent is vitiated by the admission that a Government monopoly in the production of fissionable material is being created. And this cannot be reconciled with our traditional free enterprise system.

Instead of facilitating the rapid scientific development of atomic energy the proposals contained in this measure would tend to stifle them—and the free enterprise system with them.

Experience has shown that the forces of free competition do more to aid the rapid development of an art than does any other system. Let us not fool ourselves—this bill will not foster either the development of atomic energy or the free enterprise system. It tends to kill them both and it is not at all necessary, for we can attain all of our objectives of safeguarding the national health and welfare, of facilitating "the rapid scientific development of atomic energy" and "strengthening free competition in private enterprise" if by "controls" we mean not state ownership but controls through proper supervision under an adequate system of licensing. This, I believe, as I have already explained, can be done and should be done.

Mr. MAY. I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD].

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, the principles and objectives of the McMahon atomic-energy bill should receive the full and sincere support of the House. The declared purposes of the act incorporate the desired ends of progress, security, and development, as well as international accord. All these demand support and require vigilant and constant guarding of the public interest, but the technical and scientific phases of the problem make it difficult for a full, public understanding of the extent and the far-reaching effects of research and experimentation in the field of nuclear-chain reaction.

The popular concept of atomic energy to the average American is a bomb—a lethal weapon designed to lay cities in ruins, and to blot out lives of thousands of people.

The pictures of the ruins of Hiroshima, of the nuclear clouds rising above Nagasaki, of the scarred hulks in Bikini atoll, have impressed upon the American people the terrific forces which have been harnessed by science. The control of these forces is well established in the statement of powers of the Commission and the committees provided for in the bill known as the McMahon bill. That this control should be lodged in civilian hands with due provision for military advice and counsel is a principle which, in my opinion, is unanswerable and worthy of the unqualified support of the membership of this House, who are the elected representatives of the people.

Adherence to civilian control of atomic energy is demanded, because the interest of every American citizen is involved.

Fundamentally, atomic energy is a new source of power which, according to scientific testimony, is capable of industrial use and application. In fact, the pending bill directs arrangements to such use in section 3 (a). What is the anticipated result? Great basic industries,

embracing many sections of this country and employing hundreds of thousands of employees, will be faced with a newcomer in the field of production of power. The great anthracite and bituminous coal industry of Pennsylvania and the tremendous source of electrical energy—all will find themselves face to face with progress. This progress, which may come and if guided and directed in the paths of peace, must march with our existing economic structure. To tear down without consideration our great basic industry of coal would bring national calamity. As a result, the careful guidance, the sound thought, and deliberation which atomic energy and its uses demands should rest in civilian hands.

The bill adequately provides for the necessary safeguards to protect the public. However, in the appointment of representatives to the commission, the General Advisory Committee and the Advisory Boards, mentioned in section 2, I hope that the basic industry of coal will receive representation from its ranks of its management and of its workers. Their interest in any future program or reconversion should receive adequate hearing and competent representation. And what is more, it should be published and broadcast to the American public the fact that this bill is designed not only to give them security but, what is more, to protect them in their economic lives, so that scientific progress as it occurs in the future will not forthwith and without full determination of its effects, blot out a great basic industry which today is the greatest source of power for the wheels of American production.

I trust that the President of the Senate and the Speaker of this House will in their selections of members for service on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, established by section 15 of the House bill, recognize that the people's representatives from the great coal-producing areas of this country deserve representation in the work of the joint committee.

It is a fact that atomic energy demolished great industries and factories in Japan. Let us not have this same great force wipe out the economic structure of great industries in our country without the people and the Congress studying and plotting the change, if any, which may come with the advance of science. None of us know as a certainty what the full force and effect of this new form of energy will be on our way of life in the coal fields. We have never stood in the way of progress, in this matter we probably could not if we wished. But the fact remains that at this early moment I feel it is my duty as a representative of the millions of people of the coal fields to bring to the attention of the proposed Atomic Commission and to the Nation at large, the obligation owed to the coal industry and its people in the great mining area of Luzerne County, Pa., in particular, and the coal-producing areas of our Nation generally. Thought and care and planning must be given to whatever tremendous transition and reconversion problems will follow in the wake of atomic energy harnessed to our economic and industrial life. Where

would there be a better place as the center in which to develop this new potential? The livelihood, employment, and welfare of the future generations of these areas is to be affected. Then these generations must be served by and be permitted to give service to any such program. Mr. Speaker, out of an abundance of caution, if for no other reason, I must insist that in this turmoil and concern and grave uncertainty filling the minds of everyone on this subject, the coal-mining areas of the country must not be lost in the shuffle of things to come. I am not an alarmist but I have seen the coal fields forgotten for years and its welfare ignored in all sorts of ways. I am making this statement now to make certain and to serve warning that we are not going to be forgotten again, if it develops that science is going to utilize atomic energy for industrial and commercial energy and power. Proper correlation of and with the coal industry is a vital factor to our national economy.

The force of this new energy may shake the sky as it is developed, I do not know; but I do know that with reference to the anthracite coal area, its patriotic workers and their families and the vast industry which is the backbone of a vast section, "let there be justice though the heavens fall."

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, it is quite impossible for me in 10 minutes even to begin the things I should like to have a chance to say on this bill.

I agree that this may well be the most important piece of legislation in the history of our Nation. I wish profoundly we did not have to consider anything of this sort. But I believe we would be derelict in our duty if we did not or if we failed to try our best to grapple with what is admittedly the most perilous problem our Nation has ever faced.

I disagree completely with those who have said that we do not need to pass a bill of this character at the present time. I think we very much do need to pass a bill of this character. With all my heart and soul I wish we did not. With all my heart and soul I wish it were possible to turn back the hands of time and to place atomic energy back in the sun again and in the secrets of the universe whence it came.

But that is not possible. Nor need we expect that the knowledge of the subject in this Nation or in any other part of the world is going to stop where it is now. Much as I should like to encourage Members of the House to continue to comfort themselves and falsely comfort their constituents by talking about the "secret" of the atomic bomb I must honestly say that I believe that to base the security of the United States for more than at most a short span of years upon any such alleged secret is to be guilty of the most dangerous sort of self-deception. Every single bit of scientific evidence, of testimony that has been given on this subject is to the effect first, that all the important fundamental knowledge was given to the world in the Smythe report published by the War Department itself and

second that we cannot reasonably expect that other nations will not have such weapons within the course of 5 or 10 years unless something in the nature of dynamic world statesmanship intercedes to stop the whole development of such weapons everywhere. We can, if we will, legislate on the mistaken premise that America's safety will be guarded by the sole possession of certain technological manufacturing methods by scientists in this country. But we cannot legislate to make that situation permanent. It is beyond our power to do so. Our difficult duty in this critical hour is to face facts, startling, world-shaking, profoundly dangerous facts like men and women. Oratory cannot change those facts.

The fact is our choice is between world law and world control over atomic energy on the one hand and an atomic armament race ending in surprise attack and untold suffering and mass destruction on the other. We must have domestic control before we can even talk effectively of world control, let alone achieve it. So, unfortunately, we have to face a much bleaker prospect, a much more complex situation than if we could depend upon the present secrecy of atomic bomb production lasting for more than a brief space of time. So I appeal to those Members whose consideration of this legislation seems so far to be limited to reliance upon the "secret" to recognize now, before it is too late, how far beyond that tragically oversimplified solution we must go if we are to serve our children's generation and not merely our own next few years. I assure them that if I believed it possible for America to keep some such vital secret and lock it in her military archives to be dedicated to preserving peace, I should go with them with a far lighter heart than beats in my breast at this moment.

One reason we need this bill, in my humble opinion, is the fact that unless a bill of this general character is passed, the development of atomic energy which has proceeded under great difficulty in recent years cannot go forward. The fact is it is not now going forward. I submit that the great majority of the most eminent scientific workers in this field are no longer associated with the project. They have gone to other work. And it is absolutely essential if development in this field is to go forward that those scientists do the work. After all, they are the only people who can. To believe the Army can do it is another dangerous misconception. Indeed, such secrets as do exist today repose in the minds of certain scientists, who, fortunately for us, have chosen to serve America.

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

Mrs. LUCE. The gentleman says that there are no basic scientific secrets on this bomb and I agree with him. There are only manufacturing secrets, but there are some of those.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Yes; that is right. I believe I said so.

Mrs. LUCE. May I ask the gentleman, if there are no secrets and we are not

embarked on an atomic bomb race, what is the urgency, in his opinion, for this legislation?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is what I was attempting to explain.

Mrs. LUCE. I did not quite follow the gentleman.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. The fact there are no secrets that we can expect to keep for any appreciable length of time, it seems to me, means more than ever that we are embarking, in essence, upon an atomic armament race at this minute which will continue and become evermore terrible and evermore an influence causing the people of all nations to live under a feeling of suspicion and distrust as time goes on. I am afraid that is the case today. One reason I am afraid it is the case is because I do not believe it is possible, as I stated, for the mind of man to stop either in this country or in any other nation, nor do I believe over a period of time that secrets can be the exclusive possession of any nation.

Mrs. LUCE. I am trying to find out from the gentleman, in view of his statement that this is an atomic-bomb race, whether the gentleman thinks this Commission, if appointed, will make more or less bombs than are being made now?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I think they will probably make precisely the same number that would be made or not made if the Commission were never appointed. I think that will not make any difference so far as the number of bombs that are manufactured is concerned. I believe the bill is clear on that and that it lies in a decision to be made by the President. I believe that is where the decision has been made in the past, and I believe that is where it will be made in the future. I think that is where it belongs.

Mrs. LUCE. Why does the gentleman think there is an urgency for this?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I have already given one reason. I believe that under present circumstances American development in this field must go on. I wish I did not believe that, but I do. Indeed, it is possible to secure a world control, such as the Baruch report proposes, until we can get the kind of world control that is not dependent upon any treaty but that is dependent only upon a world law of peace and the power of an international agency to inspect and control atomic energy in every nation of the world and prevent any nation from possessing weapons of this sort, precisely as the gentlewoman herself said, until we can get that kind of control I believe that American development has to go on. As I view the world situation at present, I believe American preeminence in this field is one factor which, coupled with the most persistent and relentless work for peace, might give us the leverage to bring about the conditions and the enforceable disarmament which could make true peace possible.

But I do not believe American development is or can go on successfully under present circumstances. I think it necessary that some form of civilian commission of this sort be created together with attendant changes in the circumstances under which the work will be done if we

are to get the kind of scientific progress which I believe under present circumstances is necessary to our country's safety and to the hope of future peace.

Mrs. LUCE. I agree with the gentleman on that particular need for the Commission.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. My second reason for believing it necessary is that if we are to hope for such international control as I just attempted to briefly describe, and I believe that to be the only hope of safety for the population of the United States in the future, if we are to hope for any such international control, we will have to first establish in the United States an effective control over atomic energy within our own borders. We do not have it now. There is nothing in present law to prevent any Tom, Dick, or Harry from possessing fissionable material, manufacturing miniature bombs with it, or exporting it out of the country. We are in a situation comparable to that of a bunch of children playing with TNT, and I may as well point out now the added danger that some individual could under present law seek a patent on atomic energy itself, in which case, under our patent laws he would have to present for public inspection at the Patent Office a description of his process and the United States would have to go to a public trial to protect whatever rights it may have or to attempt to protect its secrets. Surely those who, like myself, do not want to give away our present advantage do not really want such a condition. Unless we have the type of control this bill provides there is every likelihood that the very circumstances which some of the opponents say they are trying to prevent, namely, the general dissemination of dangerous information, and indeed dangerous devices may well take place. You may get all sorts of development here and there of a purely sporadic nature, and none of us has any possible means of predicting what the result might be.

So that my second reason is this. I believe I have at least an inkling of what atomic energy is. I confront it with feelings of mingled awe and a sense of almost oppressive responsibility. For it is the energy of the sun itself, the fundamental energy of the universe, by far the most tremendous gift of God that mankind has ever presumed to take from His natural storehouse. Atomic energy is by infinite measure the most destructive force ever loosed on this earth. And not only do I know it will be our destruction unless moral and, indeed, religious and spiritual forces of corresponding strength are awakened throughout the world to meet it, but I also believe pending that time it must be controlled if mankind is to survive and to preserve any real vestige of his civilization on this planet.

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. I would just like to say this as another reason why the bill should be passed now. We must proceed with our basic scientific research, which is our greatest protection in the future, and, just as the gentleman

said, if we do not have the knowledge, if we stay where we are in science, we will lag behind. We must keep our preeminent position in science in the world.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is right. I thank my colleague.

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. And the way we can do that is by making advances in the basic sciences. The scientists are leaving these projects now because there is no set program, and we cannot make these scientific basic discoveries under military control. That is the crux of it. The statements made that the military is thrown out of this program is utter balderdash and nonsense.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I think the military is not thrown out of it at all. On the contrary, I think our military needs are met in the bill or I would not support the bill.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Does the gentleman believe that this is a very important bill?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I certainly do.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Then does not the gentleman think that in view of its importance, in view of the fact that we only had 2 days of hearings before the Committee on Military Affairs, and in view of the fact it is coming up in the last few days of this session of Congress, that we should delay it a little bit until we really understand what is in the bill?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I believe this, I will say to the gentleman: I believe that every moment is precious. I believe that every moment that America still retains preeminence in this field is precious for the future chance of life of the peoples of the world. I ask the gentleman to consider what the situation would be if some great dictatorships stood in our position today. It is only so long as America is preeminent that we stand a halfway good chance of gaining the controls for peace which are our only hope, and since I believe domestic controls must precede international ones I believe there is the greatest urgency about this legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Only so long as America does retain that position is America's position half as strong as it needs to be in trying to bring, from her real desire to seek peace, the rest of the nations of the world into a position where world control over this awesome thing can be established.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. I would like to say to my colleague on the other side of the aisle that the statement that we only had 2 days of hearings on this legislation is not justified. We had weeks and weeks of hearings, and the gentleman from

California testified before the committee at that time.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is true.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, that was an entirely different bill.

Mr. MAY. That was on the subject of atomic energy; the May-Johnson bill.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. This bill in the Senate of the United States was considered for months by a committee, whose membership the gentleman from Texas read to the House the other night, than which there could be no more distinguished or more essentially conservative membership selected in that august body, and it seems to me that the House ought to have some regard for the basic work that was done there and for the legislation that was written.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMASON. More than that. Three or four volumes of testimony before this special Senate committee were printed, and every Member of the House was provided with a copy of those hearings.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Indeed, that is true.

May I say, Mr. Chairman, that the provision in the bill which provides that atomic energy, the very energy of the sun itself, the energy developed at an expenditure of \$2,000,000,000 of the taxpayers' money of the United States, shall not be capable of being privately patented or monopolized by some one corporation in this Nation—to say that, seems to me to be the very essence of statesmanship and the very essence of the protection of a free-enterprise system. I hope Members will consider the alternative to some of the patent provisions of this bill. That alternative is to say that atomic energy can be patented. Do you really believe that should be possible? That some private agency should be able to call this great national development, paid for by all the people, its own private domain? Do you want to expose it to the possibility of an international private cartel controlling it? Remember this thing is capable of becoming not only the overwhelming military weapon which it has been proven but possibly also the overriding economic power in our whole Nation, a power great enough to transform the whole pattern of all our production. I ask you, should that be the exclusive property of any one individual or corporation? Do you propose to let the basic energy of the sun be patented? Would such action promote free enterprise? What, may I ask, becomes of little business then? What, finally, becomes of the people who paid for all this and gave their sons in the war in addition? I wonder what would happen, indeed, if atomic energy did become the private preserve, if you will, of some private agency? I, for one, am willing to take my stand against letting it become the private preserve of any single agency.

Last of all, Mr. Chairman, let me point out with emphasis that this legislation can be changed by any Congress that sees fit. It is designed to carry us through

what I do not hesitate in saying will probably be the most difficult adjustment period mankind has ever experienced.

Fondly do we all hope that the day may come when mankind will have learned as it certainly has not yet learned to live safely with atomic energy. As that day is approached the admittedly unprecedented provisions of this bill can be changed. But for today we need it. Our country needs it. The world needs it. The fact that I wish these things were not so cannot be allowed to affect my judgment as to what I must do in supporting the bill.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, it is very regrettable that there are not more Members on the floor at this time, because I believe there is not a member of our House Committee on Military Affairs or of this body itself who knows more about the pending legislation than the very able lawyer and distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Elston], to whom I now yield 15 minutes.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, first of all I wish to thank the gentleman from Missouri for his very much undeserved compliment.

Mr. Chairman, as I have heretofore said, this bill is both dangerous and unnecessary. It is dangerous because it sets up a Government bureau with more power and authority than has ever been granted before. This bureau, under the provisions of the bill as now written, would have life and death control over the industry of the Nation whenever we reach the place where atomic energy may become useful for industrial purposes, in fact, even before that time. Moreover, the armed forces would become subservient to this power even in matters of national defense so far as the use of atomic energy is concerned. Furthermore, it removes incentives provided by our patent laws to inventors, and adopts a patent system found only in Soviet Russia. The fact that the Constitution of the United States gives to every inventor the exclusive right to his discoveries has meant nothing to the proponents of this legislation for under the provisions of this bill patents relating to the use of atomic power are either revoked or become the property of the Government.

Although the measure relates to the use of atomic power for military as well as civilian purposes, every conceivable effort has been made to eliminate representatives of the armed forces from representation on that all powerful bureau known as the Atomic Energy Commission. In its introductory section this bill is presented to us through a series of misrepresentations. For example, section 1 provides that it is "declared to be the policy of the people of the United States that, subject at all times to the paramount objective of assuring the common defense and security, the development and utilization of atomic energy shall, so far as practicable, be directed toward improving the public welfare, increasing the standard of living, strengthening free competition in private enterprise, and promoting world peace."

If enacted into law this bill would do exactly the reverse of these things. If the paramount objective is to assure the

common defense and security, why has so desperate an effort been made to completely eliminate the armed forces from representation on the Commission or in any department under the supervision of the Commission? Even though the bill purports to deal with atomic weapons and national defense, every attempt to give the Army and the Navy some representation has been resisted to the utmost. The House Committee on Military Affairs was bitterly assailed by the supporters of the bill generally because it dared to amend the act as it came from the Senate so as to provide that at least one member of the Commission and the head of the Division of Military Application should be from the armed forces. The only argument I have heard against it is the rather specious claim that it is not in keeping with our traditions for a military man to serve on a policy-making commission—that military men are only interested in war, and that other nations might frown upon their presence on the Commission. In this connection I wonder why the civil functions of the War Department are so conveniently forgotten. If there has been any Government agency that has been free from criticism and that has been elevated above the run-of-mine Washington bureau, it has been the Corps of Army Engineers which has for so many years been responsible for our rivers and harbors and flood-control projects. In this work they have handled billions of dollars and have performed work in no way related to war. Yet I have never heard that it was not in keeping with American tradition for them to exercise these functions.

Mr. Chairman, I have heard a lot of statements today about this legislation. I think everybody agrees on one thing, that there is a lot of confusion about it.

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELSTON. I shall be glad to yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

Mrs. LUCE. Is it not rather a little more correct to say we are not confused about the legislation. We understand it rather clearly. What we are confused about is what to do about it.

Mr. ELSTON. That may be but I for one am not willing to turn this Nation into a totalitarian state merely because there may be some confusion about proposed legislation. Since some speakers today have indicated that they are for the legislation solely for security reasons, I would say that is all the more reason why things should remain as they are. I am not willing to substitute a politically minded bureau, such as this bill would set up, for trained military personnel, so long as we are in any danger.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELSTON. I am pleased to yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. If there were a civilian commission they would be subject to penalties, but you could not court martial them the way you could the military officials, could you?

Mr. ELSTON. Civilians, of course, would not be subject to court martial.

They say that if the Army is represented on the Commission this country might go ahead and manufacture atomic

bombs and atomic weapons. The answer to that I believe is that any time the President of the United States wants the manufacture of atomic bombs to cease all he has to do is to give a simple order to stop.

You will no doubt hear it loudly proclaimed that the armed services have been taken care of in the Senate bill by providing for a military liaison committee. Read the section creating this committee and you will see that it has been given no authority whatsoever. Aside from the fact that the Atomic Energy Commission shall consult with the liaison committee, and that they shall keep each other informed as to atomic energy matters in the War and Navy Departments, the liaison committee has nothing to do. Actually nothing is provided for in this section that could not and should not be done between any government departments as a matter of simple courtesy and expediency. Since the Commission must deal with matters of national defense, I do not know how it could function without consultation with the War and Navy Departments. The appeals which the services are permitted to make to the Secretaries of War and Navy, and through them to the President, would be permitted without this legislation. In a word, this section is nothing more or less than a sop handed out to convey the erroneous impression that our armed forces are given some recognition. Even this was denied in the beginning despite the fact that the atomic bomb was developed under the supervision of the Army and all secrets in connection therewith are in its custody.

Before we look into the powers of the Commission and the extent to which it encroaches upon private industry and interferes with our American way of life, you will note that section 9 requires the Army to transfer to the Commission forthwith upon the passage of the bill, all facilities, equipment, and material devoted to atomic energy, research, and development. This would include even the Oakridge plant, together with any bombs now in existence, as well as formulas and secrets in connection with the atomic bomb and other atomic weapons. So at the start, even before the war is officially over, the branches of the services charged under the Constitution with the defense of the Nation are required to turn over to a civilian Government bureau of political appointees weapons which the services may require for the defense of the country. If this does not jeopardize the security of the Nation, then the Bikini tests and the results at Hiroshima and Nagasaki were incorrectly reported.

So much for security. As to other powers of the Commission, let us examine a few of them. In the field of research the Commission may make grants-in-aid and loans to public or private institutions or persons even in connection with research for industrial purposes. Thus the Commission has the power to favor one school or university as against another, and to favor industries, companies, or individuals to the detriment of others. As no person or company would have the right to engage in research on their own part, you per-

haps begin to appreciate what is meant by the term "life-and-death control of industry."

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, may I say that that is why some of the college professors are so strong for this legislation.

Mr. ELSTON. I guess there is little doubt of it.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELSTON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I can not understand this talk about giving this secret away. We have never done anything like that before. We have kept our military secrets to ourselves. Who are these people who want to share this secret with the world and what are they doing it for? That is the thing I can not understand at all.

Mr. ELSTON. I have an idea who some of them are.

Bear in mind, Mr. Chairman, that the Commission will become the owner of all fissionable material regardless of who may now possess it. It can be parceled out for industrial purposes only with the consent of the Commission. As the time may come when atomic energy power may supplant many other forms of power, and become vital to every industry in the Nation, it is not difficult to understand the extent to which the Atomic Commission would control the industries of the country.

If any person, industry or company should be dissatisfied with the distribution or refusal of the Commission to distribute any fissionable or by-product materials, such person or company may obtain a review of the determination of the Commission by an appeal. But let us examine into the type of appeal afforded. On a matter as important as this, one would feel the appeal should be to the courts, or at least to an unbiased or disinterested tribunal of some sort. Such is not the case, however. Section 5 (d) (2) makes the Commission the judge, jury, and executioner so far as appeals under this section are concerned. The Board of Appeals created by this section shall consist of three members who shall be appointed by the Commission. Should any person feel himself aggrieved by a decision of the Board of Appeals his only further appeal is to the Commission itself. Even this right is not guaranteed as it is provided that "the Commission may in its discretion review and revise any decision of such board of appeal." Here, I submit we see bureaucracy at its worst.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. That sounds just like the OPA.

Mr. ELSTON. Well the OPA never asked for anything more than that. And if there was ever anything that is the fulfillment of a bureaucrat's dream, I think it is this section.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELSTON. I am glad to yield to my distinguished friend from North Carolina.

Mr. DURHAM. The gentleman certainly would not be in favor of exporting this material to some foreign country?

Mr. ELSTON. I certainly would not.

Mr. DURHAM. Well, at the present time that could happen if we allow the matter to run loose as it is at the present time. Any country could import this material into their country from the United States.

Mr. ELSTON. No. I am sure we have ample authority today to regulate exports and imports of dangerous commodities.

Mr. HANCOCK. Under the existing law, has the Army the power to monopolize the sources of materials and real estate containing deposits of such materials? Is there any such authority under present law?

Mr. ELSTON. The Army might have that authority in time of war under war power acts.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELSTON. I yield.

Mr. JENNINGS. Does not the Government have power to condemn any property it may need, under the general law?

Mr. ELSTON. Yes. The Government has the power to condemn anything it needs for a public purpose.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELSTON. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It seems to me it would give that group tremendous power over other groups. I am thinking even in terms of internal disorder and strife and conflict in our own country. That is one reason I would like to have the Army in it. That would not happen if the Army was in it.

Mr. ELSTON. I do not think it would either.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELSTON. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I would like to ask the gentleman what he feels should be done, under the circumstances he alluded to himself, namely, that if some development in the field of atomic energy were made which rendered all development of power obsolete, whether he would not believe that should that happen it would be most important that some provision be made somewhere so as to assure that some such development as that could be available to be used on an equitable basis by all competent users in the country.

Mr. ELSTON. Well, I would want to wait until that happened and then regulate it.

On the question of the appeal procedure I was discussing, it may be contended that the Administrative Procedure Act would apply, but since that act makes an exception in cases where agency action is by law committed to agency discretion, the Administrative Procedure Act could not be invoked in view of the section to which I have just referred. In an effort to make the Administrative Procedure Act apply to this bill, I offered an amendment in committee to the effect that it shall apply to this act, but since the appeal section contained in section 5 still remains in the bill, it would no doubt be construed to be an exception.

One of the most objectionable features of this bill is section 7, which contains the licensing provisions. Under this

section it shall be unlawful for any person to manufacture, produce, or export any equipment or device utilizing fissionable material or to utilize atomic energy except under and in accordance with a license issued by the Commission. Do not be misled by subsection (b) which requires a report to Congress before such licenses may be issued. If you will examine that section you will find that there is but one report to be made to Congress. That report will be made when, in the opinion of the Commission, any industrial, commercial, or other nonmilitary use of atomic energy has been sufficiently developed to be of practical value. In that report the Commission will set forth all the facts with respect to such use, and the report will contain the Commission's estimate of the social, political, economic, and international effects of such use. After 90 days subsequent to the making of such report, the Commission will have unlimited authority to issue licenses for the utilization of atomic energy to such persons and on such terms as it sees fit.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELSTON. I yield.

Mr. McDONOUGH. After the report is made, what happens? Is it merely an informative report? Does the bill further say that the Congress shall say "Yes" or "No"?

Mr. ELSTON. They simply file a report with us whether or not the Congress wants to enact supplemental legislation. If we want to enact supplemental legislation at any time, we do not have to wait for a report from any bureau.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELSTON. I yield.

Mr. DOYLE. Would you not want the Commission to give a full report to Congress on every phase of the subject?

Mr. ELSTON. Certainly, I would want them to report, but I am pointing out that this section is meaningless as far as the issuance of licenses is concerned.

Mr. DOYLE. If you want a full report, should it not cover the economic phase of the proposal?

Mr. ELSTON. I am pointing out the misleading language of the section and the effort to convey the impression that before licenses may be issued in any case the Commission must report to the Congress.

When we reach section 10 of the bill we see unfolded a strange philosophy for America. Let me read the pertinent part of this section:

It shall be the policy of the Commission to control the dissemination of restricted data in such a manner as to assure the common defense and security. Consistent with such policy, the Commission shall be guided by the following principles:

(1) That information with respect to the use of atomic energy for industrial purposes should be shared with other nations on a reciprocal basis as soon as the Congress declares by joint resolution that effective and enforceable international safeguards against the use of such energy for destructive purposes have been established.

In other words, hereafter it shall be the policy of this country, as soon as

international safeguards have been established, to share the use of atomic energy secrets and power with the other Nations of the world. When in all the history of this Nation has it been required that anything developed for the benefit of American industry shall be shared with other Nations? American industry leads the world today because of American inventive genius and our free enterprise system, but now we have a new philosophy. Do not lose sight of the fact that this sharing plan pertains to the use of atomic energy for industrial purposes only. It has no relation to the outlawing of atomic energy for military purposes which, I am sure, every thinking person favors when it can be done without endangering our own security. Judge for yourselves what this international plan will mean to American industry.

Not only must we share such information with other nations, but we must make sure they get the information. Section 10 (b) authorizes the Commission to establish such information services, publications and even libraries, as it sees fit. These may be established anywhere in the world. I know, of course, that someone will say that this sharing of information must be on a reciprocal basis, but who determines what shall be reciprocated? The Commission, of course. Since we apparently have all the information regarding atomic energy, what are we to get in return? Perhaps good will. So far as this section is concerned, the Commission would have authority to exchange atomic secrets for industrial purposes for good will as the Commission is the sole judge.

The patent section of the bill is definitely unconstitutional in its present form. Article I, section 8, clause 8, of the Constitution provides—

The Congress shall have * * * power to promote the program of science and useful arts by securing for limited times for authors and inventors the exclusive right to their respective writings and discoveries.

This section has been interpreted on many occasions by the courts, and the leading decisions on the subject are set forth in the minority views which accompanied this bill. For example, it is said in *Solomons v. United States* (137 U. S. 342, 346), that—

The Government has no more power to appropriate a man's property invested in a patent than it has to take his property invested in real estate.

The only testimony presented to our committee on the subject of patents came from Mr. Conder C. Henry, formerly Assistant Commissioner of Patents. He said, and I quote:

By removing the incentives provided by our patent laws, the bill is a radical departure from anything known in our history. The only parallel I can find to it is the Soviet patent law.

He further stated that hundreds of inventions used at Oak Ridge and elsewhere in the development of the atomic bomb had previously been made by private inventors. Moreover, he pointed out that under our present patent system the interests of the Government were fully safeguarded without encroaching

upon the constitutional rights of any person. This same system should and can continue, and it is my purpose to offer, as I did in committee, an amendment to strike section 11 from the bill.

Section 15 of the act creates a new congressional committee with full legislative authority, and this comes at a time when Congress is recommending fewer committees—even a consolidation of the Military and Naval Committees.

In the enforcement provisions of the act the Commission is given the broad power to make regulations and orders and enforce them by punishing offenders with a fine as high as \$20,000 and imprisonment for not more than 20 years, or both. This section, I believe, violates the rule laid down by the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of *Schechter v. United States* (295 U. S. 495), wherein it was held that Congress cannot delegate to any Government agency the power to make regulations having the force of law without laying down the policies and establishing the appropriate standards.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Ohio five additional minutes.

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ELSTON. I yield.

Mrs. LUCE. There being very few available sources of thorium, plutonium, uranium, and so on out of which fissionable material can be got, would the gentleman also think that the world authority which would own all these materials could take our large supplies and divide them up at will?

Mr. ELSTON. I presume that might be done if we became a part of that world authority.

Mrs. LUCE. Would it be possible?

Mr. ELSTON. It would not be possible to distribute fissionable material outside the United States at this time, but subsequent international agreements could make it possible.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELSTON. I yield.

Mr. McDONOUGH. With regard to the deposits of this radioactive material, certainly the commission would have control of such materials within the boundaries of the United States but would it control deposits in other parts of the world?

Mr. ELSTON. No; but it could acquire them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has again expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for four additional minutes.

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELSTON. I yield.

Mrs. LUCE. The gentleman spoke of the section called "Control of Information" in which there is formed a bureau to disseminate information. Would he care to comment on what type of infor-

mation this \$10,000,000,000 or \$20,000,000,000 corporation might disseminate to the people of America?

Mr. ELSTON. There would be no limitation on it, because the section I referred to authorized and directed the commission to establish such information service as it saw fit; in other words, it would be within the discretion of the commission to decide on the type and extent of information services, the number of libraries, and so forth.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELSTON. I yield to the gentleman for a question.

Mr. DURHAM. Does not the gentleman think that if the commission did the things he points out they would be subject to the Espionage Act?

Mr. ELSTON. If the terms of the Espionage Act were violated.

Why do they say this legislation is needed? The principal claim is that it will impress the rest of the world that we have taken the matter out of the hands of the military and invested it with civilians. If that be the purpose, this legislation very definitely is not needed as the President can order the military authorities to cease any of their military activities at any time, including the manufacture of atomic bombs or the use of atomic energy in any way.

Another claim is that peace of the world requires international control of atomic energy. If that be so point out a single thing in this bill dealing with international control or in any manner related to it. International control can come about only by international agreement. If any legislation is needed to augment such an agreement it necessarily would come after the international agreement was entered into.

Do we need this legislation to begin negotiations for such an agreement? The best answer is—such negotiations have begun before the duly constituted United Nations Atomic Energy Commission. Mr. Baruch submitted a proposal to this Commission a month ago. But it takes two or more to enter into an agreement, and Russia has flatly rejected Mr. Baruch's plan. Not only has she rejected it, but she has submitted a counterproposal which never could be agreed to if we have any regard at all for the security of this country.

So if we do not need this bill to remove an impression that we are militaristically inclined and we do not need it for the purpose of helping to bring about international control of atomic energy, what do we need it for? If it seeks to do anything further than to place shackles on American industry and barriers against inventive genius and ingenuity such purpose does not appear from the language of the bill.

If this Nation is concerned lest the other nations of the world think we are assuming too much of a military attitude we perhaps should explain why we are spending hundreds of millions of dollars in proceeding with the Bikini tests. Is it consistent to carry on these demonstrations and at the same time try to fool the American people into believing we can pacify the world by creating another bureau and many expensive bureaucrats

to further regiment the lives of our people and further encroach upon their liberties?

If this measure were to stop with encroachment upon American freedom it would be bad enough, but not necessarily fatal, as such an invasion might be corrected by subsequent legislation, although I have found that liberty and freedom, once surrendered, are not easy to regain. There is always another emergency offered as an excuse for retaining them. On the other hand, if the security of the country is involved legislation might be helpless to correct the error.

As I see it, the bill before us today, if enacted into law, will definitely jeopardize the Nation's security. At the moment the secrets of the atomic bomb and the bomb itself are safely in the hands of the military authorities in the keeping of that branch of the Government charged by the Constitution with the responsibility of defending the Nation. That is where I submit it should remain until our safety is assured under international agreements actually entered into and until machinery has been set up in the world adequate to enforce such agreements.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a very brief statement for the information of the membership. Two very distinguished Members of this body are resigning this afternoon and taking their seats on the judiciary of the country. They would like a little time in which to say good-by to us. I hope that when I move that the Committee rise, all gentlemen present will retain their seats until we listen to our colleagues. The ceremonies will be very brief.

Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. JOHN J. DELANEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 1717) for the development and control of atomic energy, had come to no resolution thereon.

RESIGNATIONS FROM THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communications:

JULY 17, 1946.

HON. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker, United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I beg leave to inform you that I have this day transmitted to the Governor of Texas my resignation as a Representative in the Congress of the United States from the Sixth Congressional District of Texas, effective from this date.

Cordially yours,

LUTHER A. JOHNSON.

JULY 17, 1946.

HON. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I beg leave to inform you that I have this day transmitted to the Governor

of Pennsylvania my resignation as a Representative in the Congress of the United States from the Tenth District of Pennsylvania.

Cordially yours,

JOHN W. MURPHY.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON].

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, today I am resigning from the House to become a judge of The Tax Court of the United States to which I have been appointed by President Truman and confirmed by the Senate.

For more than 23 years I have had the honor to serve continuously as the Representative of the Sixth Congressional District of Texas, having first been elected in November 1922 to the Sixty-eighth Congress, and my first term began on March 4, 1923, that being the beginning date of the new Congress at that time, but since the adoption of the twenty-first amendment to the Federal Constitution the terms of Representatives in Congress begin now on January 3.

In severing my relations as a Member of Congress, I wish to express my appreciation of the many courtesies and kindnesses that have been extended to me throughout the years by my colleagues and the leaders of the House, for whom I shall always have an affectionate regard.

Also, in taking leave of this body, I would like to say a few words in defense of Congress as an institution. My service here of almost a quarter of a century should qualify me to know what Congress is and how it works.

A few years ago I delivered in this Chamber a memorial address honoring some of our departed Members, in which I alluded to this subject, and I wish to repeat a few of the observations which I made at that time.

Contrary to the popular belief, membership in Congress requires constant labor. The manifold duties here require not only unremitting toil but deep thought, often vexatious worry, and this has been true at all times, but especially so during the grave crisis through which our country has been passing during the past decade.

Some years ago a well-known writer and prominent businessman was elected to membership in the House, and after serving a short time and familiarizing himself with the duties here and becoming acquainted with his colleagues, wrote an article for a current magazine entitled "What Surprised Me About Congress," in which he described his disillusionment as to the ability of Congressmen and the amount of work which they do. His conclusion was that, viewing Congress from the inside, he was surprised to find how hard they worked, how much they knew, and the conscientious manner in which they discharged their obligations.

If the American people could see Congress at close range, and follow them daily, they would reach the same conclusion as did the distinguished author of that article.

The Congress of the United States epitomizes and expresses as no other

body possibly can the genuine spirit and the profound emotion of American life. To be chosen out of a population of 140,000,000 people to be the representatives of their constituents in the National law-making body is an honor.

Critics may speak in disparagement of our National law-making body, but the history of our Government reveals that, by and large, the type of men who have served here excel in character and ability the same number of men in any other similar group.

The membership of Congress, representing as it does divergent views and faiths, both political and religious, and coming from those of wealth and those of poverty, might be compared to a great mosaic, reflecting a true cross-section of the American people.

It has always been a popular pastime to ridicule any legislative body, and Congress has often been made the subject of gibe and criticism, but not only the quality of its membership but the importance of the work which Congress performs is a complete answer to those who scoff.

If some foolish and fantastic decision should ever be made that one of the three coordinate branches of the Government should be abolished, the legislative, if a democracy is to survive, would be the last to go. Whatever else may be said about the Congress of the United States, with all its faults and its foibles, it is the palladium of our liberty, and when Congress falls the Republic will die.

I love the Congress of the United States where I have spent a large portion of my life in serving my country, and I want to see it continued on the same high plane that it has always occupied in the past.

Now that I am to be no longer a part of this body, and will never again be a candidate for an elective office of any kind and my motives cannot be impugned as actuated by self-interest, I wish to repeat and reemphasize what I have often said in the past as to the value of longevity of service in Congress. The Member who comes here expecting to serve only a short time, and serves only a short time, cannot do justice to himself, his constituents and his country. Service in Congress, to be at its best, should be in the nature of a career and not merely temporary. Seniority may have its abuses and objections, but it is necessary to encourage and require length of service, which is highly desirable for the country's good. The States whose delegations have served longest here always take highest rank, and rightly so. The delegation from my own State of Texas has always been outstanding, and one of the reasons has been that our State has retained its Congressmen on the average for a greater length of time than many of the other States; four of our delegations have served longer than I.

Of course, the question of ability is involved, and that should be one of the first matters of consideration in choosing a Congressman, but when a Congressman has ability, character, and devotion to duty, his constituents should keep him in Congress as long as he will serve.

While I shall not be here to vote when the measure comes up, I hope that this

House will pass the reorganization bill to increase the compensation of Congressmen and create a retirement fund for Congressmen. The passage of this legislation will be an act of justice. Soon after I became a Member of Congress, more than 20 years ago, I voted to increase the salaries of Congressmen from \$7,500 to \$10,000 per annum, and the newspapers in Texas carried a headline, "Three Texas Congressmen vote to increase their salary"; but never did I have a word of criticism from any of my constituents for this vote.

Congress has passed legislation providing for retirement compensation to nearly everyone in the Government except themselves. Surely the Members of Congress are entitled to the same privileges and benefits that other servants of the Government receive, and I trust that Congress does justice to itself and to the country by passing shortly an adequate system of congressional retirement. Nothing would so instill courage into the Members of the Congress as the knowledge that when they retire after long years of service they would not become objects of charity.

You will please pardon me for giving you this gratuitous advice, which I seldom do, for I am a good deal like a friend of mine who said he never gave advice, first, because it was seldom appreciated, and, second, because it was never followed.

I shall not detain you longer, for I know how busy you are in trying to complete the program of the House so adjournment can be had the latter part of this month, but I did not want to take leave of my colleagues without these few words of farewell. I have enjoyed my service here and shall always treasure in my heart the friendships which I have made on both sides of the aisle.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURPHY].

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I want to endorse fully and subscribe to the thoughts outlined by my distinguished predecessor, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON], soon to be Judge JOHNSON, of Texas. I have not been here as long as my distinguished friend. I have been here but 4 years. I left a busy, active trial practice back home to come to Congress. But in the 4 years I have been here I have made many strong friends and lasting friendships that I shall love and revere all my life. It has been a great privilege and a high honor to have worked with and under the distinguished Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Texas, SAM RAYBURN. I think he is a great American. From the day I attended my first Democratic caucus when I had made my little speech and received a word of praise from our distinguished leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], he has been my adviser and friend ever since and shall be for the rest of my life. He, too, is a great American.

I have enjoyed meeting the Members on the Democratic side and on the Republican side.

I have enjoyed close personal friendship with those on the Republican side.

I do not think I have ever passed the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], without having a fine, friendly "Hello" from him. I have worked with Members of the House on 11 committees.

In recent days on the Pearl Harbor Committee I have worked night and day with my good friend, the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART], as well as the members on that great committee from the Democratic side of the House, the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER], and the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. CLARK]. So, too, I have had the pleasure of working with members of the Senate, the distinguished majority leader, Senator EARKLEY, from Kentucky; the distinguished gentleman from Georgia, Senator GEORGE; the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, Senator LUCAS; the distinguished gentleman from Michigan, Senator FERGUSON; and the distinguished gentleman from Maine, Senator BREWSTER.

I think Congress is a great institution. I think Congressmen should be returned by their constituents because after 4 years of hard, diligent labor here I feel I have begun to realize what this institution means to America and to its Members. I have worked hard on every committee, and yet I feel if I were here longer I could be even more useful. But back home we have a challenge. I have been named to the Federal bench in the middle district of Pennsylvania. I would like to see that court hold a place of honor, integrity, and prestige among the courts of the Nation, and I shall try as earnestly and diligently as I can to see that that objective is accomplished. In the sense that I am leaving good friends, I regret having to make this decision. However, my going on the bench means that I will be able to spend many, many more hours and to enjoy the company of my good wife and lovely family. A decision has been made. The future holds a challenge. I leave here to face it.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it is with a keen feeling of regret on the one hand and pleasure on the other that I see our two friends, the one from Texas and the other from Pennsylvania, leave this distinguished body today to assume the responsibilities in another field of Government service and in another branch of our Government. I say that my pleasure is filled with regrets. Both are human feelings. The pleasure at their continuing their service in a field for which they are both so well qualified and which they both love, and the regrets that this body is losing the services of two of its outstanding Members, and the additional regret that as far as this body is concerned, as long as I am a Member here, I am losing the assistance and inspiration of their presence and their support. In both of these friends of ours, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURPHY], we have men of different names, probably

different racial origin, coming from different sections of the country, but both essentially the same type. They both possess an intense love of our country. To begin with, they are outstanding Americans. But as human beings, as I have observed them, looking beneath the surface and seeing the substance, they have always impressed me as men of essentially the same type, both possessing characteristics which are, in my opinion, essentially the same. Both of them, for example, possess the quality of ability. They both have vision. They both have character. They both have courage. Both men are honorable and trustworthy. The people of America have benefited greatly by their service in this body, one for 23 years and the other for 4 years. The people of their districts can well feel proud of the service that these two outstanding men have rendered in their behalf during their service in this body.

As my mind goes back through the years, I see the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON] always at my side fighting for the passage of such legislation as our conscience and our judgment told us we should support. During the 4 years of the service of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURPHY], as I look back my mind sees the same type, always at my side, and that means the Speaker's side, because the majority party, of course, had the primary responsibility, loyally supporting us, and their loyal support giving inspiration to the leadership to carry on, even when it looked hopeless, to go down fighting, with the flag flying.

I know I speak the sentiments of all my colleagues when I extend to both of these distinguished friends of ours, who will soon be former colleagues of ours, our sincere best wishes in the new duties that they are to assume and perform, and in accomplishing the maximum of success and of benefit to our Government and to the branch of service that they will honor, after they are sworn into office, one as judge of The Tax Court of the United States, and the other as judge of one of our United States district courts.

I conclude by saying that my feelings are mixed, feeling of pleasure and regret, but the pleasure greatly overshadows the regret.

Throughout the journey of life, as long as it may be for both of you, and to your loved ones, I extend my very best wishes.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognized the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, may I join in expressing my sincere regret at the retirement from Congress of these two able and distinguished Members. While both sit on the Democratic side, the entire membership is sorry to see them go. They are both men of integrity and courage who have served their State and country with great devotion. It is unfortunate when men of their type should leave Congress, particularly in these critical hours, when men of experience and patriotism are needed. However, they are entering another field where they can render important service.

I remember my first associations with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON] with pleasure. Our friendship has extended over a period of 22 years. When I came here as a freshman Member of Congress it was my fortune to be assigned to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. Here I early became intimately acquainted with my distinguished Texan friend. During these years I have come to know him intimately and appreciate his many fine qualities. He has applied himself diligently to the public service. He has been honest, sincere, and conscientious in his efforts to make this a better land. I deeply regret his leaving the legislative branch of this Government.

The distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania has been here but 4 years. In this short period of time, however, he has impressed us all with his fine ability and sincerity.

So I join today the majority leader and others in expressing my regret that these two good men are leaving the Halls of Congress. I wish for them long years of life, and hope for them brilliant success in their new work.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I suppose I should receive this news of the departure of our two colleagues with practically unmingled pleasure, first, because, of course, they are going to judicial honors that are well deserved, to duties that are possibly less arduous but are certainly highly honorable; and, second, because it reduces the Democratic majority by two. I confess, however, that I look to their leaving with a pang of regret.

I want to speak particularly about my friend, the able and distinguished gentleman from Texas. For 8 years I have served with him on the Foreign Affairs Committee. I have served with him on subcommittees. He and I were members of the delegation to represent Congress at Ottawa at the meeting of the Empire Parliamentary Association. I have seen him at work on the floor, in committee, and have met him socially. His broad grasp of fundamentals and his keen study of details have made him an able and effective Member of this body, and will distinguish his work on the bench. We have had times when we disagreed and when he fought strongly for the views in which he believed. There have been other times when we joined in fighting together for causes in which we both believed. Throughout these 8 years of rather close association, however, I have never known the gentleman from Texas to lose his temper, or to do or say anything mean or dishonorable, or to take any course which was questionable in any way. Throughout his work, as I have observed it, he has in reality been "the gentleman from Texas."

And now as he leaves us, and as we feel this loss, I hope no one will call me to order for unparliamentary language when I say, "Luther, we love you. We will miss you. This country is better because you served here."

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH].

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I take just a moment to express my sincere personal appreciation for the friendship which I have enjoyed with the gentlemen who are being appropriately honored here this afternoon.

I remember that when I came to this body almost 14 years ago I received assistance of a very helpful nature from the able gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON], who is now retiring from this body.

I remember also that when the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURPHY] gained membership in the House of Representatives I came to know him very soon in his career through service on at least one committee where our activities were joined together. It was my good fortune to speak in the city from which he comes and to find out the genuine esteem in which he was held by those who reside in that community.

I can say very sincerely that I believe the poet, Longfellow, must have had in mind a man like LUTHER JOHNSON when he said, "Age is opportunity, no less than youth itself, though in another dress," and even though Luther is not as young as when I knew him 14 years ago, I find him still vigorous, with a great capacity for service to this Nation which I am sure in his new position he will give to the country.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BELL].

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I think a feeling of deep regret comes to us when we come to a parting with friends whom we have long admired and loved. For 12 years I have been one of LUTHER JOHNSON's colleagues here in the House. I have never served on a committee with him, but day after day when I have seen him around on the floor of the House I have instinctively felt from the first time I met him that he was my personal friend. I have known and admired him for his great ability, for his sincerity, for his staunch love of the country that we all try to serve. It is with deep regret I see him leave this House, although I rejoice at the great honor that has come to him.

When Mr. MURPHY first came here I got acquainted with him as a member of the Committee on Insular Affairs. He had been a member of that committee for a very short time when I learned that he not only was a hard working Member of Congress but a man who was an able, alert lawyer. As chairman of that committee, from time to time I relied upon him when legal questions would arise. I want to congratulate the people of his State and the people of the United States on the fact he has been appointed as one of our district judges of the United States district court. I think that the courts of our land are the bulwark of American liberty, the safeguard of our American democracy. In my opinion, the President of the United States has chosen wisely in appointing these two gentlemen whose departure from Congress we all regret.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH].

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, my first reaction is that of depression when

I note the departure of these two Members from the House of Representatives. Frankly, I am concerned at the number of good men who are leaving the House. These two men, added to Messrs. Woodrum and Ramspeck, as well as one or two others whose retirement has not yet been announced but who we know are not coming back, persuade me that the House is not gaining by these acts but rather is losing. Of course, in the progress of time, we will make it up, the people will make it up, but it is somewhat depressing to me, who has been in the Congress for 25 years, to see these two men leave us. We have certainly needed men of their type.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON] will understand perhaps that I have had a special delight in my friendship and acquaintance with him, because I rode the range for 5 or 6 years in Texas, and upon occasion called myself half Texan. Like the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] I have served on the Committee on Foreign Affairs with Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. It has been a delightful association. The committee has had some extraordinary important things to consider during the war period, and I noted, as had the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] and the other Republicans on that committee, the patriotic, unselfish stand that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON] took. As a matter of fact, the number of occasions upon which that committee has been divided upon a partisan basis have been very few in number. Time and again the Members on the opposite side joined hands in supporting helpful-making legislation to which Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON had contributed enormously.

He and his family can be proud of what he has done on that committee for his country. He is leaving us along with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURPHY]. They both will continue their honorable service and, after all, what is better in life than honorable service to your country.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I think in the going from the House of our two colleagues, first of all we stress our own personal loss which is, perhaps, very selfish. These two distinguished and able lawyers are going out into the world to practice their talents in the judicial world for the benefit of the areas that they will serve. It will be a tremendous loss to us here in the House. They are both delightful men to work with. One of them I never had the pleasure of serving with in committee. The other I served with in the Committee on Foreign Affairs for 18 years. We have had very difficult legislation in that committee, legislation of far-reaching import, vital not only to our own country but vital to the world. We have had stormy sessions and differences of opinion.

I would like to say that I found the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON] able and most unselfish. He was an able leader in the Foreign Affairs Committee, just as he has been an able and loyal leader of his party on the floor

of Congress. Frequently while he was acting chairman as the acting ranking minority member of that committee, I had occasion to know some of the difficult problems that he had to face, perhaps better than some of the other members. I enjoyed my service with him when we both served as delegates and observers to the Inter-American Conference at Mexico City. There the distinguished gentleman from Texas, Judge JOHNSON, and I, saw eye to eye. It was not always easy, Mr. Speaker, to get some of the members of our own delegation to go along with measures that finally passed and that are being generally regarded as most successful. These measures, like the Act of Chapultepec, set the pattern for our inter-American relations and also the pattern for the United Nations.

I shall miss these great statesmen, Judge JOHNSON and Judge MURPHY. I wish them both Godspeed and as much success in their new positions of honor and distinction as they have achieved in the House.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS].

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I, too, wish to express regret at the departure from these Halls of these two distinguished Members, and to wish them Godspeed on their new journey in the Government service.

It has been said that it is impossible to gild the lily or to refine pure gold. I shall not attempt to do so here this evening. Suffice it to say that these two distinguished Members of this body have proven by their long service that they are able men, are courageous men, that they are honorable men. We hate to see them go.

It happens that since coming here 13 years ago I have been more closely associated with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON] than with the able gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURPHY], because as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs for 10 years I sat by his side, I might say at his feet. I have always benefited by his advice, prized his friendship, been impressed by his great ability, and admired his many lovable qualities. Though not so big in avoirdupois, LUTHER JOHNSON has nothing little about him. I have never heard, and I do not think anybody else has, of LUTHER JOHNSON doing a little thing or saying a little thing. He is incapable of harboring animosity, he is incapable of bitterness, he is incapable of doing a mean thing. His judgment is always unbiased, his good humor never failing, his integrity unquestionable. I prize his friendship dearly.

I have found him to be a Representative in Congress with an eagle vision and a child's faith. Long before many people in this country had the vision to see that the United States had to take a major and leading part on the stage of world responsibility, LUTHER JOHNSON saw it and fought for it. His faith, his childlike faith, in humanity in general and the American people in particular has always been an inspiration to me.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure, and I believe the rest of the Members of the House will

agree with me, that the people of our great country who want integrity on the bench may be assured that when the judicial ermine finally falls from the shoulders of the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the gentleman from Texas it will be spotless as when it was placed there.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I cannot refrain from participating in this occasion, which has almost assumed the solemnity of a memorial service. I do not approach it in that sort of a spirit at all, and I am happy to note that my distinguished friend from Texas is now bearing that gracious and infectious smile that has endeared him to me ever since I have been here as a Member of this House.

I am not going to take time to enlarge upon the fine statements and sentiments that have been expressed with respect to my dear friend from Texas, whom I have learned to love since I have been here. Needless to say, I agree with them. And I do not feel so bad about your going, sir, as some people have expressed. I am happy you have the opportunity to go into this job, because you are entitled to it and will get some relief from the situation that is plaguing some of the rest of us here, and who will have to remain in Congress and do a job here, while you are doing the same type or even a bigger job on the bench.

I want to say just a word about my good friend the gentleman from Pennsylvania, JOHN MURPHY. John is a Democrat, and I am a Republican. He is Irish and I have some Irish in me. We both have the same sort of forebears. I used to think sometimes he was a little bit too much the other way and sometimes you get the wrong impressions of people whom you do not know. Sometimes you hear people say unkind things about people whom they do not know and they come to the wrong conclusions about people they do not know. I want to say to you, my colleagues, that it has been one of the great experiences in my life to have been privileged to serve upon the Pearl Harbor Investigating Committee, where I have come to know JOHN MURPHY intimately. I have grown to love the boy. He has great character and great ability. I rejoice with him, and I know down in the bottom of his heart he is rejoicing, because he has a wonderful wife and family from whom he has been separated to all these 4 years that he has been here chasing back and forth between here and his district in Pennsylvania. I praise God that John is going to have a chance to go back into that judicial district and do the splendid job I know he is capable of and take care of his wonderful family and become an American citizen that the whole Nation will be proud of, because he will distinguish himself on the job.

I do not always agree with these men—and I do not always agree with JOHN MURPHY. He does not always agree with me. But I know that through the close association that we have had we have come to know and understand each other. Out of that association has come

a friendship of which I am extremely proud. That goes for my association with some other men in the House of Representatives whom I have had the privilege of having come in intimate contact with. When you get to know people and really sit with them and find out what they are thinking and how they react, you find after all, under the skin they are honest-to-God Americans thinking the same as you are thinking. I find my good friends to be that way. I am not saying anything in memoriam—this is not a requiem with me. I want to say, "Hosanna, thank God you are relieved, you two gentlemen." Thank God you are going to a job where you can have some peace and will not receive 500 telegrams a day giving you the dickens about something every day of your life. I hope you enjoy your work. I know you will do a grand and splendid job.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COMBS). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON].

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to prolong the session, but certainly I could not let this pass without saying at least a few words. Today the House of Representatives is losing two of its finest men. But, likewise, the judicial system of the country is gaining two fine judges. We have all known JOHN MURPHY during the last 4 years. I cannot express it as well as the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] has just said it, but JOHN MURPHY has exemplified to all of us that he has that thing called character as well as ability. So it is safe to say that he will adorn the great bench on which he will sit in the old State of Pennsylvania.

As for my other friend, I do not approach this with any sadness at all because I rejoice with him and his family as well as his countless friends all over the Lone Star State of Texas that he is to go to one of the high courts of the United States here in the Capital City.

I have known LUTHER JOHNSON for many years, but for the last 15 years I have known him as intimately as I know my brother. I suppose I would be safe in saying he is my most intimate friend in this body. As the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS] so well said, LUTHER JOHNSON is absolutely incapable of thinking a little thought or doing a little act. He has been honored and respected by his people down in Texas all of his life. He comes of good stock. As a young man he distinguished himself as a district attorney. For quite a good many years he was an outstanding lawyer in central Texas, and 23 years ago he did something that is not often done by candidates for office. He came to this great law-making body without even an opponent. His people rose up and, as we call it in these war days, drafted him. For all of these years he has had very little opposition at any time, and he now voluntarily retires to accept this high Federal judgeship. He counts his friends by his acquaintances. Every person who knows him respects and honors him. We are going to miss both of you gentlemen but we hope we see you often. I just want to say, not only for myself but for the 20 Members from

Texas, that LUTHER JOHNSON will make a great judge. He is not only a man of character and great legal ability but he knows and will dispense justice. I am proud of him and happy to count him one of the nearest and dearest friends of my life.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JARMAN] is recognized.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the majority leader rather than the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON], who just preceded me, in that I listened to the remarks of these distinguished gentlemen a while ago with a feeling of mingled sadness and gladness. Sadness, because of the realization that they brought to an end their very distinguished careers, nearly 24 years in the case of the gentleman from Texas, and 4 years in the case of the gentleman from Pennsylvania. And the further realization that as the roll is called tomorrow it will not be our pleasure to hear their names included as one of us, and that as we come into this House tomorrow and in the days to come and pass around these Halls, it will not be our pleasure to enjoy a cheery hello or good morning with them. Gladness because of the realization that their congressional worries are over; that no more will it be necessary for them to worry about OPA or to reach a decision on any other controversial legislation. Never again will patronage problems arise to harass them, sometimes even in the middle of the night, they will not be bothered hereafter by the little matter of reelection each 2 years. And that hereafter their lives are destined to be ones of serenity, quietude, and complete pleasantness, we hope and believe.

They will both be greatly missed in the House. As many have said, I have been more intimately associated with the gentleman from Texas than it has been my pleasure to be associated with the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

I know that the membership of the Foreign Affairs Committee in particular will miss the fine and able services and the genial characteristics of the gentleman from Texas. The Foreign Affairs Committee will not be quite the same thing, Luther, without you.

And with you, as also with the gentleman from Pennsylvania, go the best wishes not only of the members of the Foreign Affairs Committee and the members of the 11 committees on which the gentleman from Pennsylvania has served, but also the best wishes of the entire membership of this House. We hope you are both destined to thoroughly enjoy your new service, even beyond your greatest expectation of this moment.

There is another reason for gratification with reference to the gentleman from Texas, which does not apply to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, in that the performance of his new duties for which he is so well qualified will not return him to Texas, will not even remove him from Washington, but on the contrary he will still be here in the Nation's Capital with his charming wife, which will afford those who love him as we all love

them both the opportunity of seeing them frequently in the years to come.

Enjoying as both you gentlemen always will the privileges of the floor of the House we hope you will frequently avail yourselves of this right and afford us the privilege, the pleasure, and the honor of often welcoming you here during the weeks, the months, the years that are to come. Luther, there will certainly be no valid reason for you to deny us this pleasure.

And as you go we say good-by, and may God bless and keep you both.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] is recognized.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I think we should congratulate the President of the United States upon a wise selection for two important places on the judiciary. I do not recall a time when two better selections have been made.

I do not think we can cover up the fact that tomorrow morning there will be empty seats in this House and that this House will have lost in the sum total of its ability. Two of the most outstanding and able lawyers of this body are going onto the bench. It has been my privilege, as it has been yours, to know these men and to appreciate their splendid qualities. I had the privilege during the last year of watching the work of Judge MURPHY before one of the important committees of this House. He rendered a real service to the people of this Nation, and particularly to the rural people of this Nation who are interested in the development of rural electrification. I want to say that they have lost a real friend from the Congress when JOHN MURPHY goes on the bench. He has rendered outstanding service here and he will do the same thing on the bench.

The closest congressional friend I have both from the standpoint of geography and friendship has filed his resignation from this body this afternoon. LUTHER JOHNSON represents the district closest in miles and closest in spirit to the district that I represent. I have come and you have all come to respect LUTHER JOHNSON, to know him as a statesman, to believe in him as a man of outstanding integrity, and I have come to love him as I have loved few men in my lifetime.

I think that many of us on this floor can repeat what the gentleman from El Paso said, that there is probably no man in this House to whom we feel a closer attachment. I have many close friends here. We all find that we make deep friendships in this body. But there has been no man in the 10 years I have been here for whom I have developed a closer feeling than my neighbor and my friend from Corsicana. He has been more than an inspiration to me; he has been more than a mere friend of mine; he and Mrs. Johnson and their splendid children have been the kind of people, and are the kind of people, that you feel proud to call your friends.

Those of us who have had the opportunity to know these good people so well have enjoyed a privilege that we should treasure all the days of our lives. I recognize that we are not abandoning those friendships, but I know, as you know,

that the daily meetings, the frequent meetings that we have enjoyed, are not going to be ours in the days to come. I know, of course, that we will have the opportunity of meeting again and we will look forward to that opportunity, but we are going to miss every day here on the floor of this House, down in the restaurant, in the cloakroom, on the way to and from the Office Building the friendship and the splendid inspiration that we have received at the hands of LUTHER JOHNSON.

Mr. Speaker, I have not the words at my command to express my feelings, and I know they are your feelings, because there is not a single man in this House who does not love and respect LUTHER JOHNSON. It is with no disrespect to the other splendid Members of the House that I say no one enjoys a wider range of friendship than does the gentleman from Texas who is today retiring from this body. We are all going to feel a sense of loss tomorrow morning; we are going to feel it for days, months, and years to come. We are going to feel that there is something missing in this House that cannot be replaced.

So, along with the other friends of both of these gentlemen who are leaving, I want you to know that as you go into another line of work, whatever your degree of success may be, and I know you will both make an outstanding success, whatever fame you may attain there, you cannot make truer friends than those you have made here in the House and particularly to my friend and neighbor I want to say that while I have admired LUTHER JOHNSON as a statesman, I also cherish him as a friend and have throughout all these years. We are losing not simply a great statesman from this body; we are losing a great man.

You know, there is a greatness of character that goes far deeper than mere ability. I believe that both of these men who are leaving us today have that depth of character as well as outstanding ability.

So God bless you both.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD].

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, it has meant much to me to know and serve here in this House with the distinguished, able, democratic gentlemen who leave us today for service in the Federal judiciary.

LUTHER JOHNSON and JOHN MURPHY are characterful and earnest. Both are fighters for causes they believe to be right. I shall never forget the Texan's stick-to-it-iveness and the Pennsylvanian's sincerity.

I have been drawn to these two men for another reason. In the midst of the busy, pressure-plus day, they always find it easy to indulge in a gracious smile and a warm greeting. Their heads are not in the clouds as they pass one by. They are regular.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognized the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BARRETT].

Mr. BARRETT of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I come from Pennsylvania. Sometimes they call it the southern part of the State known as the First District

of Philadelphia. I should like to express my interest in the appointment made by President Truman and how it affects the people of Pennsylvania far and wide. They think in JOHN MURPHY's appointment that the President has designated one of the finest men ever to come from that great Keystone State because of his temperament and judicial ability. JOHN MURPHY is not only admired, but he is loved by all his friends, particularly those of Pennsylvania. They admire him because of his integrity, his rectitude, and his unswerving loyalty to his friends and associates, and to know him is but to love him. I am sure he will do a courageous and worthy job in his new position.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BRUMBAUGH].

Mr. BRUMBAUGH. Mr. Speaker, the appointment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURPHY] to an important judicial post in the great Keystone State is a source of pleasure to me since he is numbered among the close personal friends I have made during my service as a Representative in Congress. While we differ in our political views that fact has never marred a friendship that I feel is destined to be of an enduring nature.

I have always found JOHN MURPHY to be upright, courteous, and, above all, sincere in his convictions. His genial personality and kindly disposition have won the acclaim of all who have been privileged to know him.

Pennsylvania is justly proud of JOHN MURPHY, and his splendid educational background and prominence in legal circles are sufficient guaranty that he is eminently qualified for appointment as a Federal judge.

The congressional district so ably represented by JOHN MURPHY has suffered a loss by his resignation but there is compensation in the fact that he is assuming important judicial duties and that his services to the Federal Government will not be terminated. May good health continue to attend him and may he enjoy a long and successful career as a Federal jurist is my sincere wish.

Similar honors have been conferred upon my good friend the gentleman from Texas, LUTHER A. JOHNSON, whom I had the pleasure of accompanying on a recent trip as a member of a congressional delegation. I have learned from his devoted wife that LUTHER JOHNSON's ambition in life was to serve in the Congress of the United States. This objective was realized, and his years of honorable and faithful service are a testimonial of his depth of character and spotless reputation.

His distinctive service, ability as a leader, and his courage and fidelity are a few of the many attributes that qualify him for the position as a Federal judge.

We shall miss his presence in the Halls of Congress, but he will have the opportunity of serving his country in a similar capacity through his assignment as a member of the Federal courts. It is my earnest wish that he may continue to enjoy the blessing of good health and derive happiness from the realization that he has many warm friends in Congress

who wish him Godspeed and a full measure of contentment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD].

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, when I first came to Congress I had the great honor of serving on the famous Committee on Foreign Affairs, and I am glad to see here today at this hour so many of my former colleagues on that committee to pay tribute to the Lone Star Ranger, my colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON]. I want to say to the Members and to Luther here today that many times when there were momentous problems—and there were many during the early months of this session in that committee—that I listened to Luther, and I listened long, and he advised me well. Whatever little I may have done there I attribute largely to his kindness and his help and his willingness to spend a great deal of time showing me around the labyrinth of international relations that a freshman Congressman could not very easily discover. I hope, Luther, that you will devote many hours this week to the rules of evidence because of the many hours you spent in this House and in the Committee on Foreign Affairs, it probably has you a little rusty. I look forward to the day when, with the gentleman from Alabama and many of the other lawyers of this House I can appear before you and say, "If Your Honor please."

Well, as they have said, Mr. Speaker, in Pennsylvania for the last several months, "Johnny, they tell me you are going to be a judge." In the coal fields, Mr. Speaker, that is the way we express affection and high regard.

JOHN MURPHY and I were admitted to the bar on the same day, and little did we wonder, Johnny, as we walked down from the courthouse that day—and I will not tell the Speaker the first place we stopped at—that you would be sitting there and I would be standing here. For a couple of coal crackers we came a long way. Mr. Speaker, this distinguished young statesman and jurist was born and raised in my district in Pennsylvania. I hope when you grace that middle district bench you will remember on occasion who your Congressman is, Mr. MURPHY.

Johnny worked on the Erie Railroad, Johnny worked in and around the mines. The story of Congressman, now Judge MURPHY, is the story of America as it has been told in this hallowed Chamber for generations. He is the current exhibit A. Twelve children in that family, a widowed mother when MURPHY was 7. They have all become leading professional men and businessmen and mothers and housewives of the great Keystone State.

The gentleman from Wisconsin discovered that MURPHY was an Irishman. Indeed he is that; a good Christian gentleman. I know his wife. I knew Mrs. Murphy before MURPHY knew her, a lovely girl. She loves him and their beautiful children. On these trips back and forth to Pennsylvania for the past few years, week end after week end—let me tell you gentlemen from other parts of the country, the far-removed terri-

tories, that you are lucky sometimes. Oh, you say, you can get home for a week end. Well, there are some week ends we wish we could not get home so often but John would never miss 1 hour with his family. I have traveled over those Poconos with Judge MURPHY driving all hours of the day and night in every kind of weather, and I am going to miss those trips and I am going to miss MURPHY, with all the feeling of friendship of all our lives.

Only you men, Americans that you are, know how I feel standing here today. Judge, this is the Hall of Congress. We are in the House of Representatives. As school kids, do you remember how you dreamed of this? You are only leaving here for the great honor of the Federal bench.

Ah, if I were a sculptor I would chisel from the marble my ideal of a young American. I would call that statue JOHN MURPHY. If I were a poet I would stir the heart of humanity with his deeds in his home State and in these Halls. Proud and eloquent would be that tribute. If I were a painter, Mr. Speaker, I would make the canvas eloquent with the deeds of this able and distinguished statesman and as capable a lawyer, district attorney, and Congressman as these great Halls have ever seen or heard. I would call that picture JOHN MURPHY.

I bring to you today, John, from Luzerne County the tribute of a half a million men and women who love you and always will. From Lackawanna County, which was carved out of Luzerne County, I am commissioned by your friends and neighbors there to reemphasize that tribute. For my colleagues of the Pennsylvania delegation and for your colleagues in the House, hail, and farewell.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York [Mr. RABIN] is recognized.

Mr. RABIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to take but a minute to extend my congratulations to my two colleagues upon their elevation to the bench. It has not been my privilege to know Mr. JOHNSON as well as some of the others who have spoken. But I will accept the summation of the lawyers who have summed up the testimony of the witnesses in his behalf, and, as a juror, I concur in their verdict.

But I bear witness myself to what was said about JOHN MURPHY. I met JOHN MURPHY on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. It has been a privilege to know him. I take this opportunity to express publicly my thanks for the help he has given me on that committee and for the inspiration that he has been to me. When I was in doubt, I talked with JOHN MURPHY. I have never gone wrong in following his advice. I have learned to respect him. I have learned to love him. I learned to respect him as a man and as a Congressman, as well as a lawyer. I know that he is beginning a career that will be a distinguished one. I hope that even greater judicial honors are in store for him.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas, the Speaker of the House [Mr. RAYBURN].

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I would not take any time at this late hour except I do want to place in the RECORD a word about these two very distinguished colleagues of ours.

First, I want to speak of LUTHER JOHNSON because I know that God never made a better man than LUTHER JOHNSON—neighbor, friend, public servant, modest, yet bold, able, conscientious, patriotic. He leaves here a heritage of which he and his may well be proud throughout his and their years. I do not know anybody who does not like LUTHER JOHNSON. If I found somebody who did not like, honor, and respect LUTHER JOHNSON, frankly I would want him examined morally, physically, and mentally, because he is the type who attracts friendship because he deserves friendship and because he gives in turn a splendid friendship. Of course, we on the Texas delegation are going to miss him every day, and terribly, for the remainder of our tenure here. I know he will make an outstanding judge on the great court to which he has been called.

As for JOHN MURPHY, I will say that in the thirty-odd years it has been my privilege to serve here, I have not known a young man to come to this House who in so short a time has more deeply impressed me and others with his fine character, his splendid ability, and, of course, an unquestioned and great patriotic desire to serve his country. When John told me that he was thinking of retiring I started to argue with him and said to him that men of his age, his physical mold, moral mold, and mental mold, should make the Congress of the United States a career. But he has the obligations of a family and they have a right and he recognized it, to have more security than a man can possibly have here.

I regret to see him go. I predict for him a wonderful career and a distinguished service on the bench.

I join with the gentleman from New York, [Mr. WADSWORTH], in regretting to see so many good men leaving the Congress of the United States. Resignations during this, the Seventy-ninth Congress, have weakened the stature of the House of Representatives. And more are going soon unless this service is made more attractive and unless men can look forward to devoting a life to the public service with security for themselves and their families after they leave here.

I am sorry to see each of you go, but I know that that branch of the public service to which you go and its capability of service will be tremendously enhanced by your entering the field of Government to which you are going.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HORAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include articles.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. RAMEY] is recognized.

A STRONG SPIRIT IN TROUBLED TIMES

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, I received a letter the other day from a constituent

which began by saying, and I quote only a part of it:

Hail to thee, blithe spirit, I see you voted for the Case bill, and I have been waiting this opportunity to tell you what I think.

I am not at this time going to go into any extended discussion of the Case bill. I voted for the Case bill because, in my opinion, it will gain much respect for labor unions in the future, and permit them to go ahead for what I am confident is a greater and permanent and more orderly future with the full public support their rights entitled them to receive. That, if you please, has always been my attitude to labor and labor unions. I am a workingman and I have a kinship with them individually and collectively. I am a member of Toledo Local 707, of State, County, and Municipal Employees of American Federation of Labor.

My voting record bears me out in this respect. However, I wish to point out, and other Congressmen no doubt share this view, that it is increasingly difficult for a man in Congress to go down the middle, do the right thing, and escape unjust criticism, in these times.

I think that this is true, largely because we have entered into the age of extremes. When we used the expression "follow the party line" a few months ago it was generally directed at communism, from which it was borrowed. But there are many lines today. There is the Communist line, the Fascist line, the leftist line, and the extremist line. We still have Roosevelt haters who insist every now and then on exhuming the body of the late President so that they may verbally spit upon him. We have a leftist line which judges everybody and everything in terms of Russia.

We do not have a clearly drawn Republican line or Democratic line, and that may be one of the things that is wrong with us. During the recent bitter OPA fight, it was quite clear that what we needed was continuance of OPA with certain relaxations of its rigidity. What's wrong with that? Nothing. Yet those who advocated it were pilloried as being weak-kneed compromisers. We had the irreconcilables who wanted OPA continued, and the equally adamant who wanted it wrecked without any reservation whatsoever. Between the two there was no common denominator, and we wound up by being wholly without any law at all.

In labor matters it is quite clear, at least to me, as to what we need. We need the protection and preservation of labor's gains. We need the exaction from labor of an honest day's work for an honest day's pay. We need the right to strike protected and preserved. It is labor's only effective weapon. We need the respect by both sides of the sacred character of contract. This is the case simply stated. Yet on the one hand we are branded as pro-labor or as anti-labor, according to how we vote on measures of such an extreme character that some of them actually have not been introduced with serious intent.

Your sincere and honest Congressman is offered all too frequently a choice of two extremes. I submit that this is not a proper choice, nor a just choice, and

not a necessary one. It is a little like asking a man to choose between THEODORE G. BILBO and Earl Browder as our next President.

The honest legislator, in these circumstances, must take a course that will be necessarily unpopular. The course he will take is to support those measures which he thinks are good, oppose those which he thinks are bad, and amend those which he thinks can, by proper amendment, be made workable and fair.

We are in a period in our history when we do not necessarily try men's souls, but we do impose some rather severe choices on them. That is the aftermath of war. It has always been thus with the backwash of war. In the late sixties we could not make up our minds whether we wanted to hang Jeff Davis or enshrine him. Nobody wanted to let him go back to planting cotton. After the First World War we wanted to try the Kaiser, we wanted to change the basis of our own Government, or we wanted to restore Germany, or we wanted to stage a permanent Red hunt and crucify everybody who had opposed us or who held economic ideas contrary to our own.

The record also shows that we did none of these things. In the course of time a middle trail of progress emerged, and that trail we followed.

I opposed the Smith-Connally Act and opposed overriding the veto. I took the side of labor in the efforts to discredit labor during the GM strike. I kept labor matters away from the Military Affairs Committee and voted to send them to the Labor Committee. I opposed the May-Arends gag rule. I opposed the amendment to keep labor out of politics. I opposed the Lea rider which would have robbed some 1,500,000 workers of the rights to WLB appeal. I defended labor and fought the effort to smear labor during the steel strike. I supported the pay raises for Federal workers and the effort to give them travel allowance. I backed the minimum-wage proposal. I voted for the Case bill.

In postwar collaboration I supported the Fulbright resolution of 1943, I supported UNRRA. I supported renewal of trade agreements, I supported the Bretton Woods agreement, I defended and defend the principles of the Atlantic Charter.

In other matters I opposed making the Dies committee a permanent congressional unit. I was for the elimination of the poll tax. I introduced a bill and steadily have supported measures for old-age-pension recipients. I have supported and expect to support every measure tending to strengthen our system of social security.

I am rather proud of this record, and yet, as many another Congressman with a similar record will testify, I have been harshly criticized for it. The chamber of commerce lynched me, at least verbally, in my home town when I opposed the Smith-Connally Act. Some of my labor friends have been sharply critical of my Case bill vote. Others, in both instances, commended me. I thank my lucky stars for these moderates, these sound thinkers, who know that labor must be safeguarded and at the same time also know that every proposed law

which gets a union endorsement is not necessarily a good law by reason of that fact. "If you can keep your head when all about you are losing theirs and blaming it on you," so one verse of Mr. Kipling's poem goes. When others doubt you, be patient, explain, confer, but do not retreat from any position unless it can be demonstrated to you that you are wrong. I cannot believe that those of us who are honestly striving for what is right and fair and decent will suffer from our devotion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] is recognized.

AUTOMOBILES FOR AMPUTEES

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I have signed the petition to discharge the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation from further consideration of H. R. 6304 in order that the measure may be considered and acted upon in this House. The bill would authorize the furnishing of a suitably equipped automobile, costing not more than \$1,500, to any veteran having a service-incurred disability due to loss, or loss of use of, one or more limbs. I endorse this measure; I urge that my colleagues add their names to the petition so that we can consider and act upon it. For it is a pressing concern, and a just proposal, yet it has been opposed.

One of the veterans' organizations of World War II declares its fundamental attitude with these words: "Citizens first; veterans second," an attitude which declares that the veterans are not looking for special privilege, that the national welfare is, in the final analysis, paramount. It has been my experience that most veterans share this attitude. However, they continue to assert, and with the same honest and knowing appraisal of their own situation, that they should be given the opportunity to get started, an opportunity to settle the accumulation of deferred business and new problems that are piled up at the border of military and civilian life and which must be cleared before they can proceed on their own and under their own powers, as they prefer.

In fact, it is the initial impediments which cause the protest and the plea from the veterans themselves. They repeat firmly and honestly that they do not want special privilege, but that they are entitled to immediate and practical assistance in getting over the first hurdle, the accumulated residue of 3 or 4 years' absence and the inevitable complications of getting started.

In many cases the initial impetus has been made, due not only to Government assistance and community action but also due to the initiative of the men themselves, an initiative always characteristic of young Americans and now spurred by this equally characteristic urge to get started, to gain security, to become, in short, an active citizen.

But we would be blind to fact and ignorant of need if we relaxed our efforts now with optimistic reassurances that all is well. For many veterans, possessed of the same initiative and the same urge, are as yet unable to get started. And not

the least of these are the men to whom we must be particularly indebted, those who are physically handicapped. We are, needless to say, particularly indebted to them because, participating in the common cause, they were at the very front, and now sharing in our common life, they have suffered permanent handicap and are in danger of being relegated to the rear.

The late great President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, called on the Nation at the outset of our ordeal for equality of sacrifice insofar as is possible, acknowledging in this phrase that some must sacrifice more than others the indiscriminate abuses of war. But, while cherishing the common good, we must not permit the greater sacrifice to harden into the perpetual handicap, to become as it were a perpetual paralysis. Our physical therapy, with its concordance of wise medical treatment, mechanical aids, training in skills, is doing wonders in restoring the disabled, enabling him to stand on his own feet, move under his own power, choose his direction. A social therapy, modeled on the same thorough method and seeking the same ends, must be developed.

We have all remarked on the characteristic attitude of the veteran of the struggle shortly ended which asserts that he wants not special privilege, only the opportunity to get started. And more than one observer close to these men and knowing them has declared that the more severe and grueling was their test in war, the greater the demand on their courage and endurance, the less do they want privilege, the more do they want to stand on their own.

Consequently we must try to measure the accuracy of the inescapable conclusion of General Bradley, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, that legislation now before Congress is "primarily a bonus for a limited group." The bill, H. R. 6304, would authorize the furnishing of an automobile, suitably equipped, to any veteran having a service incurred disability due to loss or loss of use of one or more limbs. General Bradley, because of his position and his record must be listened to. But his statement is inconsistent with our observation that the veteran, and more particularly the handicapped veteran, does not seek special privilege.

Yet the veterans who have lost the use of their legs support the proposed legislation. Are they then seeking special privilege? Let us listen to one of their spokesmen, Staff Sergeant Gillerman, of Brookline, Mass., a patient at the Walter Reed Hospital, who lost a leg in France. He spoke to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation at hearings on this bill with the support of 50 of his fellow lower-limbs amputees who were present. He said:

Gentlemen, we know that we can never be restored to complete normalcy. All we ask for is a chance to once again be able to compete for a job with people who are unhampered by such hardships. * * * It—

The Government—assumed the all-important task of rehabilitating these men to as complete a state of normalcy as possible in order that they might resume a useful, independent position in a society for which they sacrificed so much.

Sergeant Gillerman pointed out that artificial limbs and appliances have proved through experience to be insufficient to overcome the hazards and hardships of day-to-day existence. He pointed out that to men who had lost their power of locomotion, an auto was a mechanical aid, even as were crutches and the wheel chair.

Now there is no doubt that the bill has a limited application, for it is specifically designed to assist veterans who have lost the use of one or both legs in line of duty. But it must be equally apparent that the bill does not propose special privilege as distinct from the basic and fundamental necessity of enabling each veteran to be independent, "to be on his own." In fact it proposes just that. The intent of the measure, the motive that evokes the amputee's fervent support, the fundamental obligation of the Nation are here all one, namely, to avail the veteran of the opportunity to be an independent citizen, which he so earnestly wants.

What we must not ignore in considering this question is the fact, a very real and, to the disabled, even a harsh fact, that he is handicapped. Sergeant Gillerman said "We know that we can never be restored to complete normalcy." Yet this complete restoration of the veteran is the goal of all our efforts. We want him to be, first a citizen, next a veteran. Complete restoration is impossible for these men; it is of course absurd to then surrender any attempt to restore them to the independent life in society. Looked at in that light, such a negative assertion would never be made. But this negative approach is inherent in any attitude which regards the minimizing of the amputee's handicap as "special privilege."

Our society is a highly competitive one. No man, particularly one who has sweated and suffered to guarantee that our society be maintained wants to be shunted to the sidelines. He wants to take his place in society and make his way in it.

However competitive our way of life may be, we retain our sense of fair play, which probably has its basis in recognition of the essential dignity of man, the recognition, for example, of his right. We want no man crushed. We want no man relegated to the sidelines against his will. We certainly want to restore his place to the man who stepped out in khaki to fight for the retention of our society. Do we then refuse to restore his place to the man who was injured in that fight? I think not, and that is why I insist that we do our best to compensate for the serious handicap of the loss of a limb.

A man who has lost his legs has not lost his zest for life; it has rather been increased. The man whose legs are paralyzed has not therefore been paralyzed in mind and will, but quickened. There is the very immediate danger, however, that we can sacrifice the zest for living, the will to live independently of the handicapped man by ignoring his handicap.

The amputee states that artificial limbs are not sufficient to overcome the hazards of day-to-day existence. They do not restore his mobility. Public

transportation is too congested, rough terrain, snow and ice, crowds, long distances and so forth, are too much for him to contend with. An automobile is the only solution. Provide them with that and the amputee and the paraplegic will make their way, maintain the car and settle the many difficulties that will be theirs.

The bill provides for a grant of \$1,500 in lieu of a car. This is also the maximum provided for the purchase of a car. It is this cash provision that has led General Bradley to his "inescapable conviction" that the legislation is primarily a bonus for a limited group. It is still pertinent to point out that the group is of course limited, and it is the very fact of limitation to the veteran who has lost the use of one or two legs that is the basis for the proposal. But there are connotations in the phrase "bonus for a limited group" which can lead us away from the just appraisal. It is not a bonus to attempt to give to the handicapped veteran a place in some ways equal to the rest of his fellows. No other veteran will deny such men this equivalent opportunity.

However, Sergeant Gillerman has pointed out that the cash provision was injected into the bill to cover small groups of disabled veterans who have already cashed their bonds and used much of their life savings to purchase a necessary auto. For an automobile is a necessity to these men. Without it they become confined, lose their place in society, lose their opportunities. And beyond this loss of opportunity and active share in daily living waits a disquieting fear. Whether the source of this fear is the threat of isolation and helplessness, or the danger of further injury and hospitalization to which such men are so susceptible, or a ranking sense of injustice, matters not as much as the fact that the fear can be minimized if we are ready with the remedy. It would be cruel to add mental instability to the physical instability which now cripples these veterans.

Consequently, I urge my colleagues to add their endorsement to this measure, urge them to sign the discharge petition. Nothing can be gained by holding the bill. Hearings have been completed. We have only to make the decision. We have only to decide whether the men who suffered the loss of their legs are to be provided with the indispensable means of maintaining some measure of an active life. We have only to decide if the veterans who have sacrificed the most are to suffer permanently without appropriate compensation. I insist that we must minimize the inequality of opportunity and freedom which is the direct consequence of their sacrifice. I insist that we must preserve more than the life, which in many cases has been preserved by the skill of doctors and the will of victims, we must preserve for them active participation in life. They, too, must share to the fullest degree now available to them the indispensable concomitants of modern living.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANE. I yield, but first let me say that I think we in the Congress owe a debt of gratitude to the gentlewoman

for her foresight in filing this bill and bringing it to our attention, so that we can join with her in an effort to have this legislation brought to the floor and voted on so that these young men who are crippled for the remainder of their lives may have a little help to more nearly put them on a basis with others not so afflicted.

I know I voice the sentiments of my colleagues not only on my side but on the minority side, of which the gentlewoman from Massachusetts is a member, when I say we are all greatly pleased that she has seen fit to bring this to our attention. I hope she will be successful. She has put in many, many hours of work and much effort and she is to be congratulated.

I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman is unflinching in his efforts for the veterans, and very successful. I know the veterans are extremely grateful—I am—for his ardent support of this measure. Does it not, however, seem ironical to the gentleman that we should spend 2 days on the atomic bomb that has destroyed so many people and yet refuse to spend any time at all trying to restore some facility to the veterans who have lost their natural functions, to enable them to walk and get about again?

Can the gentleman tell me where the opposition is? It is incomprehensible to me that there could be or that there should be any opposition. Members of the press ask me: "What is the opposition? Where is it? Why does not the bill pass?"

Mr. LANE. I take it that the gentlewoman knows best about whatever opposition there is. It exists somewhere, some place, because we are unable to bring this matter up for consideration without a discharge petition. It is on the desk for us to sign.

I join the gentlewoman in her efforts, for I feel this should be one of the "must" bills. We should take care of these young men who have these impediments, who have given their limbs for their country.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Does not the gentleman believe that every Member who has signed that petition, so long as the bill does not come out of the World War Veterans' Committee, will rejoice because he has tried to give veterans without limbs an automobile? When those who have not done so are motoring away from here I think they will regret it all their lives.

Mr. LANE. I certainly do; and I thank the gentlewoman for her contribution.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANE. I yield.

Mr. CANFIELD. I, too, wish to compliment the gentleman from Massachusetts on the fine statement he has made and to say I believe that in the many years I have served here on Capitol Hill the saddest sight I have ever seen was that of a group of these amputees going from office to office seeking support for this worthy legislation.

Mr. LANE. I join with the gentleman from New Jersey and I know that he feels like most of us, that this bill should be brought to the floor for action as soon as possible. I know his efforts have been

along these lines, for his record has always been one of working for the welfare and benefit of the veterans.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. RAMEY. I concur in the statement of the gentleman from New Jersey. I am grateful for the address the gentleman is giving us. Of course, we all know the continuity of the faithfulness of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS]. I believe the gentleman will concur in the statement that it should not be necessary for these men to go around soliciting; it is something that is due them. Time is the essence and I believe this petition should be signed immediately.

Mr. LANE. I thank the gentleman for his contribution and I join with him in his sentiments. I think the sooner the better.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROWAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from the Secretary of War.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1477. An act to authorize relief in certain cases where work, supplies, or services have been furnished for the Government under contracts during the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 661. An act for the relief of Harold H. Rhodes;

S. 706. An act to amend Veterans Regulation No. 9 (a), as amended, so as to increase the limit of amounts payable thereunder in connection with the funeral and burial of deceased veterans;

S. 1132. An act for the relief of Aeronautical Training Center, Inc.;

S. 1748. An act for the relief of Ivor E. Nicholas; and

S. 2291. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to transfer a vessel to the American Antarctic Association, Inc.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 16 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned, under its previous order, until tomorrow, Thursday, July 18, 1946, at 10 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

1466. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting a draft of a proposed joint resolution granting permission to Thomas Parran, Surgeon General of the Public Health Service; Rolla E. Dyer, Assistant Surgeon General, Public Health Service; Howard F. Smith, Assistant Surgeon General, Public Health Service; Herbert A. Spencer, medical director, Public Health Service; Vance B. Murray, medical director, Public Health Service; and Gilbert L. Dunahoo, medical director, Public Health

Service, to accept and wear certain decorations bestowed upon them by France, Cuba, Mexico, Chile, Finland, and Luang-Prabang, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

Mr. CLARK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 710. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 7037, a bill to amend the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2530). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LANHAM: Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. Senate Joint Resolution 4. Joint resolution authorizing the erection on public grounds in Springville, Ariz., of a memorial to Gustav Becker, without amendment (Rept. No. 2543). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. REED of New York: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 7052. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2544). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HEALY: Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 223. An act to provide for the establishment of a modern, adequate, and efficient hospital center in the District of Columbia; with amendment (Rept. No. 2545). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MANASCO: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. S. 1636. An act to amend the Surplus Property Act of 1944 to designate the Department of State as the disposal agency for surplus property outside the continental United States, its Territories and possessions, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 2546). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1004. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Robert Olsen, a minor; with amendments (Rept. No. 2531). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1459. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. J. W. Williams, Jr.; with amendments (Rept. No. 2532). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1887. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Leroy A. Robbins; without amendment (Rept. No. 2533). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3210. A bill for the relief of Clyde O. Payne with amendments (Rept. No. 2534). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3619. A bill for the relief of Harry D. Koons; with amendments (Rept. No. 2535). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2855. A bill for the relief of Martin A. Tucker and Emma M. Tucker; with amend-

ments (Rept. No. 2536). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4815. A bill for the relief of Pittsburgh DuBois Co.; with amendments (Rept. No. 2537). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4827. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Pan American Petroleum & Transport Co. against the United States; with amendments (Rept. No. 2538). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4860. A bill for the relief of Materials Handling Machinery Co., Inc.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2539). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5287. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Cecile W. McAfee, Sarah McAfee, and Haven H. McAfee; with amendments (Rept. No. 2540). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. STIGLER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5847. A bill for the relief of Watson Airfotos, Inc.; with amendments (Rept. No. 2541). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5848. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Millie Moore; without amendment (Rept. No. 2542). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. KLEIN:
H. R. 7060. A bill to amend section 3 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, as amended (39 Stat. 875-878; 8 U. S. C. 136); to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. PITTENGER:
H. R. 7061. A bill to restore agencies and functions to the status in effect before the taking effect of Reorganization Plans Nos. 2 and 3, transmitted to Congress on May 16, 1946; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. HORAN:
H. R. 7062. A bill to expedite the disposition of surplus property; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. BROOKS:
H. R. 7063. A bill to provide for the selection for elimination and retirement of officers of the Regular Army, for the equalization of retirement benefits for members of the Army of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BAILEY:
H. Res. 711. Resolution requesting the Secretary of the Treasury to furnish to the House of Representatives certain information with respect to the operation and administration of subsections (b) and (d) of section 122 of the Revenue Act of 1945; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey:
H. Res. 712. Resolution to investigate dissemination of propaganda by Office of Price Administration; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. CELLER:
H. R. 7064. A bill for the relief of Amin Bin Rejab; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. COFFEE:
H. R. 7065. A bill for the relief of A. J. Sproufske; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GEELAN:
H. R. 7066. A bill for the relief of Peter J. Geenty; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HART:
H. R. 7067. A bill for the relief of Louisa Russell Nipkow; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. McGEHEE:
H. R. 7068. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Martha P. Matthews; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana:
H. R. 7069. A bill for the relief of Margaret Katherine Hume; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. RUSSELL:
H. R. 7070. A bill for the relief of W. J. Cross; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

2102. By Mr. GEELAN: Petition adopted at the twenty-sixth annual department encampment, Department of Connecticut, of Veterans of Foreign Wars, that veterans who are employed as apprentices under Public Law 346 or 16 who are injured while working at their trade or profession should continue to receive the sustenance payments presently being made to such persons employed as apprentices under the above public laws; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

2103. Also, petition adopted at the twenty-sixth annual department encampment, Department of Connecticut, of Veterans of Foreign Wars, endorsing the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill and requesting its early passage; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2104. Also, petition adopted at the twenty-sixth annual department encampment, Department of Connecticut, of Veterans of Foreign Wars, advocating that the United States keep secret all of its military secrets until such time as international cooperation, mutual good faith, and confidence have been established; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2105. Also, petition adopted at the twenty-sixth annual department encampment, Department of Connecticut, Veterans of Foreign Wars, advocating the establishment of a depot in Connecticut for the disposal of surplus property; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

2106. Also, petition adopted at the twenty-sixth annual department encampment, Department of Connecticut, of Veterans of Foreign Wars, to enact legislation which would change the Articles of Government of the Navy to provide for equal treatment of enlisted personnel in courts martial; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2107. By Mr. HANCOCK: Petition signed by George Gronau and 50 other residents of the city of Syracuse, N. Y., protesting against the recent order of the Department of Agriculture reducing the amount of grain to be allocated to the brewing industry; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2108. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the South Tyrolean Peoples Party Bozen, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to aid in struggle for freedom and right of self-determination; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2109. Also, petition of Vergil McMillan and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the case of Ola May McMillan et al. against Francis W. Taylor et al.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.