

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 3434. A bill to grant retirement with pay to certain emergency officers of World War I seriously disabled from gunshot wounds incurred in combat; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 3435. A bill to provide that automatic national service life insurance as to deceased veterans of World War II shall be payable, in turn, to their widows, children, and parents, if any, without any requirement, as at present, as to their dependency; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 3436. A bill to amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 to provide that payments be made to survivors for unused leave accumulated by members of the armed forces before their death in service; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 3437. A bill relating to the compensation of those veterans of World War I and World War II who suffer from tuberculosis; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 3438. A bill to provide for the payment of direct Federal assistance to permanently and totally disabled individuals, blind individuals, and certain individuals 60 years of age or over; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3439. A bill to raise the limit on the amount of annual income from other sources which may be received by the widow or child of a veteran of World War I or II without disqualifying such widow or child for a pension for the non-service-connected death of such veteran; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 3440. A bill to provide that automatic national service life insurance as to deceased veterans of World War II shall be payable, in turn, to their widows, children, and parents, if any, without any requirement, as at present, as to their dependency; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 3441. A bill to provide that disabled veterans of World War II who elect to receive the educational benefits granted by part VIII of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) shall receive the entire subsistence allowance provided by such part; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 3442. A bill to provide that retired enlisted personnel of the Army who served as commissioned officers during World War II shall receive the pay of retired warrant officers; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 3443. A bill to amend section 6 of the act of March 20, 1933, so as to eliminate financial inability to defray expenses of hospital treatment or domiciliary care as a prerequisite to obtaining such treatment or care in a Veterans' Administration facility, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 3444. A bill to amend section 251 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. R. 3445. A bill to exempt from the immigration quota certain persons who served in the armed forces of governments allied with the United States during World War II; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GAMBLE (by request):

H. R. 3446. A bill to amend the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, title IV of the National Housing Act, the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 3447. A bill to amend the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 3448. A bill to amend the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BROOKS:

H. R. 3449. A bill to provide for equalization of flight pay for Navy and Marine Corps officers and former officers who did not receive flight pay equal to that paid to Army officers engaged in regular and frequent aerial flights; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 3450. A bill to authorize the acquisition of a site for a national cemetery in northwest Louisiana for the burial of members of the armed forces of the United States dying in the service, of former members whose last discharge therefrom was honorable, and certain other persons as provided for in United States Code, title 24, section 281, as amended; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. COLE of Missouri:

H. J. Res. 202. Joint resolution to provide emergency relief for victims of the tornado at Worth, Worth County, Mo., and for the restoration and reconstruction of the devastated areas; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. J. Res. 203. Joint resolution to study and inspect the operations of the United States Post Office Department; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GEARHART:

H. Res. 209. Resolution creating a select committee to make an investigation with respect to alien property, private war losses, foreign loans, and related matters; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BENNETT of Missouri:

H. Res. 210. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House of Representatives to investigate the causes of and feasible methods of preventing railroad accidents; to the Committee on Rules.

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. 3451. A bill for the relief of Szoszana Sierdzka; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HESELTION:

H. R. 3452. A bill for the relief of James R. Walsh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 3453. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Louise A. Ellison; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3454. A bill for the relief of Emile G. Peltier; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3455. A bill to authorize the presentation to Edward R. Egan of a Distinguished Service Cross; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SASSNER:

H. R. 3456. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Andrew Johnson, Alexander H. Tongue, James F. Sirlouis, James W. Dixon, J. Frank Tongue, Thomas E. Wroten, Halvor H. Hellen, George J. Carey, Robert C. O'Berry, Norman C. Carey, James W. Hungerford, Sarah E. Webster, Nathaniel M. Dare, and Richard J. Johnson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

500. By Mr. Gwynne of Iowa: Petition of Mrs. C. A. Turbett, and others, Le Grand, Iowa, re S. 265, to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce, and so forth; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

501. Also, petition of members of Osage Lutheran Church, Osage, Iowa, re S. 265, to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce, and so forth; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

502. By Mr. LeCOMPTE: Petition of the members of the Nazarene Church of Charlton, Iowa, in the interest of S. 265, S. 623, H. R. 14, and H. R. 2408; to the Committee on Armed Services.

503. Also, petition of Mrs. May Miller King and members of the American Legion Auxiliary, Corydon, Iowa, in the interest of H. R. 142, S. 265, and S. 623; to the Committee on Armed Services.

504. By Mr. PRICE of Illinois: Petition of the Honorable Martin H. Kinnelly, mayor of the city of Chicago, Ill., urging that the Congress continue program of Federal aid to local communities in the operation of control towers at terminal airports and its program of assistance in the construction of new airport facilities in order that this Nation may keep abreast of the international development of air transportation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

505. By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Petition of Lowell Hebrew Community Center, Lowell, Mass., concerning Palestine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

506. Also, petition of Lowell Ministerial Association, of Lowell, Mass., concerning Palestine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

507. By Mr. TALLE: Petition of Mrs. Theodore Bassett and 41 other citizens of Edgewood, Iowa, endorsing S. 265; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

508. By the SPEAKER: Petition of membership of the Pasadena Townsend Club, No. 1, Pasadena, Fla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

509. Also, petition of members of the Valdosta Townsend Club, No. 1, Valdosta, Ga., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

510. Also, petition of the Newark Archdiocesan Federation of Holy Name Societies, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to combating atheistic communism; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MAY 14, 1947

(Legislative day of Monday, April 21, 1947)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Forbid it, Lord, that we should walk through Thy beautiful world with unseeing eyes. Forgive us, our Father, for taking our good things for granted, so that we are in danger of losing the fine art of appreciation. With such dire need in every other part of the world, make us so grateful for the bounties we enjoy that we shall try, by Thy help, to deserve them more.

Where we are wrong, make us willing to change, and where we are right, make us easy to live with.

For Jesus' sake. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHITE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, May 13, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF A JOINT RESOLUTION

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he also announced that the President had approved and signed the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 102) to permit United States common communications carriers to accord free communication privileges to official participants in the World Telecommunications Conferences to be held in the United States in 1947.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 64. An act granting the consent of Congress for the construction of a dam across Dan River in North Carolina;

S. 132. An act to relieve collectors of customs of liability for failure to collect certain special tonnage duties and light money, and for other purposes;

S. 214. An act to change the name of the Lugert-Altus irrigation project in the State of Oklahoma to the W. C. Austin project;

S. 273. An act to limit the time within which the General Accounting Office shall make final settlement of the monthly or quarterly accounts of fiscal officers, and for other purposes;

S. 460. An act to amend section 327 (h) of the Nationality Act of 1940; and

S. 534. An act to authorize additional allowances of good time and the payment of compensation to prison inmates performing exceptionally meritorious or outstanding services.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATES, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH, SENATE (S. Doc. No. 54)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the legislative branch, Senate, amounting to \$350,000, fiscal year 1947 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

TRANSFER BY NAVY DEPARTMENT OF THE U. S. S. "TEXAS" TO THE STATE OF TEXAS

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, reporting, pursuant to law, that the State of Texas had requested the Navy Department to transfer the U. S. S. *Texas* for use as a part of the San Jacinto battleground for historical purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON CONTROL AND ERADICATION OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a re-

port on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of the foot-and-mouth disease for the 30-day period ended April 29, 1947 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

AUDIT REPORTS OF EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON

Two letters from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, audit reports of the Export-Import Bank of Washington for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1945, and June 30, 1946 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

Petitions signed by members of the Associated Townsend Clubs of Pinellas County, the Dover Townsend Club, No. 1, and the Valdosta Townsend Club, No. 1, all of the State of Florida, praying for the enactment of the so-called Townsend plan to provide old-age assistance; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on Public Lands:

"Concurrent resolution to memorialize Congress to enact proper laws relating to the national forests

"Whereas the United States owns or controls lands known as national forests in South Carolina; and

"Whereas some of these lands are quite suitable for continued agricultural use and are not indispensable for national forest use; and

"Whereas some World War veterans are unable to obtain farms or homesteads by ordinary means: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That the General Assembly of South Carolina do memorialize the National Congress to enact proper laws to provide: (1) For homestead entry and settlement, with preference to World War veterans, of all lands owned by the United States in rural areas of South Carolina suitable for occupation and use as farms which are not indispensably necessary for public use; and (2) that all of such parts of the existing national forests in South Carolina suitable for occupation and use as farms, not allotted for homestead entry and settlement, be offered for public sale; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Members of Congress from South Carolina and that they be requested to initiate and press for enactment the necessary laws to accomplish the purposes of this resolution."

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition signed by 57 citizens of Altamont, Kans., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 265, to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR ADVERTISING

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Mrs. Verne Bowers, president of the WCTU and chairman of temperance in the Methodist Church of DeWitt, Ark., together with a petition, without the signatures attached, of DeWitt, Almyra, and Con-

way, Ark., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 265, to prevent the interstate transmission of advertising of alcoholic beverages.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the letter, and petition will be received and appropriately referred, and without objection, the letter and the petition, without the signatures attached, will be printed in the RECORD.

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

DeWitt, Ark., April 28, 1947.

Hon. JOHN L. McCLELLAN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Enclosed I am sending you a petition signed by 91 voters asking that you give consideration and all possible support to S. 265, commonly known as the Capper bill to prevent the interstate and radio advertising of all alcoholic beverages, and that you support any other bills of similar character if by so doing you can help us secure relief from the injurious beverage alcohol custom and traffic. And we ask that you have this petition inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Thanking you in advance for anything you can do to help us in this good cause, I am,

Very respectfully,

Mrs. VERNE BOWERS,
President, WCTU, and Chairman
of Temperance in the Methodist
Church of DeWitt, Ark.

To the Appropriate Committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress, in Particular to the Senators and Representatives in Congress of the Signers of This Petition:

We, the undersigned qualified voters, respectfully request that you give favorable consideration and support to S. 265, a bill to prevent the interstate transmission of advertising of all alcoholic beverages and the broadcasting of such advertising by means of radio; and that you support any other bills of similar character, if such support will best serve to secure quick relief from the offensive and injurious promotion of the beverage alcohol custom and traffic. The social and economic evils arising from the present widespread use of alcoholic beverages should certainly not be increased by the systematic promotion of their use. We believe that many millions of people are profoundly concerned because of existing conditions and almost daily offended because of the invasion of their homes by liquor sales promotion.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MILLIKIN, from the Committee on Finance:

H. R. 1. A bill to reduce individual income-tax payments; with amendments (Rept. No. 173).

By Mr. WATKINS, from the Committee on Public Lands:

S. 805. A bill authorizing an appropriation for the construction, extension, and improvement of a high-school building near Roosevelt, Utah, for the district embracing the east portion of Duchesne County and the west portion of Uintah County; without amendment (Rept. No. 174).

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. MCKELLAR:

S. 1277. A bill to amend the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BUSHFIELD:

S. 1278. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to William Fast Horse; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MAYBANK (for himself and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina):

S. 1279. A bill to establish the Cowpens Battleground National Military Park; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 1280. A bill for the relief of Maria Hedwig Feresz; and

S. 1281. A bill for the relief of James B. Walsh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming introduced Senate bill 1282, to promote the national security by providing for the coordination of all elements of national security, and for the reorganization of the military structure of the Nation to conform to the requirements of modern warfare, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming (by request):

S. 1283. A bill to reenact and amend the Organic Act of the United States Geological Survey by incorporating therein substantive provisions confirming the exercise of long-continued duties and functions and by redefining their geographic scope; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. GURNEY (by request):

S. 1284. A bill to amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946, approved August 9, 1946 (Public Law 704, 79th Cong., 2d sess., 60 Stat. 963), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WHITE (by request):

S. 1285. A bill to define the functions and duties of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and for other purposes; and

S. 1286. A bill to integrate certain personnel of the former Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation and the Bureau of Customs into the regular Coast Guard, to establish the permanent commissioned personnel strength of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(Mr. BREWSTER introduced Senate bill 1287, to change the name of the United States Tariff Commission to "the United States Foreign Trade Board" and to vest additional authority in the Board, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MYERS:

S. 1288. A bill to raise the minimum wage standards of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

BOUNDARY TREE TOURIST PROJECT, N. C.

Mr. BUSHFIELD submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 113), which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands:

Whereas the Secretary of the Interior has granted a loan of \$150,000 at an annual interest rate of 1 percent, out of the revolving fund established by the act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 984), to the Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians, Qualla Indian Boundary, N. C., for the purpose of developing facilities for the tourist trade, known as the Boundary Tree tourist project; and

Whereas the tribal fund of the Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians has to its credit

in the Treasury of the United States over \$300,000, which is held in trust by the United States and on which interest is paid by the United States at an annual rate of 4 percent; and

Whereas the land upon which it is proposed to construct the Boundary Tree tourist project was originally a part of the Smoky Mountain National Park and was purchased by the tribal council, under supervision of the Office of Indian Affairs, from the National Park Service; and

Whereas the land of the Eastern Band of the Cherokee Indians, which is now held in trust by the United States, was originally owned by the band and its members without restriction and was deeded to the United States in trust under the act of June 4, 1924 (43 Stat. 376) for the purpose of having all such land allotted equally among members of the tribe, which allotment has never taken place; and

Whereas such loan to develop the tourist project was requested by the tribal council of the Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians, but numerous petitions have been received by the Committee on Public Lands from members of such band alleging that the development of the project by means of the loan is not to the best interest of the band; and

Whereas such petitions further allege that the loan will serve to impede individual enterprise of the members of the band and subject them to liability to repay the loan without economic gain commensurate with such liability, and that the development of the project by means of such loan will further subject the members of the band to the supervision and authority of the Office of Indian Affairs: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Interior is requested to withhold payment of the loan until such time as the Committee on Public Lands has made a full study and investigation of the allegations made by opponents of the loan and has by resolution signified its approval or disapproval of the loan: and be it further

Resolved, That the Housing Expediter is requested to withhold approval of the application for authorization to construct the building project which is proposed as a part of the Boundary Tree tourist project until such time as the Committee on Public Lands has made a full study and investigation of the allegations made by the opponents to such loan and has by resolution signified its approval or disapproval of such loan.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION—AMENDMENTS

Mr. KILGORE submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 526) to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. KILGORE also submitted an amendment in the nature of a substitute, intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 526) to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. KILGORE (for himself, Mr. AIKEN, and Mr. O'MAHONEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 526) to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. KILGORE (for himself, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. MAGNUSON, and Mr. MCGRATH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, jointly to the bill (S. 526) to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. FULBRIGHT) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 526) to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. TAFT (for himself, Mr. PEPPER, and Mr. MAGNUSON) submitted amendments intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 526) to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

RENT CONTROL—AMENDMENT

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to submit an amendment intended to be proposed by me to the bill (S. 1017) providing for the temporary continuation of rent control, transferring rent control to the Housing Expediter, providing for the creation of local advisory boards on rent control, and for other purposes, which contains a feature that is found in House bill 3203, which was recently passed by the House. I request that the amendment be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment submitted by the Senator from New Jersey will be received, printed, and will lie on the table.

MEETINGS OF COMMITTEES DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two subcommittees of the Committee on the Judiciary be permitted to sit during the session of the Senate today.

One subcommittee is considering the nomination of Thomas Vincent Quinn to be Assistant Attorney General, and the other subcommittee is considering Senate bill 104, the antimonopoly bill.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], who is presiding over the subcommittees, feels that these hearings should not be postponed due to the fact that there are a number of witnesses from out of town.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, permission is granted.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules and Administration may meet this afternoon at 2:30 o'clock.

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

MILK PRICES IN AGRICULTURE'S PATTERN—ADDRESS BY THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE

[Mr. HATCH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on

milk prices in agriculture's pattern, delivered by the Hon. Clinton P. Anderson, Secretary of Agriculture, before a testimonial dinner sponsored by the Schoharie County Democratic Committee, Schoharie, N. Y., on May 13, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

SPECIAL PRIVILEGE AND THE PRESS—EDITORIAL FROM ARIZONA DAILY STAR

[Mr. MCFARLAND asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Special Privilege and the Press," published in the May 6, 1947, issue of the Arizona Daily Star, which appears in the Appendix.]

STOP THE FEDERAL "BUREOCRACY"—AN EDITORIAL FROM THE CHICAGO TRIBUNE

[Mr. MCFARLAND asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Stop the Federal 'Burocracy,'" published in a recent issue of the Chicago Tribune, which appears in the Appendix.]

SECRECY AND SCIENCE—EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. McMAHON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Secrecy and Science," published in the New York Times of Monday, May 12, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

RELIEF ASSISTANCE FOR COUNTRIES DEVASTATED BY WAR

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 153) providing for relief assistance to the people of countries devastated by war.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate is operating today under a unanimous-consent agreement, which will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Ordered, That on the calendar day of Wednesday, May 14, 1947, at the hour of 2 p. m., the Senate proceed, without further debate, to vote upon any amendment that may be pending, or that may subsequently be proposed, to the committee amendment to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 153) providing for relief assistance to the people of countries devastated by war; and immediately thereafter upon the committee amendment, whether amended or not, and upon the final passage of the joint resolution as amended.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

Mr. KEM obtained the floor.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

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

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

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

Aiken	Cordon	Hill
Ball	Donnell	Hoey
Barkley	Downey	Holland
Brewster	Dworschak	Ives
Bricker	Eastland	Jenner
Bridges	Ecton	Johnson, Colo.
Brooks	Ellender	Johnston, S. C.
Buck	Ferguson	Kem
Bushfield	Fulbright	Kilgore
Butler	George	Knowland
Byrd	Green	Lodge
Cain	Gurney	Lucas
Capper	Hatch	McCarthy
Chavez	Hawkes	McClellan
Connally	Hayden	McFarland
Cooper	Hickenlooper	McGrath

McKellar	O'Daniel	Thomas, Okla.
McMahon	O'Mahoney	Thye
Magnuson	Pepper	Tydings
Malone	Reed	Umstead
Martin	Robertson, Va.	Vandenberg
Maybank	Robertson, Wyo.	Watkins
Millikin	Russell	Wherry
Moore	Saitontall	White
Morse	Smith	Wiley
Murray	Sparkman	Williams
Myers	Taft	Wilson
O'Conor	Taylor	Young

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is necessarily absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] is necessarily absent.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-four Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, at the outset of what I have to say, I want to commend the Committee on Foreign Relations, and particularly its able and distinguished chairman, for the work done to safeguard the expenditure of such sums as may be appropriated at this time for relief assistance. For this, I have nothing but praise. It is concerning the amount of the grant that I rise to speak. The joint resolution as passed in the House provides for an appropriation for relief assistance in the sum of \$200,000,000. This has been increased in the Senate measure to \$350,000,000.

The idea of a human being anywhere in the world without sufficient to eat wrings the heartstrings of every one of us. The American people, always generous and sympathetic, now enjoying a period of unexampled abundance, will not turn a deaf ear to such an appeal. There can be no question that an urgent necessity for food exists today in many places in Europe, Asia, and perhaps elsewhere in the world. There is nothing new or unusual about this. Unfortunately, it has occurred at many places and at many times in the world's history. The only thing new or novel about the present situation is the idea which has grown up in recent years that such situations should be met, not by voluntary charity, but by taxes to be levied upon the American taxpayer.

The important question for Congress to decide on the pending measure is how far this burden can wisely and fairly be placed upon the American taxpayer. We must bear in mind that we are not deciding an appeal for voluntary charity; we are deciding to what extent the money of the American taxpayer shall be involuntarily taken from him for this worthy and beneficent purpose.

Such a generous gesture must be made in full recognition of two inescapable economic facts:

First. Lavish expenditures, by increasing the cost of our Federal Government, make high taxes inevitable; and

Second. Purchases here for shipment abroad increase prices to the American consumer.

The first of these propositions would seem too obvious for an extended argument. Yet there is reason to believe that many an American citizen has not come to comprehend this hard economic fact of life. He fails to understand that every generous relief gesture from an open-handed Administration means fewer shoes for his own children, less food for his own family, fewer educational advantages for his own community. All of us know, when we stop to think of it, that the cost of the Federal Government is an important and integral part of the cost of living.

The second proposition has been demonstrated by our recent experience. An examination of the prices of the items which make a cost of living index issued by the United States Department of Labor, reveals that the largest percentage rise of any component in the cost of living has been in food. The Index shows that the consumer price of food was about 85 percent above the 1935-39 average, and all items other than food were only 37 percent above this average. In the period 1935-39 foodstuffs constituted about 34 percent of the cost of living, whereas it is now more than 40 percent. In other words, the price difficulty today, with which the President and so many others are so preoccupied, is due to the sharp advance in food prices. The relatively high price of foods is directly traceable to the Government's food purchases for shipment abroad.

Shortly after the first of this year, the Department of Agriculture became aggressive in its food buying. The Department's grain purchasing program for foreign relief was increased from the original goal of 400,000,000 bushels for the fiscal year to "400,000,000 bushels as soon as possible," and as much more as could be purchased by July 1. This was an especially inopportune time for the Government to be in the market.

The visible supply of grain was small and there was an extreme shortage of boxcars for transporting grain. The shortage of transportation facilities was even made more acute by the long hauls of the Government grain to the seaboard and the Gulf.

Nevertheless, in spite of the tight grain supply situation, the Government competed actively with the mills who were attempting to buy enough wheat with which to grind flour for their normal domestic trade. It was contracting with the mills for millions of sacks of flour, also for foreign shipment. The inevitable result was a sharply rising grain market, beginning in February, which spread to other food commodities.

The report of ex-President Hoover, released in late February recommended that the United States pay \$475,000,000 for food to German civilians during 1947 and the first half of 1948. Close on the

heels of the Hoover report was the announcement by Secretary of Agriculture Anderson that the United States had agreed to provide the British with sufficient meat to prevent a cut in their current meat ration. He said also that the United States would help Great Britain build up a stock pile of wheat this fall, and that there would be a ready outlet for every bushel of grain harvested this year. These Government announcements were, of course, immediately reflected in the markets, inasmuch as the Government activities already were a dominating factor.

Foreign governments were allocated 140,000,000 pounds of our domestic meat supply for the first quarter of the year. Of this amount, the British Government was allocated 50,000,000 pounds, practically all of which was purchased by the British from between mid-February and April 1. This had a direct and substantial influence in increasing meat prices in this period. More recently the Government has allocated 155,000,000 pounds of meat for purchase by foreign governments during the second quarter of the year.

It must be apparent from these figures that legislative expenditures for relief constitute the first stage, the first step, the first station, along the inflationary line. The praiseworthy efforts of the merchants of Newburyport to reduce the cost of living are doomed to failure so long as the Federal Government itself is committed to inflationary policies.

Mr. President, I should like to believe that the present call for grants, to be a burden on the American taxpayer, will not be repeated again in the near future; but anyone who believes that is living in a fool's paradise. Incidentally, the American taxpayer has urgent calls for charity in his own family and in his own community, to which he is not always able to respond.

Yesterday the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations [Mr. VANDENBERG], with his customary candor, told the Senate that a so-called children's fund proposal would soon be presented to us through the United Nations. So we must ask ourselves squarely, How far can the economy of the United States stand these constant drains with nothing coming in and everything going out?

It has often been said on the floor of the Senate that the most important problem before the Government today is to maintain our free institutions. Unless we can keep our system of free enterprise and free institutions, under which America has grown great and strong, the torchlight of liberty will probably go out all over the world. To do so we must have a sound financial and fiscal structure.

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

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Before the Senator leaves the question of the children's fund, I should like to make this observation: I entirely agree with what he is saying, but we must carefully survey the total prospective obligation which is involved when we engage in legislation of this sort. So far as the children's fund

is concerned, there is considerable question as to how it ought to be handled. In the House measure, which will be in conference with the Senate amendment, there is a provision that a portion of the pending appropriation shall be used for whatever minimum contribution we shall ultimately make to the children's fund. We have not included that clause in the Senate committee amendment, because we have wanted that whole subject matter, beginning with the total amount of the grant, down to the possibility of including the children's fund, and the inclusion of other factors, to be left in a liquid state, to be adjusted in conference. I say to the Senator, therefore, that the point which he makes regarding the children's fund is a valid point, and one which will be considered in conference.

Mr. KEM. I thank the distinguished Senator from Michigan. I think the Senator will agree with me also that so long as demands coming from abroad are met at the expense of the American taxpayer, the demands will continue to come.

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

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I am very much interested in the remarks of the distinguished Senator. I agree with his general premise. However, his statement in relation to the prices of farm products in the period from 1935 to 1939 has in it an element of misdirection, because I know from my own experience during that depression period that the farmers of America were selling their crops at prices far below the cost of production, whereas in a great many other lines producers were getting the cost of production. To illustrate, I know that in those years, on a farm which I have owned for a number of years, we were selling milk at prices between 90 cents and \$1.25 a hundred. That means that 48½ quarts of good 3-percent milk were being sold on that basis. It cost us between \$1.85 and \$1.90 to produce the milk at that time, when labor was cheap.

I have seen a great many similar statements in the press, and I am sorry to say that some of my manufacturing friends are using the same figures. At that time the farmer should have received at least the cost of production. In that event, the percentage of increase in the price of foodstuffs would not be so great as it now is. Certain segments among our farmers probably have been making money. At the same time, they have been wearing out their farms. They have not been able to obtain machinery in many instances, and when they bought machinery they had to pay increases of from 100 to 200 percent. I am speaking on the basis of my own experience.

While this is a trifle irrelevant to your main thesis, sir—with which I agree—I thought I should interject these observations at this point, because I feel that, just as there has been propaganda throughout the United States to the effect that the Republican Party, which is in control of the Congress, has not been doing an effective job, there has been propaganda to the effect that the farmers have been milking the public, which is all rot. In the past 10 or 15

years between 5,000,000 and 6,000,000 farmers have left the farms, and today farms are again going on the auction block because farmers cannot get machinery or labor. I feel that those facts should be given the publicity which they merit.

In relation to the matter of loans, I had hoped at some time to express my views on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. KEM. As a matter of realism, should we not call them grants or gifts?

Mr. WILEY. Is the Senator talking about foreign loans or gifts like the present aid bill?

Mr. KEM. I am talking about what we now propose to do, and similar transactions in the recent past.

Mr. WILEY. I think the Senator is correct in that. We have made loans. This is a gift to the poor starving people of Europe.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (MR. DONNELL in the chair). Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Let us be specific about it. So far as this bill is concerned, it is a grant and has no relationship to a loan.

Mr. KEM. Exactly.

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

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I want to say that the news that came over the radio the other night, and was confirmed in the subcommittee hearing the other day in the examination of a representative of the Department of Agriculture, to the effect that the good Lord has again favored this Nation, that we will have 150,000,000 more bushels of winter wheat this year than we ever had before in our history. I sometimes feel that there are hidden laws which apply, and one of those laws is that when we reach out and do that which our hearts tell us we should do—help those who are in need, save them from going berserk mentally, save them from becoming objects of communism—the operation of that law shows itself in making us adequate. May I say, then, to the Senator, that it is admitted that we will have the greatest national income in our history; it will be approximately \$170,000,000,000. While I would be the last one in the world to think that we should become prodigal, I still feel that it is imperative that we do the job as good Samaritans where that is necessary; and that job should be to make the other fellow competent to help himself, and not make him a "leaner."

I thank the Senator.

Mr. KEM. I appreciate the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin. I join with him as a brother farmer in his interest in American agriculture. I am sure he would agree with me that so long as the Government, by its purchases, continues to preempt the available supply of agricultural products, such products will rise in price. I am sure he will also agree with me that in the judgment of most students of American agricultural problems the present rise in the price of certain agricultural commodities is unsound and not for the

best interests of American agriculture. I appreciate also the scriptural references made by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin, and I might suggest others, such as "charity begins at home" and "Trust the Lord and keep your powder dry." Perhaps that is not scriptural. I do not know whether it was Cromwell or Napoleon who said that, but in any case there is good authority for it.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to give me the chapter and page of the Scripture.

Mr. KEM. I yield if the Senator can correct me in that quotation.

Mr. WILEY. The last quotation, as the Senator suggests, is ascribed to Cromwell. But I remember something which is pertinent to the Senator's argument, and I have quoted it heretofore on the floor of the Senate. I think it was St. Paul who said something to the effect that he who does not look after his own is unworthy. That brings up almost a metaphysical argument. How do we look after our own? It is not by letting the other fellow die while we are looking after our own.

Mr. KEM. I think I may say at the outset that I do not want any Member of the Senate to be deaf to the appeal of someone in need. I am trying to present some economic facts which I think should be taken into consideration. They are hard, economic facts which I think are worthy of our consideration in connection with this problem which is only one of a number of similar problems which without doubt will confront us in the immediate future.

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

Mr. KEM. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I want to suggest to the Senator that I am not at all clear about the reference to St. Paul made by the Senator from Wisconsin, but I am clear about a reference to which the Senator can turn to his own great advantage in connection with his argument. It happens to be a statement to which I give my complete allegiance. St. Paul said:

But if any provide not for his own, and specially for those of his own house, he hath denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel.

Mr. KEM. I thank the Senator.

So, Mr. President, I think we must ask ourselves how far can the Congress of the United States stand these constant drains? It has often been said on the floor of the Senate that the most important problem before the Government today is to maintain our free institutions. To do so we must have a sound financial and fiscal structure. In considering this matter let us be just and wise at the same time that we are generous.

Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the pending resolution to reduce the appropriation from \$350,000,000 to \$200,000,000, which is the amount fixed by the House committee after extensive public hearings. I want to say that this amendment is offered without apology, as a compromise between head and heart.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 8, line 17, it is proposed to strike out "\$350,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$200,000,000."

EXEMPTION OF EMPLOYERS FROM LIABILITY FOR PORTAL-TO-PORTAL WAGES IN CERTAIN CASES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 247)

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States with respect to his action on House bill 2157, the Portal-to-Portal Act of 1947, which the clerk read.

(For President's message, see today's proceedings of the House of Representatives on p. 5281.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The message will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RELIEF ASSISTANCE FOR COUNTRIES DEVASTATED BY WAR

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 153) providing for relief assistance to the people of countries devastated by war.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] on page 8, line 17, to strike out "\$350,000,000" and insert "\$200,000,000."

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, when we, as nonpartisan Americans, survey the position of the United States in the world today we are constrained by the sheer brute force of events to come to this conclusion:

In the large sense we have defeated the enemy, but we have not won the peace. We have killed off the German threat and the Japanese threat to our existence as a people, but we have not achieved any of our positive aims. Speaking broadly, Poland has not been liberated, democracy has not been established, autocracy has not been destroyed. To replace a German hegemony by one bearing another national designation is no gain; it is merely a change of name. The Christian concept of the dignity of man, which was the underlying spiritual fact in whatever idealism there was in World War II, is still reviled and violated in most of the world. That is a dreadful statement to make; but there is not a man in this room who does not know that it is true.

Mr. President, what is the matter with us? How is it that we can win the battle and lose the peace?

We need not look back very far to find the mistakes which will supply the answers to that question.

First. For one thing, we gave our supplies and our equipment to our allies during the war with a lavish hand—which was all right. But in conspicuous cases we did it without requiring assurances as to the future—and that was not all right. All of human experience shows that the time to get promises is before the other fellow gets the stuff, and not afterward.

I remember the argument which was made during the war whenever anyone suggested that some assurances as to the future should be received before we turned everything over to an ally. It ran something like this: "If your neighbor's house is on fire you lend him the equipment to extinguish it. You do not stand around arguing over how much it costs or the precise terms upon which you lend

it to him. You leave such things until after the fire is out." That is what was said at that time. But, as we read in the book *The Strange Alliance*, written by Maj. Gen. John R. Deane, who was the head of our military mission in Russia during the war:

The fire in our neighbor's house had been extinguished and we had submitted ourselves to his direction in helping to extinguish it. He assumed that we would continue to submit ourselves to his direction in helping rebuild the house, and, unfortunately, we did. He allowed us to work on the outside and demanded that we furnish the material for the inside, the exact use of which we were not allowed to see. Now that the house is finished, we have at best only a nodding acquaintance.

There is no use in crying over spilled milk, but we can reflect in passing on how much better off we would be today if we had exacted some assurances—not selfish promises for ourselves alone, but assurances for the benefit and the peace of the whole world—when we were still in a strong position to do so.

Second. Toward the end of the war we overestimated the ability of the Japanese to resist, and, therefore, in order to secure Russian support, we made concessions at Yalta which we now bitterly regret. We made concessions there and elsewhere which not only involved the giving up of our own overwhelming military advantage at a time when our victorious armies were advancing across Germany; they also involved a breach of faith with the people like the Poles, who had believed our plighted word.

Third. We were utterly, completely, and abysmally unprepared for the end of the war. We remember what happened. Those of us who were in the service at that time will never forget it. Not a word did we hear from our national leadership, telling the soldiers and the sailors and the airmen of America, or their military leaders, or their families, or their Congressmen why it was necessary that they remain in the service. Our leaders did not tell us that it was absolutely essential to the national well-being that the United States maintain armed forces after the end of hostilities. They did not say that these forces would have to bear a definite relationship to the other armed forces in the world. If they had, the men in uniform would have understood, and so would their families and so would their Congress. But the tragic fact remains that they were never told why it was necessary for them to stay in the service. Naturally, they wanted to get out. Naturally, their families wanted them at home. Nobody gave them a good reason for not being at home. And naturally a few months after VJ-day, we read of soldiers actually boozing the Secretary of War because of their impatience to be out of uniform. By that time it was too late. The water was over the dam, for all the world to see. Mr. President, leadership would have avoided that disastrous occurrence.

Fourth. And so the people of the world beheld this sickening and astounding spectacle: the greatest military power the world had ever seen had, within a few short months, defeated itself by

allowing its huge strength to dwindle away. The armies and the navies which the best troops of Germany and the finest fleets of Japan had not been able to defeat were going to pieces because of the lack of comprehension and the lack of leadership at the head of the government.

It was no wonder that so little could be accomplished at the peace conferences. Our opposite number at those peace conferences had never been taught to respect weakness. Those who faced us at the peace table had been brought up in the hard, flinty, and bloody school of European politics in which no one agrees to anything unless force is in evidence. Indeed, when we consider how fast our Army and Navy were evaporating, it seems a miracle that the satellite peace treaties, unsatisfactory as some of them are, were ever agreed to at all. This was due to the fact that Secretary Byrnes, supported by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], had made it clear that the United States would not yield further.

This was possible because we, the American people, had finally begun to learn the lesson that indecision on our part leads to brutality and bullying and expansionism elsewhere. But we have only begun. We have recognized our mistakes. But as a people, we have yet fully to grasp the far-reaching, positive, and purposeful steps yet to be taken, which I now desire to submit to the Senate under four major headings:

First. Clearly the first item in an effective foreign policy is the personnel abroad to carry it out.

There are many unfair criticisms of our foreign service. For example, it is not fair to say that it is largely composed of millionaire graduates of Ivy League Colleges who loaf in glittering world capitals where, having entirely forgotten America, they adopt reactionary and supercilious views in order to toady to the European nobility. That is a common criticism, but it is not true. Whatever merit that criticism had in the past, the truth is today that in the main our foreign service consists of men coming from all sections of the country, who depend on their salaries for their living, and who have had to meet stiff requirements in order to enter the service and then to stay in it.

They must often endure a life of isolation, separation from families, appalling prices at the official rate of exchange, which of course they are compelled to use, lack of food and fuel, and an unrelenting grind of work, often in hostile surroundings, and with very few diversions. I believe that our Foreign Service is, on the whole, as patriotic, as intelligent, as broad-minded, and as industrious as any other professional group.

This, however, does not mean that they are without faults, some of which are attributable to the vastly increased scope and volume of their work. Conceding that we have sound human material with which to deal, I believe these latent faults can be corrected if the following specific recommendations are adopted:

(a) With so much of the world behind the iron curtain, it seems vital that our Foreign Service officers receive specialized training in intelligence work to enable them to recognize the intelligence techniques being practiced by designing nations.

(b) With the entire world a welter of propaganda, our Foreign Service men should have training in publicity methods and in public speaking. They should be able to mix with, talk to, and understand all groups, just as we who hold elective office must do every day.

(c) The struggle between democratic parties and communism for influence with foreign organized labor, for example, opens a new and unfamiliar challenge to the Service to play an important part in demonstrating the advantages of a free system without involving interference in a nation's internal affairs.

(d) The great increase in the size and diversity of activities in our embassies requires better training in administration and organization.

(e) It is also probably true that many Foreign Service officers have spent too much time abroad; and the new requirement that they must have leave in the United States every 2 years, and a tour of duty in the State Department early in their service, is a good one and illustrates a policy which could be broadened.

(f) Another defect in the Foreign Service, which I believe has had some serious consequences, is the idea that the chief can do no wrong. We saw this attitude time and again in the military service. It kills a lot of initiative and independent thinking. I believe that the country has paid a heavy price for it. One remedy would be to have other reports coming into the Department through other channels to counterbalance, and give proper perspective to that of the chief. Further, I am told that there should be an improved inspection system which would periodically bring all foreign service officers to Washington so that their work could be appraised in such a way as to check the all-too-human tendency to curry favor with the boss.

(g) Thought should be given to having some permanent officials in certain key positions in the State Department who will give continuity to our policy and who will consequently prevent a lot of mistakes and errors by virtue of their knowledge of what has happened before. One often gets the unfavorable impression that there is not always enough teamwork and coherence among the top men in the State Department.

(h) One last word about the men of our Foreign Service. Even the best of them, and there are some very able men in it, give the impression that in diplomacy it is more important to avoid blunders than to achieve successes. I recognize that there have been many occasions in history when this has been a good rule. But we are in an era now in which we must be somewhat venturesome if we are to avoid disaster. Only the bold ever rise above mediocrity. We need an infusion of new blood or of new spirit or of both into our representation abroad which, excellent though it is in many individual cases, still in certain

quarters regards it as outside its province to come aggressively to grips with the forces in the world which so closely affect American destiny. I deem it of fundamental importance, Mr. President, that we inculcate our Foreign Service with the spirit of positive, not negative, action.

(i) Finally, the President and the Senate have a direct responsibility, insofar as the caliber of our American representation abroad is concerned. We have the job here of confirming the diplomatic appointments which the President sends us. We should carefully scrutinize them, whether they be career or non-career men. There was a time in the past when, without dangerous consequences, their jobs could be objects of political reward, and I know that both parties have played that game. But today, it would be both dangerous and reprehensible to select men to head our missions abroad on any basis other than that of fitness to do the job. It is offensive to one's common sense, to say nothing of one's patriotism, to think that the United States should be represented abroad year after year by men who have never had any qualifications at all and are only there because they had a friend at court. Good men from outside the Service are a great asset and are necessary to effective carrying out of foreign policy. Inferior political diplomatic appointees, on the other hand, do a great deal of undeserved harm to the Foreign Service career men. They lower the prestige and depress the morale of the career service as a whole.

(j) Congress has just appropriated \$400,000,000 for aid to Greece and Turkey. We are in the course of appropriating \$350,000,000 more for general relief abroad and the end is not yet. But we all know that unless these programs are ably administered they may be worse than useless. I know that able men to render this service are hard to find. It is easy to name men who are too arrogant; or men who are too soft and who, desiring some local popularity, think they are doing a people a favor by pauperizing them. The foreign-relief program calls for the best human talent in America.

So much for personnel.

Second. Then comes the development of a consistent, coherent, and thoroughgoing attitude on the part of those who conduct our foreign relations, supported by an understanding public opinion. We must not blow hot and cold. We must not be caught by surprise. We must be thoroughgoing as well as consistent.

(a) We would do well to make it clear immediately that we shall not aid governments which have failed to carry out their commitments of the United States. In particular, the executive branch should take all necessary steps to insure the registration, the screening, and the effective control of all contracts which Americans have made with such governments, giving special attention to those contracts which call for the acquisition of our production "know how" in industry—which, I am told, is what some of our international competitors particularly want to know. In fact, I submit we

should not let agents of a foreign country into our plants unless the foreign country allows Americans to enter its country and poke around in its plants.

(b) While we must be prepared to spend some money, we must not "pour money down a rat hole." There is never any use in pledging financial outlays abroad until we are satisfied that it is not a mere hold-up game or a last-minute rescue party and until we are sure that fundamental steps have actually been taken which will change the situation permanently for the better. No nation—and certainly not the United States—is rich enough to be strong everywhere at once. No nation is rich enough ever to splurge money recklessly. There is a limit; we must pick the place where we can properly influence the situation for the better. We must not only pick the place; we must make our expenditures sole, in pursuance of an intelligent plan whereby in exchange for our outlays these peoples become self-supporting and thereby enable us to achieve those concrete things which need to be done. What are some of these things?

For example, it is frequently and correctly pointed out that the nations of western Europe are not making a real recovery from the damage done by the war and that they are staggering along on a hand-to-mouth basis. We in America certainly have a great stake in getting these nations back on their feet and on a self-supporting basis, if for no other reason than that we can then stop our own expenditures for foreign relief. To reestablish these nations, will, however, cost money. But it is worth doing, if in exchange for our aid, the nations of western Europe agree, for example, to integrate themselves, not in a military or a linguistic sense, but into an economic arrangement which has the possibility of life and growth. It is sicken-
ing after each war to reconstruct the same old European crazy-quilt. Of course, this European unity must be entirely voluntary. Although its present divisions are killing it, Europe, the birthplace of Western civilization, does not wish to be—and must not be—"united" under any foreign ruler.

Another example of getting something in return would be to work out our entire raw materials program as a part of our foreign policy. It is well known that we are short of many very important commodities, and that in some ways we have become a "have-not" nation. In formulating our new foreign policy we should seek to obtain the raw materials which we need and do not possess ourselves. This would be helpful to us and to the world and would be a self-respecting solution of several serious problems at one and the same time.

We and those nations with whom we have relations must deal in realities in terms of human freedom. In exchange for our help the military and political pressures which now cause fear and worry as to the future must be removed. We are constantly reminded that there are still military factors in back of foreign policy. Once political and military conditions are stable, much of Europe can again become a sound economic risk.

If positive steps are not taken to solve these political and military problems, we shall go from tensions to hatred to civil war and finally to world catastrophe.

Whether we look at this proposed foreign policy from the standpoint of integrating a new Europe, or from the standpoint of easing our raw material shortage, or from the standpoint of restoring peace and prosperity, we may as well realize that it will in all probability be cheaper to appropriate substantial sums to be spent in accordance with a sound plan than to appropriate a smaller sum on a shotgun basis. In one case you have a good chance of getting your bacon back; in the other you face the sure prospect of total loss.

(c) Mr. President, it is distressing to me to hear an increasing number of Americans say: "Here we go granting millions of dollars to foreign governments while we do nothing to ease the high cost of living and the housing shortage for the poor American people." It is distressing to hear it, but we all know that an increasing number of Americans all over the United States today are talking that way. And as long as they think that we are getting nothing out of this foreign program they will go on talking. But if they are convinced that they will get new markets for their products and vital raw materials which they need and a real chance for peace for their children as a result of these expenses, then this talk will stop. But to convince them, we must have a real far-sighted plan. We must be ready to undertake this non-brutal, nonimperialistic, noncompulsory, nonviolent, nonselfish, and nondestructive assistance program, not because it is against something we do not like, but because it will build that solid individual prosperity which is a man's best hope of being rescued from his misery.

Third. We must make American democracy an article of export. Actually the Christian concept of the dignity of man is the strongest revolutionary force in the world. But for some reason or other—call it lack of imagination or lack of understanding—we have allowed the materialistic and brutal verbiage of communism to gain a greater export currency than our own belief, which springs from eternal sources and which can never run dry. We must export our way of looking at our fellow man. This does not mean that we try to force anything down any man's throat. That would be imperialism. It emphatically does not mean that we uphold any regime, no matter how corrupt, provided it is anti-Communist. That would be nihilism. But it does mean an outlay of time, intelligence, energy, and money to present our view and to give compelling demonstration of its worth. It is the essential first step that we believe in ourselves. Without such belief nothing can be done. Without such belief, all expenditures are mere waste.

Mr. President, let me sum up. We made dreadful mistakes when the shooting stopped because we were not prepared for the end of hostilities. To avoid these mistakes in the future, we must:

First. Develop a modern-minded American personnel to carry out our foreign policy abroad.

Second. Make a consistent, decisive, and thoroughgoing over-all plan for foreign policy which will secure military, political, and economic conditions in the world which will make peace and prosperity possible; and which, by making foreign peoples self-supporting, will obtain for us the markets and raw materials we need. In other words, Mr. President, what is wanted is a foreign-aid program which will also aid the American people.

Third. Make American democracy an article of export.

Fourth. There is a fourth point—one more word of advice, which always and ever underlies a constructive and fruitful foreign policy. That word calls for a strong America—strong in its economic life, strong in its enthusiastic faith in its own institutions, and strong in its armed forces on land, sea, and air, without which no foreign policy can be aught but mere words.

We can, I think, be hopeful that these things can and will be done. The American people are showing a keen interest in world conditions. We have in General Marshall a Secretary of State who is completely above party and is of proven ability. We have in the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] a chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee who acts always in an utterly nonpartisan spirit and who has evoked widespread admiration by his sure grasp of the challenge which confronts America. We can look confidently to the future with their wisdom and patriotism at the country's service.

Above all, let us realize that our foreign policy exists—and our effective support of the United Nations is possible—only in proportion to the national strength behind it. The fact that we allowed so many of the war's painfully won gains to slip away between our fingers in the year after the shooting stopped must teach us once and for all what a crime we commit against ourselves and against humanity when we allow ourselves to become weak.

[Manifestations of applause in the galleries.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The occupants of the galleries are admonished that it is strictly against the rule of the Senate that any demonstrations be made from the galleries and that the rule will be strictly enforced.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I offer certain perfecting amendments, the necessity for which will be obvious. They constitute precisely the same formula which is in the Greek and Turkish aid bill. Obviously there is going to be a gap between the authorization and the time when the appropriations themselves can be made, and provision is made in the Greek relief bill that a temporary advance of \$100,000,000 can be made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, to be reimbursed to the RFC the moment the appropriation itself is made. It is doubly necessary that there be an arrangement of a similar sort in connection with the pending measure, because there is a similar gap, and the pressure for some immediate funds to start the purchases or relief supplies is absolutely unavoidable. Therefore, at the request

of the Department—and although I have not had time to canvass it with the committee, I am sure it would meet with the committee's approval; at any rate, I will put my own personal request behind it—I ask for the adoption en bloc of certain amendments, the net result of which is exclusively, after the passage of the authorization and preceding the passage of an appropriation, to make available from the RFC \$75,000,000, to be reimbursed to the RFC from the appropriation as soon as it is made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to immediate consideration of the amendments? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will state the amendments.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I suggest the Chief Clerk read them all, because they all can be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The amendments will be considered en bloc, and the clerk will state them.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 9, line 4, it is proposed to delete the words "to be appropriated."

On page 13, line 24, to delete "appropriated pursuant to" and substitute "authorized under."

On page 8, after line 21, to add the following paragraph to section 1:

Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and directed, until such time as an appropriation shall be made pursuant to this section, to make advances, not to exceed in the aggregate \$75,000,000, to carry out the provisions of this joint resolution, in such manner and in such amounts as the President shall determine. From appropriations authorized under this section there shall be repaid to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation the advances made by it under the authority contained herein.

On page 9, lines 7 and 8, to delete the words "appropriated pursuant thereto" and substitute therefor the words "authorized herein."

On page 9, line 14, to delete the words "Sums from the appropriations made pursuant to" and substitute in lieu thereof of "Funds authorized under."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments submitted by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] to the committee amendment.

The amendments to the amendment were agreed to.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, there is one other perfecting amendment, necessitated by the following fact: The Federal Employees' Pay Act of 1946 fixed specific ceilings for civilian personnel in the War and Navy Departments. Under the pending measure it is contemplated that some of the personnel will be borrowed from the War and Navy Departments, and the sole purpose of the amendment which I now submit, at the request of the Departments affected, is to eliminate for the time being from the ceiling applicable to civilian employees in those departments such employees as are borrowed. The amendment is very essential.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the amendment? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 9, after line 24, it is proposed to insert a new subsection as follows:

(d) Such additional civilian employees as may be required by any department, agency, or independent establishment in connection with the furnishing of procurement, storage, transportation, and shipment services under this joint resolution and which services are paid for from funds herein authorized, shall not be counted as civilian employees within the meaning of section 607 of the Federal Employees' Pay Act of 1945, as amended by section 14 of the Federal Employees' Pay Act of 1946.

It is further proposed to change subsection "(d)" to subsection "(e)."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan to the committee amendment.

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

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. I should like to inquire whether or not the agencies which are to furnish these employees are going to be reimbursed from the fund now proposed to be authorized.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is the plan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan to the Committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, on April 7 I gave notice that I would propose an amendment to the pending joint resolution which would exclude from any of its benefits certain countries and governments to which, under existing circumstances, I feel we are not obligated to provide relief, and with respect to which the cost of relief, if provided, I feel would impose upon the people of this Nation an unjust burden of taxation. Moreover, Mr. President, the spending of money for relief purposes in the countries which my amendment would exclude from the provisions of the joint resolution would be inconsistent with the action of the Congress and with the established policy of this Government as contained in the recent Greco-Turkish relief measure which has been enacted.

As I stated yesterday, I voted for the Greco-Turkish aid bill with considerable reluctance, because it was not primarily a relief bill in the sense of relieving human distress. We all know that one of the major objectives of that bill is to enable Greece and Turkey to build up their military strength for resistance to military, political, and economic pressures which are being applied for the purpose of undermining their governments, at least with that purpose in mind, and possibly with the purpose of consummating further expansion into regions even beyond their territories.

Mr. President, everyone knows whence that pressure comes. When we speak of external pressure on Greece and Turkey everyone knows its source. Now we are going to take from the Treasury of this Nation \$400,000,000 to bolster these weaker nations—Greece and Turkey—and to build up resistance to that form of aggression and insidious infiltration which seeks to undermine the established governments of those countries.

Mr. President, when I gave notice on April 7 that I would submit this amendment to the general relief bill, there was greater reason and more justification for its adoption than there is now. At that time the final form of the joint resolution now pending before us had not been determined by the Foreign Relations Committee of this body. The Foreign Relations Committee, as I said in my brief remarks yesterday, Mr. President, has done a marvelous job in placing in the joint resolution certain provisions which are restrictive in character and which impose conditions upon other governments whose people are to be assisted, conditions which have to be met before this relief will be available to them.

Another forward step that was made by the committee in framing this joint resolution, in contrast to the policy we have pursued in the past under UNRRA, is that we retain full control and supervision of the funds which are to be expended.

Mr. President, I adverted to a point yesterday which I want to mention again today. When the bill authorizing and committing this Nation to the UNRRA program was before us I had serious apprehension that in such a tremendous program, with such a great outlay of money under the set-up as proposed, we would find that we were having very little control or supervision over UNRRA funds notwithstanding we were to contribute more than 70 percent of the total funds involved. That absolutely occurred. In many instances those funds went into countries and were actually used by the political authorities in power for strictly political purposes. In other words, the poor victims for whom UNRRA relief was really intended, got no assistance unless he was subversive to the political clique and authorities in power. If not, relief assistance was denied him.

Mr. President, the amendment I offer would make Russia, Albania, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Yugoslavia, Rumania, and Bulgaria ineligible for any benefits or assistance from the appropriations authorized in this bill. When I gave notice that I would propose such an amendment, Mr. President, I placed in the RECORD tables of figures which had been prepared for me and made available to me by the State Department and by the Legislative Reference Service and other agencies of the Government, showing the assistance that these countries had already received from us amounting to more than \$1,200,000,000 since VJ-day. As I interpret the measure now before us, in view of the explanation made of it yesterday by the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, and taking into account the letter of Secretary Marshall, which has been placed in the RECORD, setting forth in what countries the funds proposed to be appropriated shall be expended, the expenditure and supervision of which is left to the State Department; it appears, Mr. President, that none of this money will go to any of the countries referred to in my amendment except to Poland and Hungary. I do not know to what extent the Committee on Foreign Relations, to which this amendment was referred, considered it; but to that extent

I assume that my objectives and purposes have been served, in that five of the countries which I have named in my amendment have been eliminated. I concede this in view of the letter from General Marshall and the assurances that have been given here on the floor of the Senate by the chairman of the committee.

I can well appreciate the fact that there might be differences of opinion as to the wisdom and propriety of specifically naming in the legislation the countries which are to receive aid, as did the House in its measure, because such action implies a commitment to those countries with respect to their share of the aid, and it would possibly be embarrassing to withdraw the aid at any time if, under the restrictions which have been placed in the joint resolution, a situation should arise under which we thought the aid should be withdrawn.

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

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Allow me to suggest that many of the matters referred to by the Senator from Arkansas can best be handled by administration, rather than being placed in a strait-jacket. If there should develop such a situation that it was desired to change the policy, that could be done under the flexible provisions of the joint resolution.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I appreciate what the Senator says, and I thank him for his suggestion. I wish to emphasize that I am grateful to and compliment the Committee on Foreign Relations on the fine job it has done. It is such a contrast and such a departure from the policies and procedures of the past that it is a monument to the committee's credit. Many of the objections which I have urged are the same objections which I had with respect to UNRRA. Then I did not know how UNRRA would work. I could only anticipate, and it did work out and operate just as I thought it would. My reasons for opposing that measure in the form in which it passed have been fully vindicated.

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

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. At the meeting of the General Assembly of the United Nations in New York the United States delegation took the position that we would have nothing further to do with UNRRA, under the arrangement by which we paid 72 percent of all the expenditures and largely turned its administration over to foreign agencies. We discovered that in many countries the authorities would take over the administration of the money which was 70 percent ours, and create the impression among the recipients that it was another government altogether that was bringing them relief. So we determined later that whatever plan we adopted in the way of relief would be an American plan, under American control, financed by ourselves, and terminable at the will of the President, whenever conditions reached the point where we thought it was necessary to discontinue relief. The joint resolution is hedged about with

restrictions, limitations, and conditions. I think it is about as well prepared, as well considered, and as well drafted as an act of this kind could be. Of course there will be mistakes. There will probably be extravagances in some places. But on the whole, the control is wholly within the United States. If it fails, we shall be somewhat derelict in our administration of the act.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I am not predicting failure under this measure as it is now drawn. That is not what I am trying to emphasize. I am very much pleased that we have profited by the mistakes which were made in connection with UNRRA. We should not make them again. We propose to keep the control under our own authorities. We reserve the right to withdraw the aid if at any time a condition arises which warrants its withdrawal. This aid is not a perpetual or continuing commitment or obligation. We can withdraw it at any time, as I understand the joint resolution.

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

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate what the Senator has said about the action of the committee in going so far to meet the objections which he had expressed by way of his amendment. In view of what the committee has done, in view of the letter of the Secretary of State, the report of the committee, and the statement of the chairman, and in view of the understanding which all of us on the committee have, does not the Senator feel that he might be justified in not pressing his amendment, or withdrawing it?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I will say to the Senator that I am not pressing it now with the same vigor I would have pressed it had the joint resolution not been so well prepared by the committee. I do not believe that the need for my amendment is nearly as urgent as it might otherwise be. However, I wish to keep the record straight. I am opposed to this Government giving aid and assistance in any form to governments whose action, conduct, and policies make it necessary for us to provide military assistance to weaker nations upon which they would impose, and with respect to which they pursue policies of aggression and expansion that would undermine and destroy those weaker nations. Aid under such circumstances is incompatible and inconsistent with any sort of sound fiscal policy, if nothing else were involved.

I cannot vote for a measure which would give promise of funds for the assistance of governments which are pursuing that sort of policy. If it were a personal matter, I would contribute my own money to provide food or relief for suffering human beings, whether they were Hungarians, Poles, or Chinese. I would make no particular distinction by reason of nationalities. I know that that is the spirit which dominates the heart of Christian America. But there are times when we must be practical.

This Government does not have the resources or the capacity to completely rehabilitate the world at our expense.

The line must be drawn somewhere. There are limits beyond which we are unable to go without inviting disaster to our own security and our own economic welfare.

While I should like to support a smaller amount, I am willing to spend \$350,000,000, if necessary. However, if we are to spend that much more than we have already expended, we can extend aid to countries whose governments are democratic and friendly to us, governments which grant the greatest measure of liberty and justice to their own people. On the other hand, we can spend the money in countries like Poland, which is under the domination of Russia, where there is no freedom, no liberty in the sense that we speak of it in America. Whenever we spend a dollar in such countries we simply enable them to continue to make expenditures in great amounts—greater than the amounts we are spending—for military purposes.

Every dollar we spend for the relief of those nations which are under the control and domination of Russia and communism is a direct aid to Russia and the further spread of communism. This simply makes it possible for Russia to spend that much more money for military purposes. I cannot vote for it, and I shall not do so. I would be willing to accept the resolution as it is and to vote for it with the assurances which have been given if those two countries, Poland and Hungary, were excluded as my amendment proposes to do. But I will not vote one dime of American taxpayers' money knowingly to aid communism or to assist Russia or any of her satellites while she spends \$13,000,000,000 per year for military purposes as she is doing this year.

I shall not take time to revert to the figures I have previously placed in the RECORD except to point out that the countries which are named in my amendment have received from this Government, or will have received by June 30 of this year, a total of more than \$1,800,000,000. Over \$1,800,000,000 in relief of one form or another has already been provided by our Government for those countries which are named in the amendment. That is too much already and I do not want to give them any more.

I do not think I shall call for a record vote on the amendment, but I want to keep the record straight. I cannot explain why we are pouring out money to buy military supplies and build military strength in Greece and Turkey, and at the same time, taking the taxpayers' money and helping to feed people on the other side of their borders in countries which are applying pressure against them. We should not arm one people to defend themselves and their government and at the same time give aid to the other side.

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

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. As I understand, the able Senator from Arkansas is quite satisfied to have a *viva-voce* vote on his amendment?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am perfectly satisfied, I will say to the Senator. I simply

wanted to offer this amendment. I acknowledge, as I have said, that the need for it under the circumstances, as the joint resolution now stands, is not as great and urgent as it was at the time I said I would propose an amendment, but it should be adopted so that Poland and Hungary will be excluded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the Senator offering his amendment at this time?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes; I offer it. I thought possibly it was the purpose of the Chair to let the amendments all lie on the desk and have them acted on after 2 o'clock.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I think we had better proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is an amendment pending, which was offered by the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM].

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes. I understand that is the parliamentary situation. I am perfectly willing to have a vote on my amendment whenever the parliamentary situation will permit it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the amendment to the committee amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas? The Chair hears none. Therefore the question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas.

The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, between lines 13 and 14 in the committee amendment, it is proposed to insert the following:

(b) No relief assistance shall be provided under the authority of this joint resolution to the Governments or to the peoples of Russia, Albania, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Yugoslavia, Rumania, or Bulgaria, or to any other government or governments, or to the peoples thereof, whom the President may hereafter determine to be under the political and/or economic domination or sphere of influence of Soviet Russia.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I simply want to say that in the viewpoint of the committee and from the standpoint of those who are responsible for this program, it would be a very serious mistake to undertake to write any identifications of countries, either pro or con, into the text of the resolution. On the one hand, we do not want to seem to create any rights or interests in behalf of any specific countries, and on the other hand, we do not want to seem to write any inhibitions or proscriptions into the law, in view of the fact that we can rely categorically upon the statement of the Secretary of State in his letter which is printed in the report and is part of the public record in respect to the places where expenditures are to be made.

So far as the general objective of the able Senator from Arkansas is concerned, I have a great deal of sympathy with what he said. I am happy to have him so generously acknowledge the fact that we have written precautions and protections into the resolution, so that there is really no possibility of exploitation in any such fashion as has been suffered heretofore. But, under the circumstances, I respectfully ask the Senate to reject the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas to the committee amendment.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I want to express my full agreement with the purpose of the amendment as expressed by the Senator from Arkansas. It is difficult for me to reconcile an appropriation of millions of dollars for military aid for the avowed purpose of stopping communism, and then to allow millions of dollars to be appropriated for Communist-dominated countries. I realize the difficulty of drawing a direct line of demarcation between relief and its general effects and the use of relief money for the building up of communism. America has traditionally been the most generous country in the world.

I shall vote for this appropriation for the needy of the world; but I say that unless there is a change of heart on the part of the State Department itself with respect to the administration of the food distribution organization, merely naming certain nations in the resolution is an idle gesture; it is a mere use of words, and I do not have much confidence that the State Department will implement the words. I hope they will, at least this is a step in the right direction. I trust that the able Senator from Michigan who heads the Committee on Foreign Relations and who has so valiantly supported these proposals, will be equally valiant in the effort to assure a proper dissemination of news so that we may know that we are not going down both sides of the street, but are taking a definite step to bring some good out of the disbursement of the great wealth of America under the theory that we may encourage someone somewhere to follow our example.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the committee amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN].

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now recurs upon the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM].

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I again advert to my remarks appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on page 3729, on April 21, when I said that the objective of the American people, namely, perpetual peace and the elevation of the peoples of all nations to a standard of living comparable to ours, is clear and well defined.

One of the points I made in the course of my remarks at that time was that with two world wars under our belts in our generation, we have never yet in 30 years established an American policy, geared to our national economy, which makes sense and which can be carried forward without a continued undue drain upon the taxpayers and workers of the United States.

The Senate of the United States has not the moral right to abdicate the powers entrusted to it under the Constitution of the United States by continuing thoughtless gifts to foreign nations. Certainly it has no legal right to relinquish to the Executive its obliga-

tion to review in detail such expenditures.

In principle, I do not see how the Senate can abdicate its powers on any issue affecting the well-being of the American people, except under wartime emergency. Each individual Senator presumably is elected on the basis of a full exercise of these powers, which in our system of government are intended to operate as a check against the Executive power of the administration.

If it is represented that these are matters which must be decided on the spur of the moment and instantaneously, the representation presumes upon a fallacy, since the relief suggested is based upon long-continuing conditions, and is not due to some special act of God, such as an earthquake. Even in the latter event, the Senate should be permitted to exercise its powers, the assumption being that it is no rubber stamp Reichstag, but is the final authority on whose decisions the United States foreign policy is based.

If it is urged that there is no time to acquaint the Senate with the full facts of the case so as to allow for requisite debate, that is tantamount to saying that only the so-called experts empowered in the administration are capable of making the decision. Government by experts is precisely the definition of fascism or, for that matter, of the Communist style of government. It assumes an honesty on the part of the experts which does not always exist, and an infallibility which is more than questionable.

As we know, the record of the experts in reference to all of the propositions which have been stamped through the American Congress has been an unsound one. Refer back to the claims made for the British loan, the United Nations, Bretton Woods, and so forth, and it is seen that none of the basic assertions urged by the experts were correct.

The record of administration of UNRRA played directly into the hands of Tito in Yugoslavia.

So long as foreign relief can be utilized for political purposes, it constitutes a weapon by which the policy of the United States is and has been committed along definite lines. If the experts, for example, were to commit the policy of the United States to the relief of Poland and Yugoslavia, that would represent a shift in the present determination to wall the Communists off. It places immense power of decision in the hands of middle-level officials whose judgment, in effect, would commit the entire policy of this Nation, not only along relief lines, but along military and political lines as well, because the unwise use of the first may lead to the second. It would allow the support of a dictator, as against the will of the people, by committing the opponents of their regime to starvation.

It seems to me that in the present crisis, only the Congress can determine these issues, and no one else. The abdication of its powers by the Congress, even in this comparatively small degree, is a frightening step backward, exactly as would be the recognition of the right of search and seizure without a warrant.

The whole system of stampede or panic politics by which, on one occasion after another, the Senate was urged to back a policy or a grant on which there was said to be no time for deliberation, discussion, and thought, is contrary to the entire spirit of this Government. In its own small way, it is uncomfortably similar to the means by which the Hitler regime secured a blank check for its policies from the Reichstag, allowing Hitler's government to carry on undisturbed its totalitarian policies with the legal cloak of the Weimar constitution and republic. The process now under way represents an invasion of the rights of Americans as a free and democratic people, as well as of the duties and privileges of their representatives.

The whole attitude, moreover, is one of reckless deficit spending without relation to the ultimate welfare of the Nation as it might be envisaged along sound conventional lines. This is a proposition which was current during the entire Roosevelt administration, namely, that deficit spending or piling up a huge national debt was an act of health, since it put people to work. Our foreign export is now operating at the rate of some \$8,000,000,000 a year. For each billion dollars, it is estimated that 1,000,000 Americans are employed. Since there is no floor to this export, and since it is not paid for in the usual way of conventional exchange of sound money and economics, but is being supported by American grants-in-aid to the importing countries, at some point it will have to stop. This point will be accelerated if the present threatened recession actually occurs this fall or in the near future, as is feared. The exports then will drop drastically, adding millions more to the unemployed lists which presumably will then exist.

No part of our plan seems to envisage placing the world on a sound economic basis, but instead, represents the support of tottering monarchial or dictatorial regimes by hand-outs designed to operate as a brake against communism.

The only defense against communism will be a healthy and sound economic life in Europe and Asia, as well as other parts of the world. This will require a world plan on the part of the United States, which will have to be considered by the Senate, which envisages bringing the present crises affecting all countries to an ultimate conclusion by which those countries will be self-supporting and healthy enough to be proof against revolutionary doctrine. Anything else plays into the hands of the Soviets and constitutes a continuous drain upon the resources of the United States which will ultimately bankrupt us.

The present deficit spending is not too much different from the old plan of plowing under cotton or dumping into the sea our surplus of potatoes. It is up to the administration, it seems to me, to present to the Congress for approval a plan by which the Western World at least can be brought to ultimate economic and political health, by which it can produce the necessities of life and pay the debts it incurs. They can hire our engineers and economists, who can show them how

to set up their own taxing districts, taxing their own people to pay the technicians and to pay their own wages to build their own projects.

Under such circumstances, the Congress can intelligently fund the plan, granting the required moneys in aid; and the individual Members of Congress will then be in a position to assure their constituents that the emergency is a temporary one, not a continuous one.

There is not even a rational plan in reference to the needs of the American economy in making a transition from a wartime to a peacetime base, the requirement for replacing obsolescent machinery and vehicles, housing, and so forth. Such a plan is desperately required if the American productive economy is expected to turn out vast quantities of materials to be sent abroad free.

The part played by British politics in this proposition, it seems to me, also should come under examination, since to date we have been committed to supporting an empire whose bankruptcy is self-evident, and whose continued operations will end in communism among all the peoples on whose back it functions.

Our resources are not limitless. We cannot play God to the rest of the world forever without having a clear concept of the ultimate goal and the ultimate outcome, as well as of the means by which it is to be secured.

Mr. President, at this point I should like to insert in the RECORD a statement by Jesse Jones in regard to subsidizing the British Empire. This statement appeared in the April 16, 1946, issue of the Houston Chronicle and Herald:

SUBSIDIZING THE BRITISH EMPIRE

(By Jesse H. Jones)

No money should be loaned to Britain for expenditure in other countries without proper security, particularly since the British have substantial profitable investments and operations in the United States which could be used as collateral for a loan.

Approval of the proposed loan now before Congress—

Referring to the \$3,750,000,000 loan to Britain, at that time under consideration by the Congress—

would start the United States down a financial road that is likely to lead to disaster. Too much spending and lending and losing is a sure road to ruin. The Congress should not ignore the dangers that lie ahead.

Mr. President, I should also like to refer to a statement made by Marriner Eccles, before the Foreign Policy Association, at Philadelphia, on February 9, 1946. The statement was printed in the Federal Reserve Bulletin of March 1946, and in it Mr. Eccles gives several reasons for extending aid to foreign countries. I quote from his statement:

Against these reasons for our extending aid to foreign countries, we must weigh the pressures on our own domestic economy. We cannot ignore the fact that such aid through Government channels, necessitates an increase in public expenditures.

We must recognize also that the expenditure of the proceeds of the loans in this country cannot be entirely welcomed at the present time. Many of these purchases will be made for products of which we will have an adequate or even a surplus supply. But inevitably other purchases will be for goods that are, for the time being at least, in

short supply and to that extent such purchases add to inflationary pressures.

Mr. President, these piecemeal hand-outs, especially as they relate to the support of foreign Marxist and semitotalitarian regimes, are a simple piece of folly which will leave this Nation poorer and weaker, not only materially, but in its relation to the world forces with which we are contending.

If the cause of this senseless behavior is fear of Soviet Russia, it would be better for us to have a show-down with Russia immediately, rather than to continue an irrational system of hand-outs which weaken our economy, destroy our trade, and makes us the ally of the small-time dictators and world cartel exploiters whose very success will spell Russian opportunity and the collapse of the western system of free enterprise.

I do not object to extending relief as such to any country; but I do wish to see whatever assistance we can logically give other peoples, rendered upon a businesslike basis, and in accordance with a well-conceived and well-thought-out plan based upon the ability of our national economy to carry the load without injury to our own people.

Mr. President, I intend to vote for this loan, against my better judgment, merely because it is called a loan to make it possible to furnish food to the peoples mentioned. However, I serve notice now that the fight is only starting, unless in the future such proposals are made under a well-coordinated and well-thought-out plan.

Mr. President, I ask that there be printed in the RECORD in connection with my remarks an article entitled "Need Abroad Is Crux of Economic Trends," from Barron's National and Financial Weekly for May 12, 1947.

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

How's BUSINESS?—NEED ABROAD IS CRUX OF ECONOMIC TRENDS

News of the worst famine conditions and industrial stagnation in most of Europe since the Thirty Years' War—when cases of cannibalism were reported—are gradually obtruding themselves on the national consciousness through the daily press. Instead of the reconstruction it seeks, the world faces an economic crisis of appalling scope.

Over the coming weeks and months the administration will make a major effort to bring the magnitude of the crisis home to the American people. Secretary of State Marshall began the campaign when, in his report on Moscow, he said the European patient is dying while the doctors debate. Undersecretary of State Acheson continued last week by spelling out "what Marshall meant" in terms of more exports, more foreign loans, and reconstruction of Germany and Japan so they could again become the international workshops they were in the past.

Two years of unspeakable suffering abroad have been accompanied by wastage of billions of our money diverted in part to strengthen our enemies and help them disrupt the world further. Even today Russia is feeding her troops in Rumania with the help of the wheat we send there. Our efforts have been floated on veritable seas of sactimonious promises about the benefits of new global institutions and multilateral economic systems. But all this is now culminating in poverty, misery and starvation everywhere else in the world on a scale that threatens to engulf our own prosperity.

CAUSES

This crisis is the direct outcome of the faulty thinking and inadequate planning for the postwar world which so signally characterized the policies of our national Administration in the closing years of the war. The economic disaster that is smiting Europe and the Far East is but the natural sequel of three basic errors in our war and postwar strategy. These have gradually snowballed into an almost irretrievable collapse abroad of all the physical means of production and distribution which hold modern civilizations together.

The first of the errors of judgment was the prevention of Germany's surrender until the country was literally turned to rubble. It was made worse by the prevention of reconstruction of civilian life there through application of the incredibly ignorant and shortsighted "pastoralization" policies of the Morgenthau school. Now we are faced with the need of spending more dollars to rebuild what we wantonly destroyed at enormous expense in men, materials, and money.

A LOSING GAMBLE

The second great error in judgment was that of proclaiming a new international order on the basis of superficially cordial contacts between a few individuals. The United States was committed to a vast new symbolism, although lacking any common understanding with the Soviet Government as to practical interpretations of the symbols. Not only that, but we took absolutely no alternative precautions to enable us to enforce our interpretations where it was important to do so against nations, like Russia, that do not accept them.

Even after the catastrophic climax of the war in Germany, the disaster could have been mitigated if our victorious Russian ally had not made such a bitter farce of the aspirations of peoples regarding international amity and cooperation. The masters of the Kremlin maintained 5,000,000 men under arms, engineered fifth-column offenses in every European country, imposed quisling governments in every nation within their orbit, and incited civil war in China and tried to do so in Iran.

Thereby they created an international situation of such deadly totalitarian menace that the rest of the world is more intent on defense than on the reconstruction it needs so acutely. Nations which are desperately anxious to disarm and re-integrate their soldiers in peaceful rebuilding, are forced instead to carry truly staggering burdens of wasteful military expenditures. Thus, they are unable to organize civilian life on any rational basis.

VICTORIAN DREAM

The third great mistake was, in absolute disregard of the fatal economic consequences of our German and Russian policies, to try to base our postwar economic arrangements on the fiction that the world of Queen Victoria's England could be revived. In those days there were six or eight great powers with roughly equivalent strength, and many other genuinely independent countries. International trading among such sovereignties grew and prospered in a healthy atmosphere of competition in which everyone had a chance.

That kind of thing is impossible today, when the United States alone possesses economic power of the same order of magnitude as that of the rest of the world put together, and when only this country and Canada have the surplus resources that can be exported for reconstruction. Yet, our State Department and Treasury still try to force other western nations into trade agreements which they are totally unable to make, but to which they nervously pay lip-service because of our overwhelming strength and their overwhelming needs.

CASSANDRA'S APOLOGY

It is because of such evidence of the continued hold of our wartime dreams for post-war happiness, that it seems necessary at this late date to harp upon the mistakes of the past. That the foregoing three major economic and political misconceptions either had to result in general collapse abroad or commit us to enormously expensive rescue operations seemed clear a great many months ago. In mid-1945 Barron's published gloomy comments on the probable consequences of Potsdam, and was chided for them by readers impressed with the propaganda of that day.

It seemed far more important to say all these disagreeable things to readers than to dilate complacently on the high level of business activity or to advertise further the well-advertised minor recession which persists in not making its appearance. Even so, it was difficult to demonstrate the error of the major policies of our administration at a time when the late President Roosevelt's magical gifts of suggestion and inspiration had stirred the public's hopes. It was also too early to explain on other than purely deductive grounds that this wonderful castle that was being built up before our eyes was nothing but a castle in the air. This column was reduced to the unhappy necessity of trying to counter mere assertions which people liked, with equally bald assertions they didn't want to hear.

SHOW-DOWN

Now, however, the consequences are becoming clear and Washington is saying the same things as Barron's. The reason the consequences are getting so obvious is that the first real post-war show-down is now so near. It is in the critical years 1947 and 1948 that we must decide the general framework of our future course. In doing so we have the advantage now of knowing what our mistakes have been and, therefore, what our new tack should be.

In simplest terms, the problem is as follows: Owing to the gratuitous prolongation of the war in 1944 and the Kremlin's sabotage of peacemaking from the very moment the fighting ended, world reconstruction has made dishearteningly little progress. As stated earlier, only North America can supply the deficiencies of the rest of the world. But, the countries in need do not have the dollars with which to buy. Therefore, if the rest of the world is to be rebuilt so that it can operate without help, we shall have to lend many more billions in order to finance that reconstruction.

The problem is roughly similar to the medical one of the patient weakened by loss of blood to the point where his system cannot restore itself without outside aid. Transfusions will bridge that gap, until one day the recipient may himself be able to contribute blood to others.

TWO OPTIONS

Much of the world is in just such desperate straits today. Secretary Marshall's description of the vicious circle which shortage of coal imposes upon industries of all kinds, was a pale illustration of the much more vicious circle imposed by lack of food. When, as in Germany, there is not enough to eat to supply a theoretical ration which itself represents only about half the American daily food intake per person, not only is there no energy for production, but much time must be spent in the mere pursuit of nourishment.

These conditions exist even though we have given away a lot of money and made a number of untenable agreements. Whatever good we have done along such lines has not been sufficient to repair the previous errors. There are just two options for us and neither of them is very attractive. But the time has come to face the music. Face it we must, or

the rest of the world will make us face it later.

INFLATION

One option is to give the necessary transfusions. Naturally, we cannot stand too many of them too close together. The billions we lend will be spent in the United States and the expenditures will be concentrated on all the scarce lines. Therefore, there will be genuine danger of further inflation if we lend on the needed scale.

The second alternative is to wash our hands of the mess we helped to create and say that the danger of inflation is too great to permit added loans. The consequence of that would be a sharp decline in exports from the United States and a collapse of world commodity prices in free markets.

That this would affect us in a seriously deflationary manner here is quite clear. Although the long-heralded recession still refuses to take place except for occasional spotty declines which, often as not, are offset by rising activity elsewhere, there is no doubt that the upward-driving forces are much weaker now than last year. Replenishment of empty pipe lines can no longer be counted on in most fields, and the Government is collecting a big cash surplus almost every month. At this time a combination of declining commodity prices, with the inventory losses that would result, and a shutting off of our export markets, would make the business picture here look bad.

SOCIALISM

Furthermore, in every foreign country affected by our refusal to grant credits extremely drastic controls over all phases of national economic activity would have to be imposed. Thus, we would be converting the rest of the world to state socialism in one fell swoop. That Socialist world would hate us as the cause of its miseries, and its leader would be Russia.

While the errors of the past are irretrievable in some respects, it is not yet quite too late. We can still use our enormous power for the good of mankind. If we do not, the penalty will be that we shall have used it for our own ultimate destruction.

An important condition is that, learning from experience, we should not, when extending financial aid to foreign nations, burden them with impossible economic conditions. We want engagements that actually can be fulfilled. The goal to strive for is a Commonwealth of United Nations, all believing in and strictly adhering to the same ideal that we serve—freedom from coercion for the individual. If Russia and her quislings will abide by this ideal as expressed in her own constitution, she will be a welcome member. If not, such a commonwealth still can be built.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] to the committee amendment.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I intend to support the pending joint resolution to provide \$350,000,000 for relief to the people of foreign countries devastated by war. Like most Americans, I have been trained all my life to contribute to worthy causes, I believe in giving. It is just as true today as in ancient times that it is more blessed to give than to receive. The experience of giving brings to us more satisfaction than almost anything else we can do. It does something for the man who gives just as for the recipient.

However, I must confess that I am voting for the joint resolution with the

most profound misgivings. Personally, I am not at all satisfied with the precedent we are apparently establishing of meeting the needs of charity by gifts of Government money and material. The money we are now voting comes entirely from the American taxpayer, of course. It is his money, and he is ultimately the giver. Yet, this type of giving—through the Government—does not give the taxpayers any of that satisfaction they would certainly feel if each one made a voluntary gift of his proportionate share. The giver is not made happy by our gifts of his taxes. Anyone who has sat through hearings on a tax bill will testify to that.

I am almost ready to suggest that the Government go out of the relief business and return the operation of such programs into the hands of private groups where charity belongs—such as the American Red Cross. This fine organization has had tremendous experience in feeding the starving and helping the needy. I believe that a dollar spent by the Red Cross goes 50 percent farther than a dollar spent by the Government. During the last fiscal year alone, the American Red Cross spent almost \$150,000,000 for foreign relief. Furthermore, they know how to spend it where it will do the most good.

In contrast, we have the unhappy experience with UNRRA as a sample of Government operation in this field. I realize that the framers of the pending measure have done their utmost to correct the tremendous waste and the other evils of UNRRA administration. We have eliminated UNRRA, but I am not at all sure that we have gotten rid of the people who administered the UNRRA program. I suspect that the same people are lining up for jobs with the new agency and are being given jobs on the basis of their experience in the distribution of relief. I have had some correspondence myself with persons of that type who desire employment.

As I here said, I shall vote for the joint resolution. I do not know where it will lead, and I am fearful of the ultimate consequences of a program of giving and giving Government funds. I think we might do better by turning the money over to the Red Cross, which at least knows how to dispense relief on an economical and impartial basis. Although I am supporting the joint resolution, I hope it will not be necessary for me to cast a vote again for any measure giving Government funds for foreign relief, except through the Red Cross or some similar organization.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, the pending amendment, submitted by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], is of a major character, and its submission to a vote should probably await conclusion of the debate on the bill. It is my understanding that the able Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] has an amendment to submit which deals with the subject we canvassed at some length yesterday. The Senator has shown me his amendment, and, so far as I am concerned, I have no objection to it. I would suggest that the Senator present his amendment now.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], I send an amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the amendment submitted by the Senator from Louisiana? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 11, line 20, after the semicolon, it is proposed to insert the following:

(h) Provision will be made for a control system so that all classes of people within such country will receive their fair share of essential supplies.

On page 11, line 21, it is proposed to strike out "(h)" and insert "(i)".

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the amendment is very simple, and to my way of thinking it goes to the very heart of the problem we are seeking to solve. It makes it possible for the supplies to be purchased by the huge sum authorized in the joint resolution to be fairly and equitably distributed among all of the people we are attempting to assist. In short, it authorizes a system of controls which assures the poorer people a fair share of the supplied needed by them to warrant the minimum diet suggested by the committee. I hope I said nothing yesterday, during the course of my remarks, which indicated that I was against the pending joint resolution. My sole and only object, I repeat, is to make it possible for all of the people of all of the countries which we intend to assist to obtain their just share of the supplies we expect to make available.

As was developed yesterday in the course of the debate, the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] stated that 80 to 85 percent of the supplies would be distributed by sale, in accord with the custom and practice in the country receiving help. I stated then and I repeat now a system of price and rationing controls must be established so that the well-to-do will not be in position to obtain more than their just share of the supplies that we allocate to the countries in need. In the committee report it is stated that the purpose of supplying these countries is to make it possible for all the inhabitants to be afforded at least 2,000 to 2,200 calories. I am in thorough agreement with all the conditions which have been placed in the joint resolution with reference to administration of the funds. My amendment simply adds another condition, which by all means should be adopted.

During a visit I made last year to China, Greece, Italy, and other countries we are seeking to assist, I found that in many places food was plentiful for those who had the money with which to buy it. For instance, in Shanghai one could get beefsteaks, chicken, and all kinds of food, if he had the money with which to buy. It was rather high in price. The same condition prevailed in Greece. In Athens, if one had the wherewithal, he could buy almost any kind of food he desired.

The amendment I propose is to be inserted on page 11, line 20, immediately

after the condition imposed under subdivision (g), and it reads as follows:

Provision will be made for a control system so that all classes of people within such country will receive their fair share of essential supplies.

Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Michigan stated yesterday that from 15 to 20 percent of the supplies will be made available to the indigent, those who cannot afford to purchase food, and that 80 to 85 percent of the huge amount of supplies will be distributed in the countries in accord with whatever system of distribution now prevails in those countries.

In most of the countries there is a system somewhat similar to what we have in our own country. There are the wholesalers and there are the retailers who distribute the supplies to the consuming public.

If the supplies are placed in the hands of the retailers without restrictions, it is my view that those who are better able to pay will be in a position to obtain more of the supplies than those who are really in need and thereby defeat the purpose of supplying a minimum of 2,000 to 2,200 calories per person.

In conclusion, may I say I am glad the distinguished Senator from Michigan has no objection to the proposed amendment.

I desire to read a paragraph from the report of the Committee on Foreign Relations, page 9:

If the relief program contemplated in the resolution is put into effect the United States would negotiate agreements with each of the recipient governments. These agreements would include the various conditions specified in the resolution and would outline the general procedures and controls which would be established with respect to the procurement and shipment of supplies.

Then follows the provision which I want to emphasize:

Provisions would also be made for a ration and price-control system so that all classes of people within a country would receive a fair share of essential supplies.

The purpose of the amendment is simply to carry out the recommendation of the committee, which I contended for in a colloquy with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG].

I cannot understand why it is that the committee failed to adopt the language I am now proposing, since it was understood that a requirement such as the one proposed was to be made and incorporated in all agreements with the countries entitled to relief.

Mr. President, I do not propose to go into further details and I am hopeful that the amendment will be adopted so as to insure, I repeat, a fair distribution of all the supplies that we will make available to all classes of people we are seeking to assist in the countries selected for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I will say again that the amendment merely writes into the joint resolution the obvious purpose

of the measure as stated in the report, and I have no objection to acceptance of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now recurs on agreeing to the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM].

Mr. KEM. I ask for the yeas and nays.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum is suggested. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Aiken	Hatch	Morse
Ball	Hawkes	Murray
Barkley	Hayden	Myers
Brewster	Hickenlooper	O'Conor
Bricker	Hill	O'Daniel
Bridges	Hoey	O'Mahoney
Brooks	Holland	Pepper
Buck	Ives	Reed
Bushfield	Jenner	Robertson, Va.
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Wyo.
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Cain	Kem	Saltonstall
Capper	Kilgore	Smith
Chavez	Knowland	Sparkman
Connally	Lodge	Taft
Cooper	Lucas	Taylor
Cordon	McCarthy	Thomas, Okla.
Donnell	McClellan	Thye
Downey	McFarland	Tydings
Dworschak	McGrath	Umstead
Eastland	McKeellar	Vandenber
Ecton	McMahon	Watkins
Ellender	Magnuson	Wherry
Ferguson	Malone	White
Fulbright	Martin	Wiley
George	Maybank	Williams
Green	Millikin	Wilson
Gurney	Moore	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-four Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, if the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] wishes to resubmit his request for a yea-and-nay vote on his amendment I shall be glad to have him do so, and then I wish to say a word about the amendment.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, very earnestly I want to say a word to the Senate about the pending amendment. The able Senator from Missouri has offered an amendment to reduce the over-all authorization in the joint resolution from \$350,000,000 to \$200,000,000. I can quite understand the feelings of the able Senator from Missouri as he has stated them in connection with his presentation of the amendment, but I very respectfully submit that this is a situation which does not yield itself to the ordinary considerations of economy which we all have very definitely upon our minds at such a time as this.

I suggest that Senators remember, first, that the united authorities, not only of the United Nations, but of our own Government, have set the utter minimum necessity in these identified countries between now and New Year's at a minimum of \$600,000,000, in human

need for the utterly elemental things which are defined in the joint resolution.

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

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. I wish to ask the Senator from Michigan if any other countries have already contributed their share of the money. It is understood, I believe, that the amount carried in the joint resolution represents about 58 percent of the need.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator from Nevada is quite correct in the allocation of the percentages. Our share of the fund is 58 percent, which we have accepted, and we have accepted it with a clear understanding that there may be some difficulty in raising the remainder of the fund. Unfortunately, the raising of the remainder has been postponed due to the delays here in Congress in the passage of the legislation. I may say to the Senator from Nevada only this, that up to date the British Government has made certain direct promises to one or two of the countries concerned, amounting, my recollection is, to \$40,000,000. Denmark has made certain specific commitments. I think Norway has made certain specific commitments. The development of the remainder of the program has been awaiting our action.

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

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. Has any of the money actually been contributed?

Mr. VANDENBERG. No money has been contributed because the fund cannot be set up until the United States has taken action.

Mr. President, our share, I repeat, is \$350,000,000. We had accepted that as a matter of good faith in the General Assembly of the United Nations, not binding, I agree, legally or in any other way upon the judgment of the Senate if the Senate's judgment is otherwise, but accepted at least on the theory that we are the authors of this alternative plan under which we advance our own funds and take our own responsibility for the administration of those funds so as to avoid all the scandals and the mismanagement and the maladministration of UNRRA in days gone by. Our share, I repeat, is \$350,000,000. That sum, allocated to the seven countries which are listed, is an absolute minimum by way of meeting the challenge of this situation. If the amount is reduced to \$200,000,000, as proposed by the able Senator from Missouri, there will not be a sufficient fund even to meet the basic needs in Greece, Italy, and Austria, the three basic countries where we cannot possibly escape the challenge which we confront in respect to this relief matter.

I submit to the Senate that when we confront a necessity for \$350,000,000 in connection with a task of this nature, if it is cut arbitrarily to \$200,000,000 we are placed in the same position as we would be in if we stood on the dock and threw a 10-foot rope to a man who was drowning 15 feet off shore.

Mr. President, so far as I am concerned, the joint resolution itself had better be defeated than to have the basic authorization cut down at this particu-

lar moment by the Senate. I shall give some further reasons why I make that statement. In the course of its consideration of the measure the House voted to reduce the figure to \$200,000,000.

I think it is fair to say that in the view of most of us who have had an opportunity to examine the House record, it is clear that the House decision was made on the basis of a misunderstanding of the facts. At any rate, the \$200,000,000 figure proposed by the able Senator from Missouri will confront the conference. I am asking, and the committee is asking, that we leave the Senate committee amendment at what is deemed to be the utter minimum of necessity, \$350,000,000, so that the two figures can go to conference. If the amendment of the able Senator from Missouri were adopted there would be but one figure in conference, an utterly inadequate figure, and even from the standpoint of the able Senator from Missouri, I am sure he would be willing to give the conferees at least that much opportunity to resurvey the situation to determine whether or not we would be making a desperately serious error if the reduction were made.

Furthermore, I remind the Senate that this is only an authorization, and that the ultimate appropriations under the act will come when the actual requests for appropriations are made.

I beg the Senate to reject the amendment, at least until such time as the conference can bring forth a final report on this legislation.

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

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. KEM. May I ask the Senator if the decision of the House was reached after extensive public hearings?

Mr. VANDENBERG. There is no doubt in the world about it.

Mr. KEM. Are those the only public hearings that have been held on the question?

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is correct.

Mr. KEM. May I ask the Senator if he can give the Senate any estimate as to additional demands of the same character which are likely to be made upon us in the near future?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I know of none. If the Senator is talking about relief funds, except as the Senator may refer to the proposed children's fund.

That is another reason why I am asking the Senate to give us this leeway when we go to conference. Under the provisions of the House language it is proposed to meet the suggestion regarding a supplementary children's fund by using some of the authorization in the joint resolution to meet the obligation contemplated under the children's fund. Except as we can have the full authorization in conference, it will be impossible for us even to consider the possibility of including the children's fund within this appropriation. I am not at all sure that there will be a children's fund anyway, under the circumstances. So far as I know, the consideration of the supplementary children's fund is the only proposal that is pending, in addition to the proposal on the desks of Senators at the present time.

Mr. KEM. If I correctly understood the able Senator from Michigan yesterday, he put us on notice that there would likely be in the immediate future a request for a children's fund, in addition to the present proposal.

Mr. VANDENBERG. As usual, I was trying to be completely frank with the Senate. One thing above everything else that I cherish is the confidence of the Senate in what I say to it in respect to matters of this nature.

Mr. KEM. The Senator certainly has the confidence of the Senate.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I thank the Senator. I wanted to be completely fair about the discussion of the children's fund. It is exceedingly difficult for me to be specific, because the suggestion in respect to the children's fund has not yet even been sent to Congress. It is a supplementary sort of undertaking which was born at New York in the General Assembly of the United Nations, when it was discovered that there was a little fund of \$550,000 left in Mr. LaGuardia's control as the trustee of UNRRA when it was going out of business. It was proposed to use that little nucleus by way of building up a supplementary fund exclusively to combat the malnutrition of children in certain areas in Europe, as a specialty, a fund to which private contributions could be made, a fund which at that time, I am very frank to say, contemplated no such magnitude as is discussed downtown at the present time in connection with this fund.

The Senator from Michigan does not attach himself to any promises in respect to the children's fund, because so far as the Senator from Michigan is concerned, he feels that basic relief is the primary challenge here. If it is possible to develop a children's fund supplementarily, I shall be very happy to participate in the effort; but so far as a further substantial demand upon Congress is concerned this year in respect to the children's fund, let me say that at the maximum we would not confront a request for more than ten or fifteen million dollars; and so far as the Senator from Michigan is concerned, he is not even committed to that.

Mr. KEM. I thank the Senator. At the risk of being tedious, I should like to ask the Senator two further questions.

First, in its deliberations, did the Committee on Foreign Relations give any attention to how far the American economy will stand drafts of this nature?

Mr. VANDENBERG. No. The Senator is quite justified, and so are all other Senators who speak in terms of a demand, that we should survey our own resources in total to see to what extent we can deal in enterprises such as the one now before us.

In respect to this relief, it is imminent and unavoidably necessary if body and soul are to be kept together in the areas of liberated Europe between now and harvest time. It is so obviously apparent that except as body and soul can be kept together in this fashion, the forces of physical, mental, moral, social, and political disintegration will have complete right-of-way in those areas between now and harvest time, that I would say it was unnecessary for the committee, and it is

now unnecessary for the Senate, to await any domestic survey in order to make up our minds that this limited challenge is one to which we dare not, on any basis of intelligent American self-interest, turn a deaf ear.

Mr. KEM. Would the Senator place that challenge ahead of the challenge that we should see, first and foremost, that we are maintaining America as a bulwark of free institutions?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I would put the challenge which the Senator now defines at the base of every consideration in the world, because except as we can keep a solvent, healthy America in existence, there is no hope whatever, not only for us but for anyone else on this earth.

Mr. KEM. I agree with the Senator. Without some consideration of the effect of this and similar drafts upon our economy, how can we be sure that we can withstand them?

Mr. VANDENBERG. In the opinion of the Senator from Michigan we should be making the precise studies which the Senator from Missouri is discussing; but I submit to the Senator that even with that fundamental, overriding requirement, which ought to be a constant challenge to our attention, it is impossible to plead that that necessity must suspend this relief appropriation, upon the immediate effects of which depends almost every hope we have, not only in respect to humanities around this earth, but in respect to stabilities.

Mr. KEM. Would the Senator from Michigan be willing to join me and other Senators who think as I do in suggesting that the amount be reduced to \$200,000,000 pending an investigation as to the effect upon the economy of the United States?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I wish it were possible to agree to a proposal of that sort; but upon second thought the Senator himself must realize that the purpose of this measure primarily deals with a crisis between now and harvest time in the liberated areas of Europe. The major expenditures for relief under the joint resolution involve situations that are already critical and will become increasingly critical up to a climax not more than 90 days hence. So it is quite impossible, I am sure the Senator, upon second thought, will concede, for us to suspend our attention to that imminent challenge for the purpose of making such a study as the Senator contemplates; but I would happily join with the Senator in setting up some sort of a system under which we shall make a total inventory of our available American resources and look in sum total squarely into the over-all possibilities within which America must live.

Mr. KEM. Does the Senator from Michigan join me in some impatience in viewing these constantly recurring crises emanating from the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I not only join in the Senator's impatience, but I join in wishing that it were not my constant assignment to have to present these situations to the Senate. I think the best proof of the fact that I consider it unavoidable is that although they come from an Executive and a State Depart-

ment downtown, which are under the general control of a party to which I am not attached, nevertheless I consider it to be my duty and the duty of my party in connection with matters of this nature to present a united front.

Mr. KEM. Will the Senator, on the next occasion of this kind—

Mr. VANDENBERG. Does the Senator mean the next crisis?

Mr. KEM. Yes. Will the Senator be kind enough to convey to the Chief Executive the wish of a very inconspicuous Member of this body that an opportunity be given for careful deliberation?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I shall be glad to carry the Senator's message.

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

Mr. VANDENBERG. I will yield in a moment. I want to be sure to yield to the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] before my time expires.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to say to the Senator from Michigan, in order to make it plain, with reference to the answer to an inquiry which I made yesterday afternoon, that the Senate is not committed to the definite amount of \$350,000,000.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am glad the Senator has brought that up again. The Senator is totally correct. It is up to \$350,000,000, if, as, and when the necessities are demonstrated to the Appropriations Committee of this body.

Mr. WHERRY. It is upon that theory that I suggest to the distinguished Senator from Missouri, for whom I have the highest respect, that what the Senate does, if it agrees to this joint resolution, is in reality to place a maximum ceiling above which we cannot go, but the justification has to be made to the Appropriations Committee to make the appropriations which that committee feels are justified, and then the question comes to the Senate for its vote. Am I correct?

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator is entirely correct.

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

Mr. VANDENBERG. If I still have the floor I will yield to the Senator.

Mr. KEM. I should like to ask the Senator from Michigan this question: In addition to the crisis technique with which we have become so familiar, is this also a blank check?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I do not consider it to be a blank check, because, upon the insistence of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, the destination of the funds is spelled out in the committee report over the signature of the Secretary of State, with the direct statement from him that it is a categorical commitment.

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

Mr. VANDENBERG. I will yield once more. I must yield the floor to the able Senator from Texas.

Mr. MALONE. I want to ask the able Senator from Michigan if there is any record of any part of an appropriation made for any purpose in the crises which have been referred to by the Senator from Missouri, having been turned back into the Treasury or having remained unexpended?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I would not know whether there is or not; and it would not make the slightest difference in my judgment respecting the vote which I have to cast here. I should like to call the attention of the able Senator from Nevada to the fact that under the textual terms of the joint resolution upon which he is now asked to vote it is required that all the funds obtained in local currencies abroad as the result of the distribution of this relief—and there will be very substantial funds obtained—shall be deposited in trust funds under the control of the Government of the United States, and the final disposition of the balance is at the command, textually, of the Congress of the United States. I submit to the Senator that that is a very far advance, he will at least be happy to agree with me, upon the techniques from which we have suffered heretofore.

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

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. I merely addressed the inquiry to the able Senator for the reason that the junior Senator from Nebraska stated that the pending measure was merely an enabling act to enable the Government to spend up to the amount of \$350,000,000.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I now yield to the Senator from Texas. I am very happy to do so.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I feel it is hardly necessary for me to make any remarks on the pending measure, for, in view of the state of the record and of the able presentation by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I cannot conceive that the Senate would refuse to grant this authorization. At that point I want to emphasize the fact that this is not an appropriation; it is simply an authorization. There will not be a dollar expended under this resolution until the Congress specifically appropriates funds within the authorization.

I very much hope that the Senate will not adopt an amendment, such as that suggested by the Senator from Missouri, which would substantially reduce the amount of the funds. If we undertake this work at all, let us do it completely; let us not do only half of it.

It has been estimated by those in authority in the Department of State that \$600,000,000 will be required to meet the relief needs of the countries involved, and that our portion of it will be approximately \$350,000,000.

I want also to emphasize the fact that this resolution is limited to relief. Under this measure rehabilitation and reconversion are not considered. We do not even send agricultural machinery. Seed, insecticides, and things of that kind are to be sent to devastated countries whose people are in distress, as well as food and clothing and the elementary necessities of human life.

The war has left us with tremendous responsibilities, some of which are implied from the war and some of which we are assuming ourselves. Of course we are all concerned with the economic conditions in our own country. Of course, we feel the necessity of preserving

the economic status of the United States. We do not want to waste the resources of the United States. We do not want to dissipate the elements of our strength. But what are we to do? We are a part of the world. We are not all of it. But whatever happens in Europe in the field of politics or government or economy, has its repercussions in the United States, regardless of our will or regardless of our attitudes. We want a peaceful world; we want a prosperous world. We want, insofar as we can, to banish the terrible conditions existing in the devastated countries of Europe.

Mr. President, the Senate is well-advised about this measure. I do not wish to consume much time at this point; but I feel that I should say a few words, in view of the many reasons that are being urged by Senators in regard to amendments and other matters.

I have often heard it said, "That people in Europe do not appreciate that we are doing for them." Mr. President, under UNRRA there was substantial complaint, which was justified, that UNRRA was extending aid in the form of food and raiment to countries that were, in turn, expending their own resources for the maintenance of large armies. It was justly complained that UNRRA was feeding the civilian populations, whereas the governments themselves were expending their resources in the maintenance of armies and in preparation for military action. But that will not be the case under this joint resolution; we have safeguarded against that.

It is true that many of the residents of Europe do not appreciate what we have done. Many of them never even knew that we were contributors to UNRRA. They were misled; they were misinformed; they were misguided; they were under the delusion that the aid which we granted under UNRRA was coming from some of the governments of Europe with which we are not in very great sympathy.

But, Mr. President, regardless of whether they are grateful or are not grateful, we, the people of the United States, have a high obligation in this respect. Our obligation is not simply a matter of charity, but we have an obligation to try to resurrect the world, so that we shall have peace in the future, instead of chaos and misery and suffering, which constitute a rich breeding ground for war and international discord.

Mr. KEM rose.

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield to the Senator from Missouri, if he wishes me to yield.

Mr. KEM. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Texas, as the ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, about a request for \$200,000,000 for Korea, which appears to have been announced today from the White House, according to newspapers which have come to the Senate Chamber. They indicate that such a request has been made. Will the Senator from Texas give us some information in regard to that matter?

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes; I shall. I shall say—although the Senator from Mis-

souri is probably as well informed about that matter as I am—that at this moment there have been newspaper stories and reports that the United States, in carrying out its agreements with Russia in undertaking to establish a stable government in Korea, is adopting the attitude that all elements in the population of Korea should be consulted, and that we should set up a really democratic system of government there; and, of course, funds will be required for that purpose. So I assume that we shall be called upon to provide such funds. I do not know what the amount will be, but I assume that it is true that we shall be called upon to provide such funds.

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

Mr. CONNALLY. I shall yield, although I wish to leave some time to the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG].

Mr. KEM. I should like to place in the RECORD—

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, this is a bad time to have matters placed in the RECORD, because we are operating under a very limited time schedule. Certainly the Senator has all afternoon to place matters in the RECORD, after the approaching vote is taken.

Mr. KEM. I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD an article appearing in today's Washington News, entitled "Korea Needs Only \$200,000,000." The article begins with the statement:

The administration today rushed plans for a \$200,000,000 economic aid program for southern Korea as Senator STYLES BRIDGES, Republican of New Hampshire, demanded Congress be told how much is planned for foreign spending instead of being asked for money in "dribbs and drabs."

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

KOREA NEEDS ONLY \$200,000,000

The administration today rushed plans for a \$200,000,000 economic aid program for southern Korea as Senator STYLES BRIDGES, Republican of New Hampshire, demanded Congress be told how much is planned for foreign spending instead of being asked for money in "dribbs and drabs."

It was reported the Korean program would be presented Congress very soon. Its purpose would be rehabilitation of railways, textile mills, and other industries destroyed by the Japs.

The Korean aid plan will be pushed despite an American-Soviet agreement to reopen talks on Korean unification in Seoul May 20.

Senator BRIDGES in asking for some estimate of the over-all anticipated cost of the Truman doctrine charged the Administration had given no indication of what the final total—estimated unofficially at possibly billions of dollars—might be.

Thus far Congress has been asked specifically for \$400,000,000 for Greece and Turkey and \$350,000,000 for general foreign relief. The Greco-Turkish fund has been authorized but no money has been appropriated. The general foreign relief fund is up for Senate vote today.

The State Department admitted the Administration now faces a handicap of its own making in further implementation of the Truman doctrine.

Congress approved the Greco-Turkish grant in response to Mr. Truman's appeals which stressed urgent military dangers involved.

Now, however, the State Department wants to put the emphasis on the economic implications of its program, particularly in getting Congress to approve wide expenditures to prop up western European economies.

State Department difficulty with Congress over its foreign broadcast propaganda program continued. Representative KARL MUNDT, Republican of South Dakota, proposed to read scripts of the Voice of America program in Foreign Affairs subcommittee hearings to determine whether criticism directed at the programs was justified.

The Italian political crisis appeared to be moving toward solution. Premier Alcide de Gasperi was expected to broaden his government by adding right-wing elements while retaining Communists and left-wing socialists.

The United Nations General Assembly prepared today to approve a broad investigation of Palestine to open the way for specific UN action next autumn.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I do not object to having the Senator put the article in the RECORD. The good old RECORD is the repository of a great deal of material which is rarely ever read by anyone who keeps up with information from reliable sources.

Suppose such funds are requested for Korea, what is the Senate going to do? Shall we say to Korea, "No; we are not interested in Korea; we do not care what kind of government exists there; we do not care whether Russia gobbles up Korea"; and if I am asked what I am going to do about that, am I to say, "I have before me an article from the Washington News which seems to be against the proposal, and therefore I will vote against it"?

Mr. President, of course, Senators will not vote against it.

Mr. MALONE. I should like to say to the Senator from Texas—

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada will please address the Chair.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let the Senator make his peace with the Chair, and then I shall yield to him. [Laughter.]

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, I wish to say that I will do as I have done on two former occasions: I will ask for a comprehensive plan, geared to our national economy and our ability to carry out such a program. But without such a plan, in the debate on this floor, I shall oppose the granting of further requests; I shall stand against them as long as I can.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am sure the Senator will stand as long as he can, Mr. President. He has already served notice on us in regard to what he will do. He did so in a speech he made earlier today.

Mr. President, let me say that even the countries which do not appreciate what we are doing, will appreciate it in the years to come. We are here to discharge our responsibilities. We are here to meet our obligations and to do our duty. I would hate to have history record that in this hour of trial and distress, when the nations that have been liberated are in sore need, we did not do the handsome and the generous thing.

Mr. President, we poured out probably \$300,000,000,000 in an effort to arrest aggression and to preserve the liberties and

the freedoms of the very nations for which the proposed aid is intended. Shall we now take the position that, after spending \$300,000,000,000 in that effort, which indirectly, through the opposition of the enemy, resulted in the killing of the citizens and in bringing about the collapse of those nations, now that they are in dire need of assistance, the United States Government will say "No"?

Mr. President, now that the necessity exists for us to help them the United States Government will not say "No," nor will we be deterred by the fact that within some of those countries there are people who are ungrateful or lacking in appreciation. But, Mr. President, when the historians come to record the transactions of this period the noble part played by the United States will be written in bright and vivid letters on an honored page.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment submitted by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] to the committee amendment. On this question the ayes and nays have been ordered.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, several Senators have entered the Chamber since the amendment was read. I ask that it be read again at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment to the committee amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment, on page 8, in line 17, it is proposed to strike out "\$350,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$200,000,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] is absent because of illness. If present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut would vote "nay."

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] are absent by leave of the Senate. If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont would vote "nay."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent because of illness in his family. If present and voting, he would vote "nay."

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], who is unavoidably detained on official business, has a general pair with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kansas would vote "nay."

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] has a general pair with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. If present, the Senator from New York would vote "nay."

I announce further that, if present and voting, the Senator from Nevada [Mr.

McCARRAN], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 19, nays 64, as follows:

YEAS—19

Brewster	Johnson, Colo.	Moore
Brooks	Kem	O'Daniel
Buck	McCarthy	Robertson, Va.
Butler	McClellan	Russell
Byrd	McKellar	Williams
Dworshak	Malone	
Ecton	Martin	

NAYS—64

Alken	Hawkes	O'Conor
Ball	Hayden	O'Mahoney
Barkley	Hickenlooper	Pepper
Bricker	Hill	Robertson, Wyo.
Bridges	Hoey	Saltonstall
Bushfield	Holland	Smith
Cain	Ives	Sparksman
Capper	Jenner	Taft
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	Taylor
Cooper	Kilgore	Thomas, Okla.
Cordon	Knowland	Thye
Donnell	Lodge	Tydings
Downey	Lucas	Umstead
Eastland	McFarland	Vandenberg
Ellender	McGrath	Watkins
Ferguson	McMahon	Wherry
Fulbright	Magnuson	White
George	Maybank	Wiley
Green	Millikin	Wilson
Gurney	Morse	Young
Hatch	Murray	
	Myers	

NOT VOTING—12

Baldwin	McCarran	Stewart
Capehart	Overtón	Thomas, Utah
Flanders	Reed	Tobey
Langer	Revercomb	Wagner

So Mr. KEM's amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, further debate is prohibited. Although amendments may yet be offered, no debate can be had thereon. Are there any further amendments to be offered? If not, the question is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

Mr. MORSE. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WHERRY (when Mr. BALDWIN's name was called). The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] is absent because of illness. If he were present and permitted to vote, he would vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] are absent by leave of the Senate. If present and voting the Senator from Vermont would vote "yea."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent because of illness in his family. If present and voting he would vote "yea."

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], who is unavoidably detained on official business, has a general pair with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. If present and voting the Senator from Kansas would vote "yea."

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] has a general pair with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. If present, the Senator from New York would vote "yea."

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 79, nays 4, as follows:

YEAS—79

Aiken	Hatch	Morse
Ball	Hawkes	Murray
Barkley	Hayden	Myers
Brewster	Hickenlooper	O'Conor
Bricker	Hill	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Hoey	Pepper
Brooks	Holland	Robertson, Va.
Buck	Ives	Robertson, Wyo.
Butler	Jenner	Russell
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Cain	Johnston, S. C.	Smith
Capper	Kem	Sparkman
Chavez	Kilgore	Taft
Connally	Knowland	Taylor
Cooper	Lodge	Thomas, Okla.
Gordon	Lucas	Thye
Donnell	McCarthy	Tydings
Downey	McFarland	Umstead
Dworsak	McGrath	Vandenberg
Eastland	McKellar	Watkins
Ecton	McMahon	Wherry
Ellender	Magnuson	White
Ferguson	Malone	Wiley
Fulbright	Martin	Wilson
George	Maybank	Young
Green	Millikin	
Gurney	Moore	

NAYS—4

Bushfield	O'Daniel	Williams
McClellan		

NOT VOTING—12

Baldwin	McCarran	Stewart
Capehart	Overton	Thomas, Utah
Flanders	Reed	Tobey
Langer	Revercomb	Wagner

So the committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the joint resolution.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the joint resolution to be read a third time.

The joint resolution was read the third time and passed.

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

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. VANDENBERG, Mr. WILEY, Mr. SMITH, Mr. CONNALLY, and Mr. GEORGE conferees on the part of the Senate.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be absent from the Senate tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, consent is granted.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the

House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3020) to prescribe fair and equitable rules of conduct to be observed by labor and management in their relations with one another which affect commerce, to protect the rights of individual workers in their relations with labor organizations whose activities affect commerce, to recognize the paramount public interest in labor disputes affecting commerce that endanger the public health, safety, or welfare, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. HARTLEY, Mr. LANDIS, Mr. HOFFMAN, Mr. LESINSKI, and Mr. BARDEN were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 76, Senate bill 526, to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 526), to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, with amendments.

COORDINATION FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Mr. President, our forefathers, at the founding of this great Nation, were rightly suspicious of granting too much authority to that necessary adjunct of a sovereign State, the armed forces. In their wisdom, they wrote into the Constitution definite provisions which they believed would forever maintain the Army and the Navy as the willing servants of civil power and would never permit them to become our master.

In these troubled days and until such time as the nations of the world will compose their differences without recourse to war the military services are an evil that must be maintained to preserve to us and to our children the benefits of our constitutional form of government. But like all such growths, they are never satisfied with what they have. Believing in spite of all the evidence to the contrary that civil government is dilatory, inefficient, and extravagant the military continually seeks to extend its influence, both within and without the armed forces, and to take unto itself many of the prerogatives of the executive and legislative branches of our Government.

We have been told repeatedly during these past 2 years that in these days of total war, involving every governmental agency and every walk of human endeavor, that our only hope of survival rests in the lessening of civilian control over the military services, and in the concentration of power and authority in the hands of the few, who will, in turn, be dominated by their professional military advisers.

There is nothing new in these proposals, for history is replete with examples of them and, what is more important, with the sobering and terrifying results that have inevitably followed in due course when they have been adopted.

It was such a philosophy that permitted Napoleon to become the scourge of Europe at the beginning at the nineteenth century. It was such a philosophy that permitted the professional militarists of Germany to dominate that country in the short span of 70 years and to bring about the cataclysm of World War I, in spite of the provisions written into the Prussian Constitution of 1850 which gave to the Diet—much as our Constitution gives to Congress—nominal control over the military budgets and over the war minister. It was such a philosophy that resulted in the military domination of Germany, Italy, and Japan during the last decade, a philosophy that we have just waged World War II to defeat. It is such a philosophy that we are now being urged to accept without the most searching of examinations because it has been recommended to us by our military advisers.

Do we really wish to follow in these footsteps of history? to provide for military domination of all of the agencies of our Government, of our industry, and of our manpower? and to come at last to the inevitable military defeat that has followed in due course, as the night follows the day? I do not think so; nor do I advise that it be done.

I know that many will say that these things cannot happen in this free country of ours. But I say that they can happen here; that they can and will happen unless we retain within these Halls of Congress our traditional and constitutional civilian control over the armed forces of this Nation.

In 1919, at the end of World War I, a bill was introduced in the Congress which would have deprived it of its power to control the Army. This bill was defeated by the efforts of Senator Chamberlain whose summation is as cogent today as it was 28 years ago. I quote from his analytical and explanatory statement as printed for the use of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs by the Government Printing Office, 1919:

This bill was framed by military advisers of the Secretary of War. Inasmuch as many of these proposals are radical and even revolutionary in their nature, and, if rejected now, are likely again to be urged upon Congress, possibly in other forms, it seems advisable now to examine all of them very thoroughly. The comments made herein with regard to them will apply to them equally as well whenever and however they shall appear in the future.

Briefly stated, the principal purpose of the legislation proposed by this bill is to empower the chief of an all-powerful general staff corps, acting by authority of the President or in his name, or with the acquiescence and in the name of the Secretary of War, to do whatever such successive Chief of Staff may from time to time desire to do with regard to the duties, powers, functions, records, property and personnel of all military bureaus and offices of the War Department. All previous legislation by Congress with respect to the duties, powers, and functions of officers of the various staff corps and de-

partments and of the line of the Army is to be repealed expressly or by implication. Nearly all the control heretofore exercised by Congress over the Army is to be transferred, theoretically to the President, but practically, to the Chief of Staff. However, Congress is still to be permitted to foot the bill.

Upon careful consideration of this section of the bill (sec. 1), especially the last sentence thereof, it will be seen that the enactment of it will give to the executive permanent and unrestricted authority to distribute as and when he pleases, anywhere in or out of the War Department, any or all of the duties, powers, functions, records, property, and personnel heretofore assigned by law or otherwise to any of the existing departments, bureaus and offices of the War Department.

From very early days of the Army and up to the present time Congress has prescribed the organization and the commissioned and enlisted strength of the various arms, regiments, battalions, troops, batteries, and companies of the line. It is now proposed that Congress shall relinquish to the Executive substantially all of this control. There is no limit as to the frequency with which this enormous power may be exercised by any President or any of his successors to meet the ever-changing opinions, views, or whims of an ever-changing Chief of Staff and his immediate subordinates. It is inevitable that the power will be so exercised, if Congress is unwise enough to permit it, with resulting instability and uncertainty throughout the Army, and great and useless expense.

The whole theory of this and other sections of the bill is unlimited, autocratic, one-man control over the entire organization and personnel of the Army. Congress is asked in effect to undo all that it has done in the past with respect to such control and to keep its hands off in the future.

Of course, in practice, the exercise of all this tremendous power would be substantially, if not entirely, controlled by the Chief of Staff. This preposterous scheme, together with many others of like intent in the pending bill, spells one-man dominance, staff despotism, and militarism to a degree never surpassed in the palmy days of the great General Staff of the German Army.

The method adopted by the framers of the bill in order to conceal this scheme and its true inwardness, and thus to secure its adoption by an unsuspecting Congress, was somewhat complicated. The whole of it is not to be found in any one section of the bill or in plain language anywhere. But it is all there, nevertheless, and it can be discovered readily enough by assembling its ingeniously scattered parts.

Now, today, at the end of World War II, we have for consideration before the Senate Armed Services Committee a measure which proposes to do for all the armed forces of this country what the bill of 1919 would have done for the Army alone. I refer to Senate bill 758.

That bill would establish a single department—the National Defense Establishment—bringing all the armed services under the administration and control of a single, all-powerful super Secretary of National Defense. It would set up an embryonic over-all high command—the Joint Staff, suspiciously like its authoritarian prototypes—a permanent militaristic staff corps superimposed over the Army, the Navy, the Air Forces, and the Marine Corps. By its failure to delineate by statute the functions for which the various services are created by Congress, the bill will permit, at the whim of some future President or of some future super Secretary, the complete de-

struction of our traditional types of balanced forces and their reorganization along the lines heretofore adopted by continental powers.

Further, and more important than this drastic reorganization of the armed forces in a pattern which, I repeat, has never yet been victorious in total war, that bill, S. 758, would provide for the eventual domination by a group of professional militarists of all the civilian agencies of Government, of our foreign policies, of our industries, and of our natural and human resources in the event of another war, if not actually in the preparatory stages for such a war.

That bill, too, was drafted by the military advisers of the Secretaries of War and of the Navy. It is couched in language so vague—and perhaps purposely so—that no two witnesses have yet agreed upon its interpretation. It is, in effect, a blank check for the single, super Secretary and for the armed forces to do as they choose to do in the future without restraint by Congress. To paraphrase a passage from the Declaration of Independence, it "erects a multitude of new offices, and sends hither swarms of new officers to harass our people and eat out their substance."

I freely admit the urgency for legislation which will perpetuate many of the joint agencies now in existence which proved so invaluable in prosecuting the war just ended—legislation which will bring about a closer coordination of all of the departments of Government concerned with our national defense.

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

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. I prefer to continue.

Mr. KILGORE. I thought at that point I should like to ask if the Senator has noticed that in the bill concerning which the Senator is speaking, and to which he is opposed, there is no provision for a really centralized purchasing authority which would eliminate the competition between the various armed branches and divisions of the Government which existed during World War II, and has existed in the past, which has tended greatly to increase the cost of war materials?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. I thoroughly agree with the Senator from West Virginia that there is no provision in Senate bill 758 for such a purpose.

Mr. KILGORE. That is the point I wanted to bring out. I thank the Senator.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. But I should like to point out to the Senator that there already exists under the Army and Navy Munitions Boards many joint committees of the Army and Navy for procurement.

Mr. KILGORE. Has the Senator ever investigated the results of their operations?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. I do not know that I can say I have investigated them. We have questioned witnesses on the subject at numerous times, and every witness who is competent to speak has spoken in the highest possible terms of the coordination which has already taken place.

Mr. KILGORE. Is the Senator familiar with the Joint Board on Standardization, which was formed in 1920 for the purpose of standardizing articles and equipment?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. No; I am not.

Mr. KILGORE. Does the Senator realize that since 1920 that joint board, being in session constantly, has succeeded in standardizing only packing boxes for overseas shipment, and that there still remain unstandardized all ammunition, all clothing and shoes, and all weapons above .30-caliber rifles and .45-caliber pistols?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. I was not aware of that fact, but I am very pleased to have the Senator call attention to it.

Mr. KILGORE. The idea of committees does not work as well as the plan of having one man who is responsible.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. I am delighted that the Senator has called the attention of the Senate to that point. I will say that in the bill which I am about to introduce there is provision for a coordinator to do that very thing.

Unlike the proponents of Senate bill 758, I believe that these admirable objectives can be attained without a drastic reorganization of our military departments; without the creation of a bureaucratic monstrosity; without the establishment of a militaristic national high command which will inevitably extend its power beyond its proper sphere—and again I point out that every nation that has adopted this sort of an organization has suffered defeat in war—and, finally, I believe that in consideration of the total aspect of modern warfare, the brunt of which falls so heavily upon the civilian, we should increase rather than decrease the amount of civilian control over our defense structure.

With these considerations in mind, I am herewith introducing for the consideration of the Senate a bill to promote the national security by providing for the coordination of all elements of national security, and for the reorganization of the military structure of the Nation to conform to the requirements of modern warfare. This bill is entitled "The Defense Coordination Act of 1947"; it might appropriately be called "The Anti-Military-Dictatorship Act of 1947." I respectfully request that it be referred to the appropriate committee for study and report to the Senate.

In many respects the bill which I am introducing resembles Senate bill 758 in that it continues those coordinating agencies now in existence which should be retained, such as the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Munitions Board, and the Research and Development Board. In many respects it differs from S. 758, since it makes no provision for a single department of the armed forces, for a single supersecretary, or an over-all high command. Most important of all, it sets forth the governmental agencies concerned with national defense in their proper perspective to each other and maintains the civilian control over the

armed forces so essential to the continued existence of our constitutional form of government.

It is my belief that the provisions of this bill will allay the apprehensions which have been voiced on all sides by spokesmen for the Navy, fearing the loss of naval aviation; for the Ground Forces, fearing the loss of their close support air arm; for the Marine Corps, fearing the loss of its Fleet Marine Forces; and for the Air Force, fearing that it may be submerged under the surface elements of both the Army and the Navy. Further, it is my belief that this bill will best adapt to modern conditions the time-tested principles of organization of our armed forces—principles which have served so successfully to defend this Nation through the 158 years of its existence.

With but one or two exceptions, every single element set forth in this bill has been subjected to the test of war; they carried us through World War II to victory; they have carried us through the days of readjustment since August 14, 1945. While avoiding the pitfalls of Senate bill 758, which can surely lead us along the road to military dictatorship, this bill will provide the agencies which are so necessary for the proper coordination of all the elements of Government concerned with our national defense.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1282) to promote the national security by providing for the coordination of all elements of national security, and for the reorganization of the military structure of the Nation to conform to the requirements of modern warfare, introduced by Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to submit a series of amendments intended to be proposed by me to the bill (S. 758) to promote the national security by providing for a National Defense Establishment, which shall be administered by a Secretary of National Defense, and for a Department of the Army, a Department of the Navy, and a Department of the Air Force within the National Defense Establishment, and for the coordination of the activities of the National Defense Establishment with other departments and agencies of the Government concerned with the national security, and I request that they be referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and be printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments will be received, printed, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services as requested by the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. SMITH obtained the floor.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] has the floor.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to ask one question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to

the Senator from Vermont for the purpose of asking a question?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I wish to ask the Senator from Wyoming what the testimony before the Armed Services Committee has shown in regard to the relative costs of maintaining the armed services under the merger bill which has been under consideration, and under the present system. Does the testimony before the committee show that under the merger bill, upon which hearings have been held, there would be a material saving in the cost of maintaining our armed forces?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. There has been no testimony at all to show any saving whatsoever. Letters have been received from two officers, one of the Army and one of the Navy, responsible for Senate bill 758, setting forth the salaries which would be paid to the chief officers of certain newly created departments. Those salaries would increase the costs by more than \$900,000—practically \$1,000,000—but the letters do not enlarge in any way on the costs of the establishment which would be necessary under that bill.

Mr. AIKEN. Does not the Senator from Wyoming believe that that is a very important question to be considered, and that the Congress should know what the relative costs of maintaining the armed services would be under the system in effect, as compared with the system proposed?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. The Senator is absolutely correct. Not only should the Congress know, but I feel that the committee should know, before it takes any action on the bill.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a comment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] has the floor. Does he yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. SMITH. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota for a comment on the statement made by the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from New Jersey.

I should like to make a very brief statement, because of the fact that the Senator from Wyoming has just introduced a substitute for Senate bill 758, known as the bill for the unification of the armed forces.

This bill has been considered in hearings before the committee for a period of 8 weeks. I believe that we have full information on the bill. Personally, I believe that the bill was a good bill when it was introduced. It represented the best thought of the men who had brought our country through the war. It represented a meeting of minds in the War and Navy Departments, a mutual agreement, and it was sent to us by the President as a mutual agreement of the War and Navy Departments. It is not my intention in any way to say that the Armed Services Committee has come to any conclusion on that bill. I stated in the beginning that it was my belief that it was a good bill. I believe the thought which has been given this bill

in committee will make it possible for the committee to bring to the Senate floor not only a good bill, but an excellent bill, which will afford an opportunity to save a large amount of money and to get a great deal of efficiency not only out of the Army and Navy, but also out of the new branch, the Air Forces Branch, which is to be established by the bill. I believe that when it comes out of committee it will be a bill which a majority of the Senate will support.

It is the intention of the committee to go into executive session next Tuesday to mark up the bill. It was so ordered in a vote yesterday. At that time the substitute offered by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] will be fully considered, as will be all amendments which may be offered by any other Senator. Certainly it is the intention of the Committee on Armed Services not to report a bill which can by any stretch of the imagination be called a bill that would set up a military dictatorship.

Mr. SALTONSTALL and Mr. CAIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. SMITH. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts for a brief comment on the matter which is under discussion.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, as one who has listened for the last 8 weeks to the hearings on the armed forces bill, together with the Senator from Wyoming and the Senator from South Dakota, I believe that the committee will report a bill which can be supported by a great majority of the Members of this honorable body. For one, I certainly shall never support a bill which could be interpreted as justifying the far-fetched conclusions which my colleague from Wyoming suggested would be a possibility under the bill which was drafted in 1919. I am confident that there is not a member of the committee who would advocate or vote to report a bill which might lead to such a military dictatorship as has been suggested.

As the chairman of the committee, the Senator from South Dakota, has said, the committee has just begun its executive consideration of the bill, and I hope, as he does, and as I am confident the Senator from Wyoming hopes, that we shall be able to prepare and report a bill which will solidify the amazing advancements in military security which were developed during the war and make such legal provision concerning them that they may continue to be employed in the days to come for our greater security at home. Many of the improvements are now simply carried out through mutual agreement of men in the different branches of the armed services. What we desire to do is to make possible improvements which need legislation, without in any way setting up a military dictatorship or impairing the integrity of the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, or the Air Forces.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 526) to promote the prog-

ress of science; to advance the natural health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes.

Mr. KILGORE and Mr. MFARLAND addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. SMITH. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia. I understand he wishes to make a brief statement about the pending legislation.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I send to the desk five amendments to the pending bill and ask that they lie on the table and be printed. It is my hope, Mr. President, that the bill will not reach a vote until tomorrow, so that these amendments may be printed and that all Members of the Senate may have an opportunity to read them. The amendments are in line with the bill passed by the Senate at the last session of Congress. They are intended to cure what some of us think are weaknesses in the pending measure. Three of them I offer on my own behalf. One I offer on behalf of myself, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. Another is offered on behalf of myself, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. I express to the Senate the hope that they will be printed before it is necessary to discuss them and before it is necessary to vote on the amendments and the bill.

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

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I should like to say that I regret very much that these amendments have been presented so late. Last February I invited various Senators who I knew were interested in the subject to collaborate in presenting amendments. I recall that the Senator from West Virginia said he had some amendments to offer. I hoped he would offer them in time. I regret that there has to be a further delay to wait for printing of additional amendments, because I think there has been adequate time. I do not want to be an obstructionist. I do not want to do other than show the utmost courtesy to my distinguished colleague from West Virginia, but, for the RECORD, I must express my regret that this bill will be held up by a long debate on seven or eight amendments such as we discussed over a 2- or 3-day period last year, at which time their provisions were clearly set forth in the RECORD. I am convinced that we can pass the bill if we move forward with the discussion without unnecessary delay. I do not object to the amendments being offered. The Senator has the right to offer them, but I regret that we are asked to let the matter go over a whole day, when I thought that after I had finished my discussion on the positive side of the matter the amendments could be discussed.

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

Mr. SMITH. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I offer an amendment and ask that it lie on the table and be printed.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I do not suggest to the Senator from New Jersey that it go over until tomorrow if we can finish the bill. I should like to say for the RECORD that the amendment in which I join with the Senator from West Virginia is not one which should surprise the Senator from New Jersey. It is almost a part of the history of the last two Congresses in respect of the allocation of funds. I am sure all of us on both sides who have been interested in the matter over a period of some years are familiar with it. I do not know what the other amendments are, but I presume that the Senator from West Virginia is offering amendments with the contents of which we are familiar.

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

Mr. SMITH. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. KILGORE. I should like to call to the attention of the Senator from New Jersey the fact that last year an agreement on a bill was reached by all factions. At the last minute amendments were offered, and the debate was prolonged for 4 days. The Senator from New Jersey was one who proposed some amendments at that time. I say, in all fairness, that I knew nothing about the unanimous-consent agreement which was reached yesterday evening. I had been endeavoring to prepare some short amendments which would not disturb the bill too much, and yet would embody the theory which I feel confident must be considered. I apologize to the Senate for doing this, but it is something that could not be helped. That is why I am asking the indulgence of the Senate in the matter, because we had an adequate precedent last year.

Mr. WHITE and Mr. CAIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. SMITH. I yield first to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I want to be sure that I understand the parliamentary situation. I believe amendments have been offered by two Senators, the Senator from West Virginia and the Senator from Washington, and with the submission of the amendments the suggestion has been made that a vote shall not be had on either the amendments or the bill until tomorrow. I had assumed that we would press forward with the bill this afternoon. I wish to make sure whether the Senator from New Jersey has agreed that votes will not be pressed for this afternoon.

Mr. SMITH. I can say to the Senator from Maine that I have not agreed to anything of the sort, but of course I shall not embarrass the Senator from West Virginia. He has offered certain amendments. I understand that other Senators will offer amendments. As the de-

bate proceeds, if it becomes obvious that those Senators will not have a chance to present and discuss their amendments today, I certainly shall not press for a vote today, thus denying them a chance to be heard. I had hoped that we could dispose of this bill today.

Mr. WHITE. Then do I correctly understand that there is no agreement to postpone the vote until tomorrow?

Mr. SMITH. At the moment there is no such agreement; but I have no objection to having the Senator from West Virginia submit his amendments and ask that they be printed. Of course, they cannot be printed until tomorrow.

Mr. WHITE. I simply wondered whether there was an agreement in regard to postponing the vote until tomorrow.

Mr. SMITH. There was no agreement of that sort, and I did not understand that the Senator from West Virginia had requested such an agreement. I understood him to express the hope that it would be possible to have the amendments considered tomorrow. I ask the Senator from West Virginia whether I correctly understood him.

Mr. KILGORE. That is correct. I have submitted my amendments, and it is my hope that they may be printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be printed and lie on the table.

Mr. WHITE. I assume that the amendments which are offered will go to the desk and will lie there, subject to being called up when they are reached in the course of the proper consideration of the bill.

Mr. KILGORE. Yes.

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

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, sometime ago I introduced a bill providing funds for a Cancer Research Institute. The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] also introduced such a bill. I think the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] associated himself with me in connection with the bill I introduced.

After considerable discussion, it was determined by all of those interested in the establishment of such a Cancer Research Institute that it could properly be handled as a part of the proposed National Science Foundation. Therefore, we have prepared an amendment which establishes within the general framework which the Senator from New Jersey is about to describe, a special commission on cancer research, a special commission on heart and intravascular diseases, and such other special commissions as the Foundation may from time to time deem necessary.

Our feeling is that with a special cancer commission directing the research in the Biological Sciences Division and the other divisions, it will be possible to secure the same result, in a co-ordinated form, as could be secured by having a separate commission or institute established.

Therefore, Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Washington [Mr.

MAGNUSON], and myself, I offer this amendment, and ask that it lie on the table and be printed.

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

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, with regard to the statement just made by the Senator from Ohio, I may say that I am more than happy to have that amendment submitted; and as the introducer of the pending measure, I am glad to accept it. It represents the end of a long series of discussions with the distinguished senior Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] and other Senators regarding the important subject of cancer research and heart research; and it is very gratifying to me that we have been able to agree with the American Cancer Research Institute and other organizations to have that provision incorporated in the bill. I shall discuss it later during the presentation of my views on this measure.

Mr. President, on February 7 I had the honor to introduce, on behalf of five of my colleagues and myself, a bill to promote the progress of science, to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare, and to secure the national defense by establishing a National Science Foundation.

That bill was reported from the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare by unanimous vote, I may say. During the time it was before the committee, it acquired the support of the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], who had introduced a bill, known as Senate bill 525, but who now, as a result of revisions on the part of both the Senator from Utah and myself, joins me in sponsoring Senate bill 526.

We are now asking the nonpartisan support of all Senators for this bill. It already has the bipartisan support of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Its wholly nonpolitical nature may be gauged by the fact that it bears the names not only of the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] and myself, but of the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]. During the committee sessions, we had the benefit of the cooperation of the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL], the junior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], and the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL].

I believe this is a bill upon which all Senators can agree, both as to objectives and methods. It results from our wartime experience with the Office of Scientific Research and Development, which

the proposed National Science Foundation would replace—let me emphasize that fact—and from important wartime scientific developments up to and including the discovery of practical methods of employing atomic energy. The bill was drawn up specifically with a view to meeting objections that previous bills in this field were too broad in scope and overly centralized in authority.

It is my hope, Mr. President, and the hope of the other Senators who have joined me in sponsoring this bill, that all branches of science will unite in recognizing the need to support a single bill in this field.

The proposed National Science Foundation is not new to Congress. Similar legislation was introduced in the Seventy-ninth Congress. Over 150 witnesses have been heard by committees in both Houses of Congress, and 149 of them urged the creation of a National Science Foundation. There was only one witness opposed to that proposal. The bill was debated thoroughly in both Chambers of Congress. It passed in the Senate, but died in the House. I refer to the bill of last year.

The Government has long recognized the contributions made by science. Abraham Lincoln, on March 3, 1863, approved an act incorporating the National Academy of Sciences. Mr. President, I wish to read and incorporate in the RECORD at this point sections 2 and 3 of that act:

SEC. 2. And be it further enacted, That the National Academy of Sciences shall consist of not more than 50 ordinary members, and the said corporation hereby constituted shall have power to make its own organization, including its constitution, bylaws, and rules and regulations; to fill all vacancies created by death, resignation, or otherwise; to provide for the election of foreign and domestic members, the division into classes, and all matters needful or usual in such institution, and to report the same to Congress.

SEC. 3. And be it further enacted, That the National Academy of Sciences shall hold an annual meeting at such place in the United States as may be designated, and the Academy shall, whenever called upon by any department of the Government, investigate, examine, experiment, and report upon any subject of science or art, the actual expense of such investigations, examinations, experiments, and reports to be paid from appropriations which may be made for the purpose, but the Academy shall receive no compensation whatever for any services to the Government of the United States.

Mr. President, this society of elders serviced the Government for over 80 years. Their advice and counsel has been a noteworthy contribution to scientific progress.

President Woodrow Wilson, on May 11, 1918, created the National Research Council, by Executive order, to supplement the work of the academy. This was during World War I.

President Roosevelt, in June 1940, created the Office of Scientific Research and Development, headed by Dr. Vannevar Bush, to mobilize science for war. That, of course, was during World War II. It was this organization that gave birth to the atomic energy project in December 1940, and later turned it over to the Army in 1942.

At the request of President Roosevelt, Dr. Bush and 50 of the Nation's other eminent authorities prepared a report on a plan for a program for postwar scientific research. This report, known as Science, the Endless Frontier, was submitted to President Truman in July 1945. I may state that we have placed on the desks of Senators copies of this important pamphlet prepared by Dr. Bush and his colleagues. It has been the handbook on postwar scientific planning. The National Science Foundation bill, which I am reporting today, has been drafted to carry out the purposes of this report.

Mr. President, science must be an essential contributor to the advance of civilization in this postwar era. Radar, guided missiles, supersonic speeds, radioactive isotopes, good and bad germs, and the atomic bomb itself should convince all of us that we live in a scientific age.

Science, industry, and the military combined to give us the atomic bomb. Our scientific skill and industrial know-how are principal causes of our leadership in the world today. But we must also recognize the hand of God in the shaping of our national destiny.

Mr. President, we are the temporary custodians of this leadership. It is a passing advantage unless we provide for its future growth. We cannot continue to enjoy the fruits of past research unless steps are taken now to encourage the growth of scientific manpower and research facility in our national institutions.

The National Science Foundation bill, S. 526, is designed to meet these needs—to promote the progress of sciences; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense, and for other purposes.

Mr. President, I propose now to discuss the bill, and the field we aim to cover by the various provisions in it. Let me first consider the over-all organization of the foundation.

The proposed National Science Foundation is a new venture for government in an untried and uncharted field requiring highly specialized guidance. Recent debates on this floor are sufficient evidence that in highly specialized scientific fields the Government must depend on the part-time services of men of outstanding ability capable of determining the most fruitful fields of research and of developing its supporting talent.

I now quote from the report on the bill, Report No. 78. On page 2 we refer to the matter of the set-up of the foundation, as follows:

S. 526 provides that the foundation established to develop a national policy for basic research as distinguished from applied science—

Let me emphasize that in the bill we are dealing with basic research, and not applied science— should be directed by the collective wisdom of a 24-man part-time board of scientists, educators, and men of public affairs appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The foundation would elect biennially from its own membership an executive committee composed of nine members, who would ex-

ercise the powers and duties of the foundation, and, with the approval of the foundation, appoint a director who, as the chief executive officer, would be responsible to the foundation. (Excerpt from Report No. 78, of S. 526, p. 2.)

I may step aside from my prepared remarks to say that after consultation with the Director of the Budget and the President of the United States himself, an amendment has been prepared, which I shall accept, which provides that the immediate appointment of the Director shall be by the President of the United States, but that the Director shall still remain subject to the control of the foundation.

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

Mr. SMITH. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. What the Senator has just suggested is provided in the amendment I have just submitted in behalf of myself and the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. SMITH. I thank the Senator. I referred to the amendment which the Senator from Washington had submitted, and which as I have said, I am happy to accept, because I think it solves one of the problems with which we have had to deal.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, would it be agreeable to the Senator from Washington to state what is provided by the amendment?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I shall be glad to read it.

Mr. SMITH. I should be very glad, for the RECORD, to have the amendment read, in order to bring out the point I am making, although that will be touched on later. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. My amendment is offered as a substitute for section 6, and reads:

SEC. 6. Director of the Foundation: There shall be a Director of the Foundation who, subject to the supervision and control of the executive committee, shall execute the policies of the Foundation and perform such additional duties as may be prescribed by the Foundation. The Director shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, after receiving the recommendations of the executive committee, and he shall serve at the pleasure of the President. The Director shall receive compensation at the rate of \$15,000 per year.

Mr. HILL. It is for no fixed term?

Mr. MAGNUSON. His service is to be at the pleasure of the President.

Mr. HILL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SMITH. Let me say, at this point, Mr. President, that we have given a very considerable amount of study to the organizational plan for the Foundation. It is essential that we understand from the beginning that the proposed Foundation is not just another Government agency. It has been designed to fit a specific need and to accomplish a definite purpose. We in Congress are asking the eminent men and women of science to chart a program for basic research to insure our future.

I should like, Mr. President, to quote from the testimony of one of these

eminent men of science, Dr. Vannevar Bush, on this point:

The Foundation will be faced with many different but exceedingly complex and highly technical questions. For example, it must annually evaluate the relative importance of scholarships, basic research, international undertakings and publications in the terms of the over-all national welfare. Within its allocation for research, the Foundation must determine the relative importance of the different fields of science. Finally, it must be able to evaluate on the basis of their scientific merits, not only the relative importance of the various specific projects, but also their potential effectiveness. Decision of these questions will require not only extensive and varied scientific knowledge, but also broad and sound concepts of the Nation's best interests. In other words, the decisions must be wisely made from the standpoint of many considerations.

In the long run and in general, the Congress should, as representative of all the citizens, make decisions of policy. It is obvious, however, that the Congress lacks sufficient time to inform itself as to the various considerations involved in making these particular decisions. It must therefore delegate to others the power to make them, retaining its ultimate control through annual reports and appropriations.

That is the way we have framed our bill. The Foundation must come back to the Congress with its annual report and its request for appropriations. That is how the control is preserved in the Congress. Dr. Bush continues:

In my opinion, this delegation should not be to one man but should be to a group of the ablest men and women in the United States, drawn from all parts of the country, who would represent the different fields of science, education, and public affairs.

I cannot overemphasize the importance of securing the services of the ablest possible individuals to guide the Foundation. A board which is only advisory would bear responsibility for the decisions of the administrator, but would not have any real authority to control those decisions. I believe that in order to be sure to secure members of the requisite caliber it is essential to give them authority commensurate with their responsibility. (Excerpt from testimony of Dr. Vannevar Bush before House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, March 7, 1947.)

I may point out that one of the issues involved in the consideration of this matter last year, and one of the issues involved in its consideration this year, is whether there should be one man appointed this year by the President, with an advisory board, or whether the center of gravity for developing the policy of this great Foundation should be in a group of scientific men, the director to be subject to the direction of the board of scientific men.

The atomic age requires the decentralization of every facility. To this end we have proposed a Foundation of 24 members, to be drawn from all areas of the Nation and from all walks of life. The Foundation, therefore, will not be composed entirely of scientists. Section 3a of S. 526 covering this point reads as follows:

SEC. 3. (a) The Foundation shall have 24 members to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The persons nominated for appointment as members (1) shall be men and women who are recognized leaders in the

fields of sciences, engineering, education, or public affairs; (2) shall be selected solely on the basis of established records of distinguished service and without regard to political, social, or religious factors; and (3) shall be so selected as to provide representation of the views of scientific leaders in all areas of the Nation.

Let me emphasize the next sentence I am going to read, because this has been the subject of a great deal of discussion, and it is one of the most important features of the whole bill:

The President is requested, in the making of nominations of persons for appointment as members, to give due consideration to any recommendations for nomination which may be submitted to him by the National Academy of Sciences, Association of Land Grant Colleges and Universities, the National Association of State Universities, or by other scientific or educational organizations.

Mr. President, the question has been raised frequently whether in setting up the Foundation there is danger of overlooking our Land Grant Colleges and our State-supported universities, and concentrating scientific research, in well-known institutions, for example, in the East. It has been the endeavor to provide definitely against that danger by incorporating in the bill a provision requesting the President to accept nominations from the Association of Land Grant Colleges and the National Association of State Universities. It is inconceivable that the President would not appoint representatives of those important educational groups to a Foundation of this size and this significance.

The membership would receive rotating appointments to insure continuity of guidance. It is important, Mr. President, that appointments to the Foundation would represent all areas of the Nation and all branches of scientific knowledge and educational institutions to insure against any concentration of this important field of research.

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

Mr. SMITH. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. While the Senator is speaking of the membership of the Foundation, I note an amendment on page 2, line 7, where it is proposed to strike out the words "medical science." The amendment would strike from the list of those who may be appointed to the Foundation recognized leaders in medical science. I wondered why an amendment was offered which proposed to strike out those words?

Mr. SMITH. I recall that.

Mr. HILL. I ask the question particularly in view of the amendment which the Senator from Ohio has just offered on behalf of himself, the Senator from Washington, and the Senator from Florida, in connection with cancer research.

Mr. SMITH. I think it was felt that the words "leaders in the fields of the sciences, engineering, education, and public affairs" would be adequate; and as the bill proceeds the Senator will see it provides very specifically for a division of the medical sciences as part of the whole program. We felt it was sufficient to reflect that branch of science in the later set-up of the divisions.

Mr. HILL. The thought comes to my mind that the words "medical science" having been in the bill, if those words are now stricken therefrom, it might invite a result different from what the Senator has in mind, certainly a situation different from that which might have resulted if the words "medical science" had never been put into the bill. To say the least, I commend to the careful consideration of the Senator, if I may, particularly the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio, on behalf of himself, the Senator from Washington, and the Senator from Florida, with the suggestion that, before the amendment is acted on by the Senate, the Senator carefully consider whether or not he now wishes to strike out those words.

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

Mr. SMITH. I shall be glad to yield if I may first answer the suggestion of the Senator from Alabama. Even some medical friends of mine raised the question of why, in one sentence, we said "fundamental sciences," and then, in the next sentence, said "medical science," as though medical science was not a fundamental science. They took issue with it, saying we made a sort of technical distinction in sciences. I think it was to please the medical men, rather than for any other purpose, that the specific words were stricken out, relying on general science to cover the matter.

Mr. HILL. I notice the committee amendment would also delete the word "fundamental."

Mr. SMITH. That is true. It was in the interest of bringing all the different groups under the heading of "Sciences."

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

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. My attention was attracted to the same point raised by the Senator from Alabama. In my own mind, I reconcile the amendments to mean that the word "sciences" includes "medical science."

Mr. SMITH. Undoubtedly.

Mr. TYDINGS. And therefore it was not necessary to make an enumeration of the branches and divisions.

Mr. SMITH. That was the reason.

Mr. TYDINGS. While I have the Senator's attention I would like to ask a question along another line. I suppose the safeguards against overlapping research or scientific study could not be written in the bill, but I assume it was the philosophy of the authors of the bill that the directors of the "academy," so to speak, would so allocate the scholarships and other work that overlapping would be reduced to the irreducible minimum. Am I correct about that?

Mr. SMITH. Of course, that is the purpose. There is a provision in the bill aimed to prevent overlapping, by bringing together all the research work of the Government. I shall come to that later. On page 15, line 12, the bill contains section 14 (a), under the heading "Interdepartmental Committee on Science":

There is hereby established an Interdepartmental Committee on Science, to consist of the Director of the Foundation, as chairman, and the heads (or their designees)

of such Government agencies engaged in or concerned with the support of scientific activity to a substantial degree as the President may from time to time determine. The interdepartmental committee shall meet whenever the chairman so determines, but not less than once a month.

Then, paragraph (b) of the same section outlines the field covered by the Interdepartmental Committee. In drafting the bill those provisions were framed to cover the point the Senator has in mind.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not believe I made my position clear. I assume, for example, some of the great universities or medical centers, to use a very apt case, may be engaged, let us say, in cancer research; and I assume the Federal Government will want to foster certain activities along the same line. I would assume the Board of Directors would be so selected and so widely chosen that they would, by management of the functions of the Government's part of the undertaking, so conduct its research as not to duplicate work that is proceeding under more or less private or semi-private auspices.

Mr. SMITH. I think that is the whole purpose and spirit of the bill; and also it is the spirit of the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Ohio a few minutes ago, in collaboration with other Senators, to cover a special cancer commission and a special heart commission.

Mr. TYDINGS. I realize it is difficult to write language into the bill to prevent overlapping of the kind I have described, but I imagine, if the Board of Directors of the enterprise were wisely chosen, they would be sufficiently well informed in various fields to give it more or less such direction as would prevent overlapping.

Mr. SMITH. It is, of course, the purpose of the framers of the bill to prevent that kind of thing.

Mr. TYDINGS. I will not interrupt the Senator again, but so long as I am on my feet I wish to ask a question only for information and not by way of criticism. Has the Senator in mind how much of an initial appropriation could be efficiently used, assuming that the bill passes the Congress and is signed by the President.

Mr. SMITH. I will say to the Senator from Maryland that in my later remarks I shall present an estimate of the amount. Outside the cancer or heart needs, which may call for a separate appropriation, because we have now added them to the bill, we estimate that about \$20,000,000 is needed at the present time to pick up the research that is going on and take care of the immediate prospects. We believe in starting in a small way—not trying to expand all over the place—and feeling our way by what might be called the trial and error method to ascertain the most effective method of advancing the purposes of the bill.

Mr. TYDINGS. I imagine that a considerable proportion of the \$20,000,000 would be spent through scholarships and fellowships in the various State and land-grant colleges and universities, and hospitals, and so forth, looking to the field of medicine to augment work which

is already being undertaken there and to bring it to fruition at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. SMITH. That is the purpose. I think our estimate called for about half the amount the first year to go into scholarships and fellowships and the various items to which the Senator from Maryland has referred.

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

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Answering the inquiry of the Senator from Maryland about co-ordination of research, there is in the budget, as the Senator from New Jersey no doubt has stated in his speech, about \$200,000,000 proposed to be appropriated for the Army for research work by the Army. It is supposed that a great deal of the money which is to be distributed to private institutions for research can be handled through the Foundation. Subsection (b) of section 14 provides that the Interdepartmental Committee on Science shall make such recommendations to the President * * * as in the opinion of the committee will serve in effectuating the objectives of this act and other legislation providing for Federal support of scientific research and scientific development.

If they make a recommendation to the President, for instance, that of the \$200,000,000 or \$250,000,000, \$150,000,000 should be handled through the Foundation, it is presumed that the President will follow their proposal and instruct the Army to proceed in that way. As a matter of fact, I understand the Army is anxious to have that done; so there will be no difficulty about that. But in general the Interdepartmental Committee on Science ought to make such recommendations to the President, who supervises all this research in the last analysis, so that he can effectively direct a co-ordination that will prevent duplication.

Mr. SMITH. I might add that we are not only going to try and cover the overlapping, but also to fill the gaps. The purpose is to bring the whole thing under one umbrella, so to speak, in order that there may be a coordinated advance.

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

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In further answer to the Senator from Maryland, I think what I now wish to say will interest him. Recently I had occasion to go through the School of Public Health at Harvard University, and the same question was asked of an expert in one of the scientific laboratories there, that was asked by the Senator from Maryland this afternoon, and his answer was that where assistance was being given by the Federal Government to different problems of research, particularly in connection with public health, there was no overlapping. The Federal Government was doing an excellent job. Where the colleges themselves were engaged in investigation in scientific work there was no overlapping, because they could not know what each one was doing, but that there was a very close correspondence between them, and particularly was that true where the Federal Government was concerned. I hope that

statement will be of interest to the Senator.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, allow me one more observation.

Mr. SMITH. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. Of course, the whole idea is new to us, but it seems to me that the Director who is hereafter to be appointed, or the Deputy Director provided for in the bill, after having broken down the scientific field into its different categories, would be very well advised if he would contact the colleges, the hospitals, and the universities, and catalog the different research programs being carried on in each. If that were done, it would present a pretty good picture of the research activities of the Nation in the laboratories, schools, and other places where experiments are being undertaken, and then it would be more easy to integrate, to find the gaps and the lapses and the overlapping, than it would be if there were no exact knowledge of such activities. I assume the Director would find out first what the situation was, and where there were lapses in the program, and would attempt to fill them up, and where there were overlappings he might even, without expending governmental money, call to the attention of the Foundation that the research program was a little lopsided and, as a sort of a Federal coordinator without authority to correct, help straighten it out.

Mr. SMITH. I can say to the Senator that I am advised that already some research is being done in that connection, and an attempt is being made to find out what is going on in all the colleges. Of course, the information ought to be gathered by the Foundation, as the Senator suggests.

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

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Of course, the purpose of the bill which was passed last year was to do that very thing. One of the first projects undertaken by the Foundation would be to take a look around the country and see what was going on, particularly in the field of military science, because the Foundation proposed in the bill would take over Dr. Bush's work, which also concerns itself with military science, and that would be one of its first projects.

The Senator from Maryland well points out that at this time the University of Washington may be doing one thing and the University of Maryland may be doing another thing, and the Carnegie Institution still another, and they may not get together unless there is constant communication established between them. But one of the very first things that should be set up is a committee which would take a look-see at these matters. That is what is really needed first. That is one of the basic purposes of the bill.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, the Senator from New Jersey has been very kind in yielding to me. Will he yield again?

Mr. SMITH. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. I wish to observe that this is a very commendable undertaking, and I think it is well for us to spend a little money on the construction side as well as give somewhat overgenerously to purposes for which we are called on from time to time to appropriate.

Mr. SMITH. I thank the Senator for his comment.

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

Mr. SMITH. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. The Senator has referred to scholarships.

Mr. SMITH. I hope to cover that point when I reach it in order.

Mr. HILL. I do not want to upset the logic or the pattern of the Senator's speech. He is going to take up that subject, is he?

Mr. SMITH. Yes. That is one of the most important things in the bill.

Mr. HILL. Is the Senator also going to discuss the Interdepartmental Committee on Science?

Mr. SMITH. Yes; that will be covered also.

Mr. HILL. I shall withhold any questions at this time. It may be that the Senator will anticipate my questions and answer them in his speech.

Mr. SMITH. I think I shall cover all the points before I finish my remarks, because I have tried to cover the whole bill. I was discussing the set-up of the Foundation and the scope of its operations. I desire to call attention to another provision of the bill, section 15 (h), which we incorporated after discussion with the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], who has been engaged in educational work for a long time and knows the field thoroughly, and who felt we ought not to leave a stone unturned to discover scientific talent wherever it might be. So we elaborated on this section to bring in certain points which I want to emphasize by reading section 15 (h):

In making contracts or other arrangements for scientific research—

And by the way I should stop there for a moment to say that the Foundation itself is not going to engage in any scientific research. The Government is not going to operate any plants of its own. Contracts will be made with different institutions for carrying out the projects in connection with which it seems wise to pursue the research.

I return to section 15 (h):

SEC. 15. (h) In making contracts or other arrangements for scientific research, the Foundation shall utilize appropriations available therefor in such manner as will in its discretion best realize the objectives of (1) having the work performed by organizations, agencies, and institutions, or individuals, including Government agencies, qualified by training and experience to achieve the results desired, (2) strengthening the research staff of organizations, particularly nonprofit organizations, in the States and Territories and the District of Columbia, (3) aiding institutions, agencies, or organizations which if aided will advance further research, and (4) encourage the growth of independent research by individuals.

The Foundation will be able to take a bird's-eye view of the entire country

and determine the places where it is worth while for the Government, by subsidy or financial aid, to help in research projects. We want to make the coverage as broad as possible, to include individuals who show promise in the field of research. Later I shall come to the question of scholarships and fellowships.

The Foundation made up of 24 members is consistent with the broad national coverage desired and is aimed to provide adequate assurance for the distribution of research funds to all types of institutions.

Before we are through discussing some of the amendments, probably there will be suggestions made that we reduce the size of the Foundation; but I wish to say for the Record that we gave most careful thought to the size of the Foundation. We wanted to have the entire country represented. We wanted all sorts of educational institutions and other institutions represented so that no stone would be left unturned in discovering the sources of scientific advance.

It has been suggested that the Foundation be reduced to a small board, or to a single director. Those of us who drafted the legislation fundamentally disagree with that thought. We believe that the broad matters of policy should be taken care of by a Foundation of 24. We started with 60, reduced the number to 50, then 48, and finally to 24, as a workable figure, in line with executive appointments by the President on a board. The membership of the board would not be the same year in and year out, but would change every 2 years as the President made appointments.

The Foundation members meeting several times a year would decide policy and the most fruitful avenues of research and bring to the Foundation fresh points of views from their respective fields of endeavor.

Let me stress the nature of the Foundation's activities and the scope of its authorization. We are speaking now of fundamental or basic research. This is the field in which this Nation is deficient. No one has ever suggested that the United States is deficient in applied research. Given the basic ideas we have always been able to turn them into practical uses. But the storehouse of basic knowledge needs to be replenished; much of it has been destroyed in Europe.

A couple of months ago, in company with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], I had a most interesting meeting with 25 of the leading research men of important industries in this area of the country. They pointed out that their speciality was applied research. They said, "We do not need any help in applied research. We can take care of applied research, which is the practical end of scientific research. We need research in basic science." They said that we would have the wholehearted support of industry. Industry can take care of its own applied research, but we have the wholehearted support of industry in finding budding scientists who discover the ideas behind all the great advances in science. That is the important feature of the bill, and I cannot emphasize it too strongly or too often.

The powers and duties set forth in S. 526 are as follows:

1. To develop and to encourage the pursuit of a national policy for scientific research and scientific education;
2. To initiate and support basic scientific research in the mathematical, physical, medical, biological, engineering, and other sciences, by making contracts or other arrangements (including grants, loans, and other forms of assistance) for the conduct of such basic scientific research;
3. To initiate and support scientific research in connection with matters relating to the national defense by making contracts or other arrangements (including grants, loans, and other forms of assistance) for the conduct of such scientific research;
4. To grant scholarships and graduate fellowships in the mathematical, physical, medical, biological, engineering, and other sciences;
5. To foster the interchange of scientific information among scientists in the United States and foreign countries; and
6. To correlate the Foundation's scientific research program with those undertaken by individuals and by public and private research groups. (Excerpts from S. 526, pp. 3-4.)

At that point we proposed to add a seventh paragraph, incorporating the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] and their colleagues who are interested in the campaign for research in cancer and heart disease.

The Foundation would look to a nine-man part-time executive committee elected biennially from its own membership to exercise the powers and duties of the Foundation. In actual practice they would probably meet once a month, but they would be on constant call. So we are not denying the concentration of authority in a smaller board. However, we feel that the broad Foundation is the proper way to organize the activity.

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

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Apropos of the establishment of the executive committee of nine members to which the Senator has just adverted, I was a little disturbed about the mandatory language applying to the executive committee, lest it might be construed as meaning that the Foundation could not act directly, but that the whole executive power of the Foundation would be vested in the executive committee. Is that the intention of the able Senator?

Mr. SMITH. It was certainly not the intention. The thought was that part-time experts from all over the United States, meeting probably once or twice a year, should determine general matters of policy. I think the Senator from Florida would agree with me that a smaller body would be required for the function of carrying out the policies decided upon. But it is certainly not the intention to do what the Senator suggests.

Mr. PEPPER. On page 5, beginning in line 3, the language is as follows:

The Foundation shall elect biennially from its own membership an executive committee composed of nine members, which shall exercise the powers and duties of the Foundation.

I was wondering if it would not be better, if the Senator intends that they may exercise the powers and duties of the Foundation, to use the word "may" rather than "shall," so as to avoid any appearance that the Foundation must act through the executive committee, and be denied the power of acting directly.

Mr. SMITH. I think the Senator makes a good suggestion. It is not the intention to take any powers from the Foundation. I am not sure whether we should say "may exercise the powers and duties of the Foundation" or "shall, under the direction of the Foundation," or "under authorization of the Foundation, exercise the powers and duties of the Foundation."

Mr. PEPPER. We might say "may be authorized by the Foundation to exercise its powers and duties," or something to that effect.

Mr. SMITH. Would the Senator like to make a specific suggestion? I suggest that the Senator prepare appropriate language which would be adequate. We cannot do it in the middle of a speech. I shall be glad to accept his amendment. I think the point is very well taken.

Mr. PEPPER. I think it is a simple matter. Why should we not say "which shall, when authorized, exercise the powers and duties of the Foundation"?

Mr. SMITH. We could say "when authorized by the Foundation."

Mr. PEPPER. We might say "which shall, when authorized by the Foundation, exercise the powers and duties of the Foundation."

Mr. SMITH. I shall be glad to accept that amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator offer the amendment for immediate consideration?

Mr. PEPPER. I offer the amendment for consideration.

Mr. SMITH. I am glad to accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The attention of the Chair has been called to the fact that the committee amendments have not yet been considered, and that therefore the amendment would be out of order.

Mr. PEPPER. It is a minor matter. Would it be within the proprieties to ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment can be considered by unanimous consent. Is there objection?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I shall not object, because I think it is a good suggestion, particularly when I read the language in lines 19, 20, and 21, on page 4:

The members of the Foundation shall meet at the call of the Chairman but not less frequently than once each year.

The thought in the bill seems to be that the Foundation group of 24 shall not meet very often—perhaps not more than once a year. If that be the case, it seems to me that the Senator's amendment is proper. There must be some committee, such as the bill contemplates, to carry out the policies of the Foundation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the amendment offered by the Senator

from Florida? The Chair hears none. Will the Senator from Florida please state the amendment in full?

Mr. PEPPER. The suggested amendment is on page 5, line 5, after the word "shall", to insert the words "when authorized by the Foundation."

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

Mr. SMITH. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I would raise this question to the Senator from Florida. If we change the word "shall" to "may", it may raise questions with the Budget Director and with the financial authorities of the Government. Assume they have to make quickly a decision to go into a side line of scientific investigation, and the Foundation has authorized them to take the main line and not the side line, and the Foundation can be gotten together only once a year. It might raise a question of appropriation. It seems to me that these responsibilities are protected by the fact that they must render a report once a year, and the Foundation can be called together more than once a year if it is absolutely necessary to do so. I would be inclined to the word "shall" rather than the word "may."

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I will say to the able Senator from Massachusetts that the only trouble about it is that, taking the language literally, it would imply that the Foundation cannot act except through the executive committee. I am sure we do not mean to deny the principal power to act except by the authority of the agent. That is the reason I raise the point, either changing the word "shall" to "may" or adding such words as I have suggested, "when authorized by the Foundation."

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

Mr. SMITH. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. WHITE. I merely wanted to inquire whether it would not be better to dispose of the committee amendments before amendments from the floor are considered and acted upon.

Mr. SMITH. I will say in answer to the Senator from Maine that that point was raised a minute ago, and I thought it was a minor amendment which might be taken care of by unanimous consent. That was the only point in doing it now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida insist upon the consideration of his amendment at this time?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I defer in order to hear a statement of the Senator from Washington.

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

Mr. SMITH. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I simply want to suggest to the Senator from Florida that the Foundation itself could delegate any authority it wished to delegate to the executive committee to be exercised in the absence of the Foundation.

Mr. SMITH. That would be my construction of it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I think it appears that the suggestion of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] may not be well founded. The Foundation could delegate its authority.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should assume so, if there were a broad authorization. That is what the Senator from Florida implied.

Mr. PEPPER. That is correct.

Mr. President, I shall merely say that this is rather a small amendment, and I thought it might be taken care of by unanimous consent on this exact point.

I ask for the immediate consideration of the amendment, if there is no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would inquire of the Senator from Florida whether or not the insertion which he suggests will follow the word "shall"?

Mr. PEPPER. In response to the Chair's inquiry, it would follow the word "shall." The words inserted would be "when authorized by the Foundation."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair assumes a comma would likewise be inserted?

Mr. PEPPER. It would be posterior to the comma in line 5 and anterior to the comma in line 6.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida?

There being no objection, the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I shall continue.

I have said the Foundation would look to a nine-man part-time executive committee elected biennially from its own membership to exercise the powers and duties of the Foundation. In actual practice they would probably meet once a month.

Decisions of scientific research procedure and policy are not daily problems similar to the conduct of a Government department.

I think that is all the more reason why the point raised by the Senator from Florida relative to the delegation of authority to a smaller committee to meet when the Foundation is not in session is relevant.

It is our feeling, Mr. President, that the Foundation should start in a modest manner, taking over the remnants of the Office of Scientific Research and Development—approximately 50 people—and proceed from there to explore the basic research needs in the respective fields, within their jurisdiction. In this work they would have the benefit of the studies now being made by the President's Research Board who are surveying the research program of the Nation and plan to submit their report before they dissolve on June 30, 1947.

I regret that the Senator from Maryland has left the Chamber, because I think that answers the point which he raised, that one of the first duties of this new Foundation would be to make a complete survey of what is being done in all the educational institutions of the country.

We are not unmindful, Mr. President, of the executive and congressional prerogatives to review the conduct of agencies under their jurisdiction. The Foundation is required to render annual reports to the President and to the Congress. Its budgetary requirements will be under congressional control and subject to review by the Bureau of the Budget.

In order to provide for the day-to-day problems confronting the Foundation, the bill provides for a chief executive officer known as the Director.

The original provision for the employment of a director I shall now read, and I call the attention of the Senate to the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] with regard to the appointment of the Director. The way in which the provision originally read was as follows:

The powers and duties of the Director shall be prescribed by the executive committee and shall be exercised and performed by him under the supervision of such committee. The Director shall be appointed by the executive committee, with the approval of a majority of the members of the Foundation. The Director shall receive compensation at the rate of \$15,000 per annum.

The amendment simply provides that the Director shall be appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate; but outside of that, he is still subject to the control of the Foundation and the executive committee.

Mr. President, I have spoken at length on the type of agency we are considering and its organization structure because our hope of success lies in creating a foundation directed by the greatest minds we can urge to serve and giving to them our complete confidence, free from any political pressure.

We have achieved, by considerable concessions at all points to present a bill free from the political bias and enjoying bipartisan support. It is my hope, Mr. President, that as my colleagues proceed with the discussion of the various features of the bill the Senate will appreciate our efforts to keep politics out of the National Science Foundation by placing the appointment of the Foundation members in the hands of the President subject to confirmation by the Senate. It is our hope that the appointments to this Foundation will not be embroiled in bitter debate, and it is for that purpose that power has been placed in a broad board, representative of all areas of the Nation. Since the Foundation will not operate research facilities itself, but will contract with existing institutions, the broad membership of the Foundation accomplishes still another purpose in that it insures representation on the board of all types of educational and research facilities.

That is where the work is to be carried on.

Mr. President, let me now consider another matter which has been the subject of a great deal of debate with regard to the handling of the allocation of the research fund.

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

Mr. SMITH. I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. GEORGE. Will the Senator permit me to ask a question?

Mr. SMITH. Certainly.

Mr. GEORGE. The Senator is emphasizing the fact that the duties imposed by the Foundation are not to be carried on by the Foundation itself, but established institutions, universities, and so forth, which may be selected to do the work. May I ask the Senator if the Foundation itself under this bill could undertake to do such work directly?

Mr. SMITH. I can answer the Senator in the negative. It is not proposed that the Foundation shall carry on any research on its own account at all.

Mr. GEORGE. But would it have the power to do so if it should elect to do so?

Mr. SMITH. No; it would not have the power to do so. I think there is a provision in the bill itself—I shall have to look it up—which distinctly negatives the carrying on of research work by the Foundation itself, even in pilot plants.

Mr. GEORGE. I am interested in the statement the distinguished Senator has made, because I think that it would be very bad policy for the Foundation itself to undertake such work.

Mr. SMITH. I call the distinguished Senator's attention to page 17, line 5, under the heading "General provisions," paragraph (c):

The Foundation shall not, itself, operate any laboratories or pilot plants.

Mr. GEORGE. In other words, it is to have no physical properties or facilities, and it is to do all its work by contract. Is that correct?

Mr. SMITH. Yes; it is to do all of its work by contract.

Mr. GEORGE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SMITH. Of course, there are governmental departments which carry on research, but that is a different matter. This Foundation will not carry on research on its own account.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes; I understand.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, in further reference to the matter of the allocation of funds or grants, I shall quote from page 2 of the committee report on the bill, under the heading "The allocation of grants." Let me state that we had under consideration two different positions. One was based on the theory that these funds should be distributed on the basis of population, on the expectation that if the funds were allocated on that basis, the desired results would be obtained. The other view was the contrary policy, which the sponsors of the bill adopted, inasmuch as the purpose of the bill is to support and give aid to research projects, wherever they may be best organized.

I now quote from page 2 of the committee's report on the bill:

The allocation of grants: S. 525 (the alternate bill) provided for the allocation of grants-in-aid to research on a Nation-wide basis, allocating a percentage of the total amount appropriated for this purpose to each one of the States on the basis of population. After full discussion the committee felt that this would not be a proper basis for the allocation of grants inasmuch as such allocation would seem to be inconsistent with the

primary purpose of the bill. The bill is not aimed to subsidize educational and research institutions throughout the country, but rather to support specific fields. The committee felt, therefore, that a competent board, such as the Foundation will be, should place research contracts wherever facilities and manpower offered the greatest hope of success.

Under this theory S. 526, as amended, instructs the Foundation to utilize appropriations for—

I have read this before, but I repeat it now:

1. Research by organizations, agencies, and institutions qualified to handle the selected project;

2. Strengthen the research staffs of organizations, and particularly nonprofit organizations;

3. Aid institutions, agencies, or organizations which, if aided, will advance further research; and

4. Encourage the growth of independent research by individuals.

The committee considered that adequate representation of the various scientific groups throughout the country on the Foundation was a more satisfactory method of assuring the proper allocation of grants, and consequently amended S. 526 to include nominations for the Foundation from the National Academy of Sciences, the Association of Land Grant Colleges and Universities, the National Association of State Universities, and other scientific or educational organizations. (See sec. 3 (a); excerpt from Rept. No. 78 of S. 526.)

Mr. President, let me say that this question has been debated more fully than any other subject. I mention it now because I am aware that amendments will be offered providing for the other procedure; namely, to have the funds distributed on the basis of population. I can only say that I am firmly convinced, from my study of this subject, my experience in educational work, and as a result of my conversations with scientific men, that to allocate the grants or funds on the basis of population would be an incorrect approach. I am aware that there is a difference of opinion on this issue, but I submit that the committee's conclusions are sound and should receive the support of the Senate.

Mr. President, a feature of the program is the provision for divisional distribution of responsibility. In order to more effectively concentrate scientific knowledge in its various fields, five divisions have been established within the Foundation:

1. A Division of Medical Research, which shall administer programs of the Foundation relating to research in the medical sciences.

Here, again, I refer to the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and other Senators who collaborated with the Senator from Ohio in regard to an amendment providing for setting up in the Foundation, under a special heading, a Commission for the purpose of carrying on research into cancer and heart diseases.

2. A Division of Mathematical, Physical, and Engineering Sciences, which shall administer programs of the Foundation relating to research in the mathematical, physical, and engineering sciences.

3. A Division of Biological Sciences which shall administer programs of the Foundation relating to research in the biological sciences.

4. A Division of National Defense, which shall administer programs of the Foundation relating to research on military and naval matters.

5. A Division of Scientific Personnel and Education, which shall administer programs of the Foundation relating to the granting of scholarships and graduate fellowships in the mathematical, physical, medical, biological, engineering, and other sciences. (Excerpt from S. 526, pp. 6-7.)

These divisions are to be surrounded by divisional committees appointed by the Foundation. Members of the divisional committees will serve part time or whenever committee meetings are called, and will be experts in their respective fields. In this manner the Foundation can start modestly, without excessive overhead. The divisional committee members will be the real working-level scientists, and it is at this level that their counterparts in Government research agencies will sit with them in planning the method of attack on specific research problems to be recommended to the Foundation.

The Division of National Defense has been designed to meet the needs of the War and Navy Departments, who recommended the specific language of the bill covering the Division of National Defense.

Recognizing that today we cannot foresee the future, provision has been made that the Foundation may create such other divisions as it may from time to time deem necessary, thus providing long-term flexibility to the Foundation's divisional structure.

It is appropriate, Mr. President, I feel, at this point to indicate the attitudes of our Military and Naval Establishments toward this legislation, for I have frequently been asked whether the military and naval authorities approve of this National Science Foundation set-up.

Secretary of War Patterson, in his testimony before the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee hearings, said:

I sincerely believe that the National Science Foundation would be the focal point for replenishing this reservoir of knowledge and skills, and for the requisite collection and dissemination of scientific information.

The War Department believes that a National Science Foundation is vitally needed—the sooner the better. It needs an official agency of science with which to maintain its scientific contacts.

The need for this contact has been made more evident by the passing of the Office of Scientific Research and Development and the National Defense Research Committee, which supplied these contacts during the war.

The performance of this task by joint activity by science and the military is not the only reason why the War Department wants the National Science Foundation. There should be a clearing house for Federal research contracts, in order that the War Department, which is just one of many Federal agencies with a research and development program, may know whether work is already being undertaken elsewhere in a field which it desires to explore. It needs to know the best place to go for its pure research work, as well as the best-qualified people to do the job it has in mind.

And, finally, there has to be some sort of mobilization plan for science, not only in the event of an emergency, but to carry on the necessary research work in peacetime. The War Department is not the agency to prepare such a plan; yet, in the absence of such agencies, it has felt compelled to go ahead with planning in this field in cooperation with the National Research Council and other civilian agencies that are concerned with the plans for scientific manpower. A National Science Foundation could do all of these things with propriety.

The War Department does not desire to comment on any details of the provisions of the bills before Congress, but I cannot help but express my opinion that these bills should not in any way interfere with the existing patent laws. If there is to be legislation on the patent question, it should be entirely apart from the establishment of a National Science Foundation.

I wish also to repeat my hearty support for the establishment of a National Science Foundation to obtain the objectives outlined in the measures pending before your committee.

Secretary of the Navy Forrestal made the following statement in the same hearings:

The Navy expects to support legislation providing for the establishment of a National Science Foundation.

Only a national foundation, such as is envisaged by the bills before your committee, will be able to bring together the necessary personnel, command the necessary resources, and possess the necessary knowledge, to do this job as it must be done.

In addition, the Navy is playing an active part in the Joint Research and Development Board which, under its civilian chairman, Dr. Vannevar Bush, provides the machinery for formulating a long-range research program for both the Army and Navy, serves to coordinate the research activities of the two services, and furnishes an over-all evaluation of the military and naval research programs.

Mr. President, with the reading of those quotations I have finished the references to the War and Navy Departments which I wanted to put into the RECORD, as I said before, because I have been asked many times whether or not the War and Navy Departments were in favor of the bill. I have talked this matter over with both Secretary Patterson and Secretary Forrestal in some detail, and they are eager to have us pass the pending measure, because it will tend to coordinate all the scientific activities, both for war purposes and peace purposes.

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

Mr. SMITH. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I might also point out that the basic principles of the bill, and of most of its provisions, are somewhat consistent with their position a year ago, when they also highly endorsed the bill.

The Senator will recall that we had before us some 150 witnesses from all walks of life—and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], whom I see present, participated in the hearing—captains of industry, representatives of labor, Nobel Prize winners, and others, and of all the 150 only 1 objected, and he only to some provisions of the bill.

Mr. SMITH. I thank the Senator for his comments.

I now wish to discuss another subject which has been a debatable one in the field covered by the bill, namely, whether we should include in the National Science Foundation a division of social sciences. I wish to address myself to that point in a moment.

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

Mr. SMITH. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. I dislike to interrupt the Senator from New Jersey, but due to a previous engagement it is necessary that I absent myself from the sessions of the Senate tomorrow, and I ask unanimous consent that I may do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, leave is granted.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I hope that before he leaves, the Senator from New Mexico will express his approval of the very worthy bill we are considering, so that he may be on record.

Mr. SMITH. That is a fine suggestion from the Senator from Washington. I trust we may hear from the Senator from New Mexico on that subject.

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

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I am very happy to express my complete and enthusiastic support of the pending measure. If it shall come to a vote tomorrow, I shall regret not having the privilege of voting for it. I want these remarks to stand in the RECORD to show that if I were present I would vote for the bill.

Mr. SMITH. I thank the Senator from New Mexico. It will be very helpful to have the country know that the Senator from New Mexico favors the measure.

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

Mr. SMITH. I yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McFARLAND. Does the Senator intend to discuss the provision for compensation of the members of the Foundation?

Mr. SMITH. I do not have that in my prepared discussion, but we can discuss it very readily.

Mr. McFARLAND. I wanted to ask the Senator a question in regard to subdivision (d), on page 17, which provides compensation at the rate of \$50 a day for members of the Foundation, for members of each divisional committee, and of each advisory committee, appointed by the Foundation. I think that is proper compensation, providing it is to be for a limited time or limited in aggregate amount. I was wondering whether there should not be a limitation. It might well be that some of these persons would draw \$50 a day for most of the year.

Mr. SMITH. Of course that was not the intention. This is the way it reads:

The members of the Foundation, and the members of each divisional committee and of each advisory committee appointed by the Foundation, shall receive compensation at the rate of \$50 for each day engaged in the business of the Foundation, and shall be allowed actual and necessary traveling and subsistence expenses (including, in lieu of subsistence, per diem allowances at a rate

not in excess of \$10) when engaged, away from home, in the duties of their offices.

It is difficult to say for how long a time a man would be engaged. We felt that we would have to offer men of this caliber adequate compensation for services they would be rendering, and it would probably be rendered for a very short time, because they would be in a more or less advisory capacity.

Mr. McFARLAND. I realize that it is not the intention to provide for a long engagement, but if it should happen to continue for a long time, then the Foundation would find itself in the position of having to pay a very substantial sum for the services of members of the Foundation and members of the different committees.

In subdivision (e) it is provided:

Persons holding other offices in the executive branch of the Federal Government may serve as members of the divisional committees or of any advisory committee appointed by the Foundation, but they shall not receive remuneration for their services as such members during any period for which they receive compensation for their services in such other offices.

Was it the intent of the sponsors that they would take leave of absence, and then go on the Government roll at \$50 a day and \$10 per diem in event they were called in for advisory purposes?

Mr. SMITH. No. It says "they shall not receive remuneration for their services as such members during any period for which they receive compensation for their service in such other offices." A man receiving a salary from the Government and called in would not be paid compensation.

Mr. McFARLAND. All they would have to do in order to get this pay would be to go off the pay roll in their regular capacity for the length of time they were called into the Government service?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Unless they were very valuable scientific people, the Foundation would not ask them to go off the pay roll. No one will get more than he deserves. As a matter of fact, most of the members of the Foundation and of the advisory committee will probably be losing money by coming here to render for the people of the country the service contemplated by the bill.

Mr. SMITH. I am glad of the comment of the Senator from Washington. In drafting the bill we did not see how we could set a limit, because this employment applies to men who are called away from their headquarters, where they may be at special work for the Government, and we did not think they would be men of the caliber who would try to put anything over on the Government.

Mr. McFARLAND. That undoubtedly is true of the great majority, and I take it that would be true, but as to some of them their services might well be required for a good portion of time. Generally, as a matter of sound fiscal policy, some limitation is fixed in legislation of this character or some limit of time fixed as to the period for which a man might draw \$50 a day.

Mr. MAGNUSON. There might conceivably be a very eminent scientist, or

the president of a great educational institution, whom the Foundation might want to keep around for a long time at \$50 a day. He might well be worth that. I know the Senator from Arizona will agree with me that if anyone does not justify such payment, the Committee on Appropriations will take care of the matter very quickly when the Foundation comes before it for money.

Mr. McFARLAND. I might say that there have been examples of considerable sums of money paid out to certain employees of the departments in situations similar to this and the Committee on Appropriations has not been able to do anything about it. The time to correct such a situation is when we write legislation.

Mr. SMITH. I appreciate the comment by the Senator.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I want to add that it is very difficult, as the Senator from New Jersey knows. It might be stated that no such member of the advisory committee shall draw more than \$5,000 or \$6,000 per annum, yet if he drew the whole of it for 365 days a year, he would probably be well worth it by reason of his contribution to the scientific knowledge of the country. He would be the kind of man needed. By the same token, it might be limited to a certain amount, and if the Foundation or the advisory committee needed an eminent American to serve longer than the basic period, he might do so at a personal sacrifice to himself.

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

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I had no such limitation in mind as \$5,000, but I would say that perhaps there should be a limitation of \$12,000 or \$15,000. There should be some limitation.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Suppose a man devoted 365 days to this work.

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

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. I should like to help clarify the record a little. I heartily agree with the Senator from Washington as to the ability of scientific personnel, but I do not want the misapprehension to creep into the record that deans of scientific colleges are highly paid men. Most of them are distinctly underpaid. The reason they are holding their jobs is that they are more interested in their work than they are in the remuneration. I take my hat off to them. They are splendid gentlemen. But please let us not entertain the idea that the heads of colleges are fabulously paid men. As a matter of fact, I think the Senator from New Jersey will admit that, considering their qualifications, college teachers are about the lowest-paid group among the income earners.

Mr. SMITH. I agree with everything the Senator from West Virginia has said. There is no question that the men we are calling on for this work are, in the proportion to the value of their services to the country, being paid the least of any group. I think I am correct in saying that.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I know the Senator from New Jersey has been underpaid, himself, on several occasions.

Mr. SMITH. I am not now speaking personally.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am not very good at figures, but I have been informed by the assistant to the able Senator from West Virginia that, if a man were kept on the job for 365 days, his compensation would amount to \$18,250, which would be all that he would receive under the amendment.

Mr. SMITH. The maximum amount a man would get if he served every day in the year would be about \$18,250. If anybody should begrudge that, for the kind of work he would give, I should feel very sorry for such a person. I do not think the provision possibly could be abused.

Now, Mr. President, if I may continue the discussion of divisional distribution, we had before us the question of whether or not the social sciences should be included. On this point, I want to quote again from the committee report, because this is a matter that has been brought up and discussed at great length, and I have had the privilege of discussing it both with people who are for the inclusion and those who are against the inclusion; and I have discussed it with the group here in Washington who represent the social sciences. I quote from the committee report:

Your committee has rejected the proposal that the social sciences be included as a division of the Foundation at this time. It is cognizant of the impact of fundamental science on modern society and of the need for social-science studies. It feels, however, that the disciplines of the social sciences are not at this time sufficiently well defined to include them in a foundation designed to treat with the basic sciences. Rather, it is the opinion of the committee that the broad, collective wisdom of the Board must be relied upon to determine the time and to what extent changes shall be made in the divisional status of the Foundation; section 7 (2) provides "and such other divisions as the Foundation may from time to time, deem necessary."

That is the section which provides for the divisions, and we say:

Time may change the relative importance of the divisions. The foregoing clause permits the necessary flexibility and leaves to the wisdom of the Board the extent to which the social-sciences disciplines are to be explored. It may thus be said that S. 526, as amended, denies mandatory provision for the social sciences, but establishes the right of the Foundation to explore the needs of the social sciences and to determine the extent, if any, that studies in this field are necessary to support work in the other divisions.

In other words, our whole emphasis is on the natural sciences, but we have left the door open for this Foundation to say if there is some area of the social sciences that should be explored, in considering the whole project that the program represents. I feel, Mr. President, that that is the correct answer to the question. Frankly, with respect to the social sciences—and I am a social science man myself; I was engaged in the social-science field, and no one values it more highly than I do—in my judgment this particular bill, which contemplates re-

search in basic sciences and medical science, should not undertake to cover the vast field which is embraced in the term "social sciences."

During the debates in the Seventy-ninth Congress there was wide difference of opinion as to how best to deal with the patent issue. I am pleased to report, Mr. President, that patents were not considered to be controversial in this revised legislation by the committee. This is largely because it is now clearly recognized that the Foundation will deal with basic research primarily and will give only a minimum of attention to applied research.

It was the unanimous opinion of the committee, and the President of the United States concurs in this view, because I discussed it with him personally, that the Foundation should abide by the existing patent practices of the Government until such time as Congress revises them.

Basic or fundamental research seldom develops patentable processes. Where this does occur, and in each contract relating to scientific research the Foundation is required to make provision before the contract is signed governing the disposition of inventions produced in the course of this research in a manner calculated to protect the public interest and the equities of the contractor.

We all recognize that in the field of applied science the patent laws are important, but we are trying in this bill to stay away from applied science and limit the work of the Foundation and the subsidies provided to basic scientific research. In that area, we do not feel special patent provisions are necessary. But we have an escape clause under which when a contract is made the relative interests of the Government and the individual are taken care of.

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

Mr. SMITH. I am glad to yield.

Mr. KILGORE. The question arising in my mind is, Does the bill, in the opinion of the Senator, eliminate applied research?

Mr. SMITH. The bill did not eliminate applied research entirely, as obviously it could not. There are borderline cases. But we did eliminate the words "applied research" and "research development" where they appeared in earlier drafts of the bill and of course military and naval research, which the bill provides for, includes applied research.

Mr. KILGORE. May I inquire of the Senator if it is not also true that the field of medical and health research offers a wide field for applied research? I call to the attention of the Senator, for instance, the cancer research that is being conducted, in which there may be tremendous advances, possibly the discovery of important inventions which may be patentable, as for instance, the process by which penicillin is now made, the patent on which gives a complete world-wide monopoly to one company. Is there not a possibility that that may likewise occur in the field of applied research? Is there not the danger that has been experienced in the past, of the

patenting of the results of military research, to such an extent that inventions, intended for the defense of this country, find their way abroad almost before our own pilot models can be developed? That is one thing about which I am worried in connection with a bill of this kind.

Mr. SMITH. Answering the distinguished Senator, my feeling is that the Foundation has to be on the lookout for those things, of course, in making its contracts and developing its whole program; but I do not feel that a bill which provides for basic research in fundamental science is the place to write patent laws. If the patent situation has not been regularly covered in our patent laws, that is the place to tackle that question, and not under this bill. I feel very strongly on that subject. So far as the other proponents of the bill and myself are concerned, we feel that the way we have dealt with it is the right way. I respect the views of the distinguished Senator from West Virginia, but I respectfully differ with him when he thinks we should write into this bill fundamental patent laws. They should go in the patent laws of the country, and not in a fundamental scientific research bill. That is the feeling of the committee, which I submit to the Senate for consideration.

Let us consider the relationship to other governmental agencies engaged in research. I touched on this before, but I shall follow my text, to have the story complete. A very considerable amount of research, mostly in the applied field, is now being conducted by various Government agencies. It is true that we have applied science in our Government agencies.

An Interdepartmental Committee on Science is to be established within the Foundation, consisting of the Director as chairman, and representatives of interested Government agencies. This committee will survey scientific research and development activities within their agencies and make recommendations to the President concerning these activities.

The bill itself spells out the relationship of the Foundation to existing Government agencies in section 15 (1), which reads as follows:

(1) The activities of the Foundation shall be construed as supplementing, and not superseding, curtailing, or limiting any of the functions or activities of other Government agencies (except the Office of Scientific Research and Development) authorized to engage in scientific research or scientific development.

We want to make it perfectly clear that we are not setting aside any work which is now being conducted. Our work is to be supplemental to the existing working of the Government agencies with which we have this intergovernmental relationship.

Another important matter is cooperation with scientific research in other countries.

There have been many regrettable instances where scientists in this country have been unable to participate in meetings and studies of their scientific groups in other countries. I have in mind, Mr. President, a specific case within my own State of New Jersey. Prof. Murray Wax-

man, Rutgers, discoverer of streptomycin, had insufficient funds to go to an international medical conference.

Modest provision has been made for the Foundation to cooperate in international scientific research activities. The approval of the President and Secretary of State are, of course, required where research outside the United States is to be undertaken. Examples of this would be certain weather and oceanographic studies, fungus and tropical disease research.

I now come, Mr. President, to one of the most important features of the entire bill. This feature deserves our very earnest attention, because it has been the subject of a great deal of discussion with the educators throughout the country. I refer to the scholarship and fellowship provision of the bill. It reaches out into every section of the United States in search of the inquiring investigative mind. That is the great quest in any country. Other countries of the world have been screening their young men and women to find this type of mind, and we are faced with the same problem.

It is useless, Mr. President, to consider ways and means of spending money for research unless first-rate men and women are available to do the work. It is the trained minds that count. Dollars alone, for example, however great in number, will not find the cure for cancer. It is limited by the number of competent men and women available to undertake the task.

Mr. President, the provision for scholarships and fellowships is part and parcel of the whole concept of the Foundation. It is designed to provide the seed corn for our national future. The GI scholastic program and the Holloway plan of the Navy are steps in this direction. The officers of the line they develop are no more effective than the weapons science provides for them to use.

Perhaps the greatest authority on this subject is Dr. James B. Conant, president of Harvard University and former chairman of the National Defense Research Committee. Let me quote from a portion of his testimony on this bill given before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on March 7, 1947. Dr. Conant says in this connection, and I quote from him because it is important to bear in mind what he has to say in connection with this important feature of the bill:

In all the discussion about research that goes on in these days an obvious fact is sometimes overlooked; namely, that it is men that count. And today we do not have the scientific manpower requisite for the job that lies ahead.

I can say there, Mr. President, that in talking with my former colleagues in Princeton University I find that they are alarmed at the lack of scientific manpower which was lost because this generation of young men was forced to take part in the war and did not get back into the scientific field.

The bottleneck of our scientific advance is essentially a manpower shortage, and unless something is done about it the bottleneck will be more constricted a decade hence.

Now, let no one imagine that, like some of the manpower shortages in the war, this can be cured by mobilizing and training for a short time the first people who come to hand.

If an emergency arises we cannot pick men up for this kind of work.

Scientific and technical advances depend on quality as well as on quantity or, to put it another way, on the quantity of exceptional men. These men have to be located when they are young and then given a long and expensive scientific education. If the proposals before you become law and Congress appropriates the money, we will see a flowering of scientific work in this country the like of which the world has never seen before. For only in this Nation where universal education reaches to the high-school level is it possible to locate the hidden reservoir of talent which, if tapped, can enrich our life and that of all mankind.

The bill before you—

Referring to the bill now being considered by the Senate—

provides for a long-term plan. The measures proposed would have been desirable even if there had been no war and no consequent deficit in our scientific and technical manpower. To the extent that we fail to cure this deficit in the next few years by proper governmental action, to that extent a federally supported scholarship and fellowship program is even more essential.

The arguments in favor of Congress providing for such a program and making adequate annual appropriations can be summarized as follows:

1. The welfare of a free society in an industrial age depends on a continuous advance of science and the application of the new knowledge to useful ends.

2. Both the advance of science and the application of science to industry, to medicine, and to agriculture depends on the quality and quantity of scientists and engineers available in a nation.

3. The supply of men depends on the number trained and the innate ability of those who undertake the special training.

4. The scientific professions in question require a long and expensive education beyond high school.

5. This education is of such a nature that it can be given at only a relatively few centers in every State.

6. Therefore, unless a student lives in one of these centers, his professional training must be costly, for he must pay for room and board away from home as well as other expenses.

7. The consequent financial barrier now prevents many boys and girls of high ability from going on with an advanced education. Much talent is lost to the Nation by this educational waste.

8. To right the balance, a federally supported scholarship and fellowship program is required.

Such is the argument in a few words in terms of the peaceful development of the country. When we turn to consider the possible contingency of war and measures for national defense, the argument for finding and developing scientific talent is even stronger. There is no longer any argument about the role of science in a defense program. If we are to remain strong from a military standpoint, as I believe we must until international agreement provides a reasonable plan of disarmament, our need for scientists is as great as our need for Army and Navy officers.

A relatively few men of great ability, imagination, daring, and with the proper training as officers of the armed forces have more than once in history determined the fate of nations. A relatively few men of great scientific ability and imagination, and

thoroughly trained, can play a part in building the military strength of this Nation in the next decade to a degree that can hardly be imagined by those who are not close to the research and development program of the Army and the Navy.

In connection with the same matter of the need for trained personnel, Dr. Vannevar Bush in his important book above referred to, *Science, the Endless Frontier*—which is on the desks of all Senators—gives startling evidence of why we must have financial aid if we are to keep our sources of supply constantly flowing. He points out dramatically how few of those who start in the elementary school actually survive to do advance work. Taking one of his illustrations and using 1,000 elementary school, fifth-grade students starting in 1930 and 1931, he shows year by year the fall-off until finally in 1938 the graduates from high school are only 417 and the graduates from college following high school in 1942 are only 72.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, without reading, to place in the RECORD at this point the figures for elementary schools, high schools, and colleges.

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

Elementary school:	
Fifth grade, 1930-31.....	1,000
Sixth grade.....	943
Seventh grade.....	872
Eighth grade.....	824
High school:	
First year.....	770
Second year.....	652
Third year.....	529
Fourth year.....	463
Graduates, 1938.....	417
College:	
First year.....	146
Graduates, 1942.....	72

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, undoubtedly there are many reasons why boys and girls drop out of school, but I think we are all agreed that financial consideration plays a most important part. Certainly this is true of those who ultimately fail to get to college. To the extent that family finances are a determining factor, potential professional talent is lost to the Nation. This is one of the evils we are trying to correct by the scholarship and fellowship provisions of the bill.

This subject is covered in section 9 of the bill which I quote at this point in order to emphasize its importance.

This is the scholarship and fellowship provision:

Sec. 9. (a) The Foundation is authorized to award scholarships and graduate fellowships for scientific study or scientific work in the mathematical, physical, medical, biological, engineering, and other sciences at accredited nonprofit American or foreign institutions of higher education, selected by the recipient of such aid, for such periods as the Foundation may determine. Persons shall be selected for such scholarships and fellowships solely on the basis of ability; but in any case in which two or more applicants for scholarships or fellowships, as the case may be, are deemed by the Foundation to be possessed of equal ability and there are not sufficient scholarships or fellowships, as the case may be, available to grant one to each of such applicants, the Foundation shall award the available scholarship or scholarships or fellowship or fellowships to

the applicants in such a manner as will tend to result in a wide distribution of scholarships and fellowships among the States, Territories, possessions, and the District of Columbia.

I emphasize the last clause especially—

The Foundation shall award the available scholarship or scholarships or fellowship or fellowships to the applicants in such manner as will tend to result in a wide distribution of scholarships and fellowships among the States, Territories, possessions, and the District of Columbia.

What we are seeking in this bill is to make the search for scientific talent widespread, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and from the Canadian border to the Mexican border.

I do not need to burden my colleagues further with data supporting the need to restore our scientific manpower so sadly depleted by the war. I am advised that Russia today has five times as many students in technical schools as we have in similar training in the United States. Mass attack of scientific problems may not of course guarantee solution, but it increases the probability of success, and with reasonable administration of the program we should find our way to the right formula for selecting these younger students of scientific promise.

Mr. President, in summing up my presentation of this case for a National Science Foundation, let me point out again that we propose a 24-man part-time board appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. I emphasize that in this board will be centered all the responsibility for the development of policy. This board in turn will elect a 9-man executive committee which will exercise the powers and duties of the Foundation and which committee will be constantly functioning. A full-time director nominated by the executive committee will administer the policies laid down by the Foundation.

As I pointed out a little while ago, under the terms of the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Director will be appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate.

When the Foundation is set up, it will take over the Office of Scientific Research and Development and the National Roster of Scientific and Specialized Personnel, together with their respective staffs.

As I stated above, there will be five divisions within the Foundation and corresponding divisional committees. All these men will be part-time employees of the Foundation representing the most eminent authorities in their respective fields. Their part-time services and their knowledge will be given to the Nation from the institutions and laboratories where they are now engaged, and their work for the Foundation will not require them to give up their present activities.

The work of the Foundation naturally falls into two main fields: First, developing basic research; and second, training men and women in the fields of basic research.

The Foundation will not itself operate laboratories, but will contract with existing research facilities and encourage by contract the establishment of facilities throughout the country where they do not exist.

The Foundation through its special division for that purpose will develop a scholarship and fellowship program through which it will discover the outstanding talent in the country to be brought into the fields of higher research.

In this proposal and this new legislation we have a new venture in a really untried and unknown field. Because of its being a new field we have simplified the bill as far as we could, and have drawn its provisions with the greatest care and after a large amount of study and consultation with experts all over the United States.

It is my own judgment and that of my colleagues and the scientific people with whom we have conferred in this matter that we should start the Foundation in a modest "trial and error" way. We are aware that any large expenditure of money in the early stages of the development of this work might easily be wasted, and therefore we believe that the step-by-step method of expanding the work is the one to follow.

No appropriation is mentioned in the bill because it is felt that the Foundation itself as part of the executive branch of the Government should year by year present its program to the Congress and should ask for its annual appropriation. We figure that a modest start can be made, based on existing research activities, for about \$20,000,000.

When one considers the possibilities of this Foundation, the modest estimate of \$20,000,000 is very impressive to me. In later years it will expand, but that is the estimate at the moment. With the addition of cancer and heart research provided for in the amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], special provision would have to be made in those fields, in addition to the \$20,000,000.

With this explanation of the bill and its principal features, and the controversial issues that have been cleared up by discussion and exchange of views, I am happy, on behalf of myself and my colleagues, to submit the bill to the Senate with the earnest hope that it will be passed promptly by both Senate and House as the National Science Foundation Act of 1947.

Mr. President, I request that the Senate proceed to consider immediately the amendments reported by the committee. I think those amendments should be disposed of so that the bill may be before the Senate for consideration with the amendments. If it is proper, at this time I ask that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that the amendments of the committee be first considered.

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

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, under those circumstances, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I am not asking to have the bill passed now.

Mr. KILGORE. I feel that more Senators should be present during the consideration of the committee amendments.

Mr. SMITH. Perhaps it might be well to take a recess at this time.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from New Jersey will yield to me for a moment to make a suggestion?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I wonder if the Senator will not withhold his request until what little I have to say about this subject can be said. The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] desires to speak for 5 or 10 minutes on another subject. Then we can see whether we want to continue with the consideration of the committee amendments, and we can then call for a quorum. I dislike to call Senators into the Chamber to listen to informal discussion.

Mr. SMITH. I will withhold my request.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, under those circumstances, I withdraw the suggestion of the absence of a quorum.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I had intended to address myself this evening to the pending measure; but in view of the lateness of the hour and the fact that the majority leader would like to have an executive session held today, and the further fact that the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] wish to address the Senate, I shall not address the Senate at this time. However, before I relinquish the floor I ask unanimous consent that at the beginning of the legislative session tomorrow, I may have the floor so as to proceed to address myself to this measure.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 153) providing for relief assistance to the people of countries devastated by war: agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. EATON, Mr. VORYS, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. BLOOM, and Mr. KEE were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, May 14, 1947, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 64. An act granting the consent of Congress for the construction of a dam across Dan River in North Carolina;

S. 132. An act to relieve collectors of customs of liability for failure to collect certain special tonnage duties and light money, and for other purposes;

S. 214. An act to change the name of the Lugert-Altus irrigation project in the State of Oklahoma to the W. C. Austin project;

S. 273. An act to limit the time within which the General Accounting Office shall make final settlement of the monthly or

quarterly accounts of fiscal officers, and for other purposes;

S. 460. An act to amend section 327 (h) of the Nationality Act of 1940; and

S. 534. An act to authorize additional allowances of good time and the payment of compensation to prison inmates performing exceptionally meritorious or outstanding services.

NEED FOR REVIEW OF THE FOREIGN COMMERCIAL POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to change the name of the United States Tariff Commission to the United States Foreign Trade Board, and to vest additional authority in the Board; and I shall ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. President, I shall speak briefly to the point, under the heading "Need for review of the foreign commercial policy of the United States." I almost apologize for addressing myself to so mundane a subject, after our indulgence in foreign loans and in scientific abstractions, but I think we must continue to eat in this country, and I shall make no apologies for diverting the attention of Senators remaining in the Chamber for a short time to the very practical question of how we are to maintain an economy which will make it possible for us to carry out both our foreign advances for relief and also the scientific research which we consider so important. So I address myself to our trade relations.

Many changes have occurred in our trade relations with foreign countries since the time when we ceased to be a colony of England. At first the changes took place slowly and we were able to analyze and meet each of them as they occurred. More recently the changes have been more numerous and the solutions less well thought out. The war has made it difficult to appraise the cause and effect of these changes. Now that the war is over the time for review is at hand. We must make this review a thorough one, and when the facts are all before us we must, if necessary, readjust our thinking in the light of present-day developments and our plans for the future of this Nation.

REVIEW OF UNITED STATES TARIFF POLICY AND TRADE

The United States has for many years maintained a policy of tariff protection. The Democrats have been low protectionists and the Republicans have adhered to the high-tariff policy. Under the system of protection this country has prospered, its resources have been developed until today its standard of living is the highest on earth. Its industrial capacity has been the wonder and amazement of the world and the sustaining force which has made it possible for us and our Allies to emerge victorious from two world wars.

When tariffs were first applied in this country they were for revenue, and as our imports increased this revenue became the principal source of income for the Federal Government. In fact, as late as 1913, when the income tax was

first adopted, tariff duties supplied one-half of the total Federal income. But by 1939 customs duties were only 6 percent of the funds collected by the Government.

Our foreign trade during this period has undergone a continuing change until today it is almost the reverse of what it was 75 to 100 years ago. How different the imports following the Civil War from those in the period preceding World War II.

In the earlier period imports normally exceeded exports, and such differences as occurred were settled by transfers of gold, remittances, loans, services, and so forth. Imports consisted of about 35 percent foodstuffs and 40 percent finished manufactures. Gradually a change occurred. Finished manufactures lost first place and crude materials took the lead.

In the case of exports, the changes were even more important. Finished manufactures which accounted for only about 15 percent of the trade in the earlier period had increased to the point where half of our exports were finished goods and another 20 percent was semi-manufactures. Exports of foodstuffs and crude materials, which after the Civil War accounted for 80 percent of our export trade, went down until just before World War II they accounted for less than 30 percent of the total.

At the same time that these shifts were going on in the composition of our foreign trade, changes were also occurring in the relation between total imports and exports. Imports were larger than exports in the post Civil War trade but for the last 70 years we have had an excess of exports. At first the excess was small. Gradually it increased until in 1946 exports exceeded imports by about \$5,000,000,000. These export balances are far too large to be offset by transfers of gold, or travel expenses, remittances, and so forth, and so the Government is making loans to foreign countries to finance these purchases.

Men in public office have long been aware of these changes and have recognized that changes in our foreign policy must be made in order to cope with the situation.

With the end of the war we have an opportunity to review the situation to see what has been done and what should be done. The New Deal undertook to offset our excess balance of exports by importing high-priced gold and burying it. In fact, that is one thing that we are still doing. Then as the international problems of the thirties became more complicated the trade agreements program was evolved as a means of reducing tariffs and increasing imports even though the act itself gives as its main purpose the expansion of export trade. But reduction in duties was not the only use made of this authority. It was used to obtain political as well as economic ends. The terms of the agreements were not enforced; and the claim that the agreements would keep this country out of war has long since been exploded.

The Trade Agreements Act was adopted originally in 1934. From then

until 1944 agreements were negotiated with some 18 countries in the course of which the average duty collected on dutiable imports dropped from 48 percent to 33 percent, a decline of almost 31 percent. Rising prices have also had their effect in bringing down the relative height of the duty so that in 1946 the duty collected was equivalent to only 25 percent of the value of dutiable imports. Please note that the rate is 25 percent of dutiable imports, not total imports. We have always tried to exempt from duty imports of merchandise of a kind not grown or produced here, with the result that about two-thirds of our import trade has been free of duty or other import restriction. Today new agreements are being negotiated as a result of which import duties will be reduced much further; how much further it is not possible to say, but it is certain that the time has come to review what has been done, to see where we are going. The Trade Agreements Act expires in June 1948, and before it is renewed future policies will need to be adopted and established.

Under existing law the existing duties may be further reduced by 50 percent from the present average of 25 percent to what would then be an average of slightly more than 12 percent, or approximately 15 points under the Underwood tariff of 1913.

THE FUTURE OF UNITED STATES COMMERCIAL POLICY AND TRADE

As indicated above, last year our exports exceeded imports by approximately \$5,000,000,000. This excess of exports must be paid for in gold, commodities, expenditures for travel, services, or loans. If we use the latter method of payment, we only postpone the time when some of the other forms of payment must be accepted. If we continue to take payment in gold, we will in the course of time have stored in caves in this country most, if not all, of the gold of the world. We certainly do not wish that to happen. It is evident, therefore, that if we are to maintain a high level of export trade that we must arrange to accept payment principally in commodities, services, and travel expenditures. If we are to maintain our place in the community of nations, we must be willing to assume the obligations that attach to that position. It is, therefore, the duty of Congress to determine how these problems should be solved.

With that in mind, I am now introducing a bill to change the name of the United States Tariff Commission to the United States Foreign Trade Board and to vest additional authority and responsibility in the Board.

In endeavoring to reach a decision as to what steps the Congress might take to facilitate foreign trade, considerable attention has been given to the operations of the British Board of Trade.

The British board reaches into the actual operation of trade far beyond that which I believe to be either necessary or desirable in the United States. In the sense, however, that the British board studies and coordinates all the foreign-trade activities of the British Government, the United States Board will do likewise.

My bill establishes the Foreign Trade Board at staff level. It directs the Board to study all factors directly or indirectly affecting the balance of international payments between the United States and foreign nations and to make recommendations to the Congress and to the President respecting the changes it believes desirable.

The Tariff Commission has had many years of experience in dealing with the problems of foreign traders. It has made extensive economic analyses of American industries. It has gained a reputation for impartiality, and, accordingly, it appears to be in the best position of any of the existing governmental organizations to undertake this assignment. The Tariff Commission, which under the terms of this bill will become known as the United States Foreign Trade Board, has never been an operating agency and is not likely to become ambitious to seize operating functions.

It should cooperate fully with the President's Council of Economic Advisers as organized under the Employment Act of 1946.

The study I contemplate in introducing this bill should recommend a settlement of the long-standing and still unsettled dispute between the State Department and the Department of Commerce as to which shall control the direct and specific aids which Government can properly render to the foreign-trade fraternity.

Some more authoritative expression is badly needed to emphasize the importance of commercial promotion by our Foreign Service officers. The tendency to minimize the importance of the commercial functions, to assign commercial activities to the lowest paid members of the staff, must cease. The market survey and economic analysis of conditions in foreign countries are highly important functions and should have primary attention by the Foreign Service. An alert Foreign Service constantly watching for opportunities to expand our foreign trade can do a great deal to equalize our international balance of payments.

There are many fields in which Government must render aid to the foreign trader. There are many fields which Government should leave entirely to business. The problem of determining a balance between these two positions needs continuous and impartial review.

The examination which I believe the Foreign Trade Board can make and the contribution which it can continue to make will take the form of periodic reports to the Congress and the President, and those reports will carry with them the prestige of impartiality; and the recommendations will, accordingly, have the respect of the Congress and the country at large.

Some expansion of this agency will be necessary in connection with the study, although it is not contemplated that at the present time any additional personnel should be added. The obvious duplication of functions and maladjustments among the departments and agencies concerned can well be located and commented on by the present staff. Its experience in testing the counter-claims for tariff revisions has given it a

background which should be very valuable in enabling it to distinguish between economic and uneconomic governmental activities.

It is my view that industry must stand the test of efficiency and economy when it asks for protection. I do not believe, however, that any existing or prospective domestic industry should be injured by reason of foreign competition if it is capable of efficient and economic operation.

The Republican Party has adhered to the policy that tariffs should protect American industry and agriculture. I believe in that policy, but some of the misapprehensions about that policy should be clarified.

The necessity for equalizing our international balance of payments is self-evident, and it is my firm conviction that this end can be attained with adequate protection for our own people in industry and agriculture against injury from the influx of competitive products, either industrial or agricultural, at ruinously low prices, resulting from low labor costs abroad.

The bill specifically directs the Foreign Trade Board to examine the possibilities of foreign travel, and fairs and exhibitions, as ways of aiding in the equalization of our present international unbalance.

I believe the potentialities to be realized through travel go far beyond those commonly recognized. The Department of Commerce, basing its figures on systematized sampling, finds that travel averaged about \$400,000,000 during the 20-year period from 1920 to 1939. The Department's figures include the sums paid for transportation to foreign shipping companies and the sums spent abroad by the United States travelers.

I may say that when we compare the volume of imports of all commodities, including, of course, sugar, coffee, and rubber, we find that the so-called travel import of Americans traveling abroad constitutes the largest single item in our entire balance-of-trade activities. That fact may lead us to the inference that it may be the item most easily susceptible of expansion.

Projecting into the future, on the basis of a national income of one hundred and fifty to two hundred billion dollars, which is the estimate for our national income at the present time, the Department feels it reasonable to anticipate travel expenditures by United States citizens abroad of between one and two-tenths and one and six-tenths billion dollars. That estimate, in my opinion, is far below the figures which I believe possible, when the potentialities of air travel are given full attention. It is by no means fantastic to foresee thousands of our middle-class families flying to spend a 2 weeks' vacation in visiting points of historical and cultural interest in Britain, Europe, around the Mediterranean, around South America, and, in the not-too-distant future, in the Orient. The time is, indeed, not far distant when flights across the Atlantic will be offered at \$100 for a passage in a period of perhaps 6 hours. Many officials in foreign lands to whom I have spoken about the tourist travel possibilities have expressed

great interest and have given me confidence that we may well find this a means of making from two billion to three billion dollars a year available overseas with which the products of American farms and factories can be purchased by our foreign friends.

Encouragement for the establishment of international fairs and exhibitions is also particularly called to the attention of the Board in this bill. Such international events—many of which can be staged here in the United States—will stimulate commercial as well as tourist travel.

It is, therefore, my suggestion that there be established a Foreign Trade Board in which the Congress can have confidence, and that the solution of these problems be entrusted to that Board, with the understanding that they will be solved, as all national economic problems should be, in the best interests of the Nation as a whole, and that the considerations will be above party politics and in keeping with the position which this Nation expects to maintain in international matters. It is my hope that all who are interested in maintaining a high level of employment in this country and in securing fair treatment for both producers and consumers at home and abroad, will support this legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the bill which I have introduced printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1287) to change the name of the United States Tariff Commission to the United States Foreign Trade Board and to vest additional authority in the Board, introduced by Mr. BREWSTER, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

SECTION. 1. That this act may be cited as "The United States Foreign Trade Board Act of 1947."

DECLARATION OF POLICY

Sec. 2. It is declared to be the policy of the Congress—

(a) To maintain a high level of employment in industry and agriculture;

(b) To formulate policies with respect to the foreign commercial activities of the United States which will conform to and supplement national domestic policies;

(c) To attain a better balance between our exports and imports, including the export of capital and capital goods under appropriate conditions, thus reducing any necessity for foreign loans by the Government;

(d) To avoid the purchase of abnormal amounts of gold;

(e) To provide for more efficient administration of the Government agencies having regulatory or promotional responsibilities directly or indirectly related to foreign commerce and travel and to coordinate their activities; and

(f) To encourage foreign travel by United States citizens and travel in the United States by citizens of foreign countries as an important element in maintaining peaceful relations between nations and in aiding in the process of making United States dollars available abroad for the purchase of products, agricultural and industrial, from the United States.

UNITED STATES FOREIGN TRADE BOARD

Sec. 3. The United States Tariff Commission shall hereafter be known as "the United States Foreign Trade Board," and all provi-

sions of law now applicable to the United States Tariff Commission shall be applicable in the same manner and to the same extent to the Board.

DUTIES OF THE UNITED STATES FOREIGN TRADE BOARD

SEC. 4. (a) The Board shall, in addition to any other duties prescribed by law, study all factors directly or indirectly affecting the balance of international payments between the United States and foreign nations and submit recommendations to the Congress and to the President from time to time respecting such changes and adjustments in law, regulation, or procedure as in its opinion may be necessary to achieve the aims set forth in section 2.

(b) In making its studies and recommendations the Board shall give particular attention to:

(1) The coordination of the activities of the several Government agencies dealing with foreign trade, including the collection and dissemination of information and statistical data by such agencies;

(2) The encouragement of foreign travel by United States citizens and travel by citizens of foreign countries in the United States; and

(3) International fairs and exhibitions as a means for promoting the interest conducive to trade, travel, and friendship.

COMMITTEE FOR CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT, INC.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, during the course of my remarks last Monday on the then-pending labor bill, I referred at some length to the propaganda activities of an organization known as the Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc. Through error, I linked that organization with a citation by the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

The organization promptly denied my statement, and requested that I correct it. This I am glad to do. That organization had trouble, not with the House Committee on Un-American Activities, but with two other committees—one a Senate committee and one a House committee.

In order further to set the record straight about the Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., Mr. President, I should like to say I spoke from memory on Monday; and what I had in mind was the citation of Edward A. Rumely and his trial last year before the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia on a charge of contempt of the House of Representatives.

He was charged specifically with having been subpoenaed—I now quote from the charge—to "produce certain records before a special committee of the House of Representatives, records of the Committee for Constitutional Government, of which he was executive secretary, he willfully made default of that subpoena by not producing the records."

The congressional committee referred to there was the Special Committee To Investigate Campaign Expenditures, House of Representatives, Seventy-eighth Congress, 1944. The House committee was trying to find out about the financial operations of the Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc.

Let me add that in the record of the hearings before that House committee and in the court testimony in that con-

tempt case, Mr. Rumely held steadfastly to the contention that when he refused to divulge the information wanted by the House committee, he was acting upon and in accordance with the instructions of the trustees of the Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc. In other words, he was the full-fledged agent of that organization.

That citation by the House committee was not the first time Mr. Rumely had been in difficulty with a congressional committee. In 1938 he was called before the Senate Special Committee To Investigate Lobbying Activities. According to the RECORD, Mr. Rumely refused to produce certain records before that committee.

I might explain that the name of the organization he was representing then was the National Committee to Uphold Constitutional Government, the predecessor of the present Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc.

As I understand, he escaped citation at that time through the propensity of the Senate to filibuster.

While Mr. Rumely was able, through technicalities or other means, to stand off the attempts of congressional committees to get the facts of his organization's financial operations, the evidence adduced at the proceedings both before congressional committees and the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia is even more revealing as to the wide ramifications of the activities of the Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., than the unchallenged statements offered by me before the Senate on Monday.

The only statement I made was that they had been cited by the House Committee on un-American Activities. I was incorrect in making that statement, and I have just said it was two other committees with which they had difficulty instead of that committee.

The RECORD further shows, Mr. President, that while Mr. Rumely has been successful in his skirmishes with congressional committees and the courts in connection with the concealment of the financial operations of the Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., he was not previously so successful with the courts in connection with charges of financial operations with foreign nations.

Mr. President, I shall not take the time of the Senate today to elaborate on what I said Monday about the Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc. By the way, I do not know how long the "incorporated" has been on the end of the name. The same people have operated under a different name during the last 10 years. I submit that much of the literature circulated by this committee is inflammatory, biased, and propagandistic.

If the Members of the Senate are interested in pursuing further the operations of the Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., I recommend the reading of the testimony before the Special Committee to Investigate Lobbying Activities, United States Senate, Part 7, 1938; testimony before the House Committee To Investigate Campaign Expenditures, Part 7, 1944; and the testimony

in the contempt trial of Mr. Rumely in the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, Criminal No. 74,306, 1946.

I wish to add, Mr. President, that the propensity of Mr. Rumely to refuse to produce records subpoenaed by a committee of the Congress—and this has happened on two occasions—and to escape any punishment whatsoever for so doing, is a sharp reminder of the helplessness of committees of the Congress to obtain information from any organizations or any persons, even by means of a subpoena, if the organizations or persons decides that they do not care to give the information demanded by a committee. It occurs to me that this is a matter which must be corrected in some way before the Congress can adequately and properly function in this respect.

In regard to the Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., they have unquestionably distributed inflammatory material which has tended to incite class against class. For instance, they distribute their material to professional classes, and the material naturally has a tendency to inflame the professional classes against the working classes. But under our present law there is nothing we can do to find out who are the real backers of this organization or any other organization. We know that under our Constitution the privilege of free speech is very broad indeed, and it should be very broad. I would oppose restricting free speech, or the distribution of propaganda throughout the United States. But I believe that the Congress should have the power, through its duly authorized committees, to investigate any organization in this country, to ascertain the facts as to its financing, where it gets its money, how it spends its money, and, more important than that, who are its real backers.

Mr. President, this is not the only organization of the kind. Many good people are listed as its sponsors, but I venture to say that not one of them has read any part of the inflammatory material which the organization, so sponsored, has been sending out during the last 2 or 3 years.

Mr. President, this situation emphasizes the helplessness of the Congress to ascertain facts which it should be within the province of Congress to learn. I hope that before long some action may be taken so that when a committee of Congress issues a subpoena, the subpoena will be more than a scrap of paper.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DONNELL in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

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

NOMINATION OF JOE B. DOOLEY TO BE DISTRICT JUDGE, NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS—REPORT OF JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on April 28, 1947, the Committee on the Judiciary reported favorably to the Senate the nomination of Joe B. Dooley, of Texas, to be United States district judge for the northern district of Texas.

I now ask unanimous consent to submit a written report (Executive Rept. No. 3) thereon, which contains a synopsis of the hearings on the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the report will be received and printed.

If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the first order of business on the Executive Calendar.

TREATY OF PEACE WITH ITALY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read Executive F, Treaty of Peace with Italy, signed at Paris on February 10, 1947.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, the treaties are to go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the consideration of the treaties will be postponed. The clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the calendar.

NOMINATION PASSED OVER—UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Joe B. Dooley to be United States district judge for the northern district of Texas.

Mr. WHITE. I ask that this nomination go over. I understand it is highly controversial, but I think an effort should be made to find a definite time when it can be taken up and disposed of, because the nomination has been on the calendar for a substantial time, and some steps should be taken for its disposition.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I shall not insist on taking up the nomination at this time, because in all probability an entire day will be required for its consideration. However, I should like to have the majority leader arrange for its being called up at some convenient time. I have not insisted, because the Senate had before it the labor bill, and the tax bill is coming along, and I did not want to disrupt the program of the majority, but I think this is a matter which should have the attention of the Senate as soon as it can be conveniently taken up.

Mr. WHITE. I give the Senator from Texas my assurance that I shall do whatever I can in that regard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection being heard, the nomination will be passed over.

CALIFORNIA DEBRIS COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Col. Samuel N. Karrick, Corps of Engineers, to be a member of the California Debris Commission.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I do not wish to object to this nomination, but I wonder if any Member of the Senate knows what the California Debris Commission is, and why the President nominates, by and with the advice and

consent of the Senate, members of that commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

The legislative clerk read the nomination of William E. Warne, of California, to be Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

ATTORNEY GENERAL OF PUERTO RICO

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Luis Negron Fernandez, of Puerto Rico, to be attorney general of Puerto Rico.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Owen McIntosh Burns to be United States attorney for the western district of Pennsylvania.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Otto F. Heine, of Hawaii, to be United States marshal for the district of Hawaii.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service.

Mr. WHITE. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I ask that the President be notified at once of all confirmations of today.

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

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION—PROPOSED UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I wonder if it would not be possible to get a unanimous-consent agreement to vote on the amendments to the Scientific Foundation bill tomorrow, without asking for a vote on the bill. I think it possible to do that, and I think it is in order to do it without a quorum call, if we confine the agreement to the amendments. I would like to propose a unanimous-consent agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. May it be understood that, by unanimous consent, the Senate is again in legislative session?

Mr. LUCAS. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois objects to the Senate resuming legislative session?

Mr. LUCAS. I want to take a moment in executive session, on a matter relating to nominations.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, of course if the Senator from Illinois objects, very well; but I do not know why the unani-

mous-consent agreement could not be made in executive session.

Mr. LUCAS. I will say I am agreeable to having the unanimous-consent agreement made if the Senate remains in executive session.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that, not later than 5 o'clock tomorrow afternoon, the Senate proceed to vote upon all pending amendments to the bill now before the Senate, until the voting is completed, and that, at that time, the bill be read a third time. I ask further that the time be controlled by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], who will have two hours, and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], who will have three hours, of the total of five hours.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I have been very much interested in the pending bill, but, unfortunately, under the procedure which we have been following I have been prevented from attending the session of the Senate this afternoon. I am a member of the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee which is handling the Department of the Interior bill. I am aware of the fact that many other Senators have been absent from the session of the Senate this afternoon during the discussion of the pending bill, because they also have been in attendance upon other committee meetings.

The Senate has unfortunately fallen into the practice, Mr. President, of granting unanimous consent that various committees may sit during the sessions of the Senate. The result has been that the floor has been emptied of Senators and important debate on matters of the greatest importance takes place without any opportunity for Senators who are vitally interested to participate. I have no desire to delay effectuation of a unanimous-consent agreement to vote, but I should like very much to have the opportunity of at least reading the RECORD of today's proceeding and knowing what amendments are pending before such an agreement is made. I suggest to the Senator from Ohio that the request might well be made some time tomorrow, in view of the very small attendance here, and in view of the facts I have just stated.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, of course, in the latter part of this session it is absolutely impossible that the Appropriations Committee and the Senate can hold mutually exclusive meetings. Members who are on the Appropriations Committee for years have never been able to attend meetings of the Senate, and never will be, under any circumstances.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have done very well, I think, speaking for myself.

Mr. TAFT. My comment has nothing to do with the Senator's request, but it is a comment merely on what he said. I hope he may agree to my request. If not, it can go over until tomorrow, and

another effort can be made first thing in the morning. However, it seemed to me, and it seemed to the Senator from West Virginia and, I understand, to the Senator from Washington, who has some amendments, that the whole position of proponents of the amendments could be stated in 3 hours. There was considerable discussion of the proposal last year, and most of the questions involved have been discussed by Senators who cared to discuss them. I only hope the Senator may agree, in order that there may be a definite understanding as to when the vote is to be taken and Senators will remain tomorrow afternoon to hear the debate.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have no disposition at all to prevent an agreement, but I think it is of the utmost importance that the Members of the Senate and the people of the country should know that under the procedure now being followed the Senate is being prevented from giving the attention it ought to give to the important measures which are before it. The Senator from West Virginia is present. He is very much interested in the pending bill, as is the Senator from Washington. I would be very much disposed to conduct myself in accordance with their wishes, but I feel that it is a great mistake for the Senate to continue the procedure of having committee sessions all over the Capitol while the Senate is in session.

It has been my experience, over a period of 14 years, contrary to what the Senator from Ohio has just said, that the members of the Appropriations Committee in the past have been able to devote their attention, both to the work of the committee and to what goes on on the floor. The unfortunate fact is, with respect to the Department of the Interior appropriation bill, the House of Representatives made so many drastic cuts in the appropriations, in order to carry out some political promises which were made during the campaign last year, that the Senate committee is now being deluged by requests from all over the United States to restore items which were stricken out by the House. A committee of western Governors appeared before the committee this morning, protesting against the cuts, and there are many other similar matters of that kind.

I will say to the Senate that some nine appropriation bills are being held up in the House at this moment. Hearings upon the War Department bill were completed as long ago as the 1st of March, but no report has been submitted by the House of Representatives Committee on Appropriations. I have good reason to believe, Mr. President, that the purpose of that is to have the Senate act upon the tax bill before the House determines how much of a deficit the Government will have next year. If the Senate can make the tax reductions that are being proposed, before the House and the Senate know how much money must be appropriated to carry on the War Department and the Navy Department and other necessary functions of government, then the melon will be distributed to the taxpayers and the country will be plunged again into an era of deficit financing;

although at this moment there is a surplus in the Treasury. So, Mr. President, I am very much disposed to call attention to this very serious situation by objecting to a unanimous-consent agreement at this time.

Mr. TAFT. I trust the Senator will not follow his disposition to make the objection. After all, it has no direct relation to a vote on the unfinished business. The Senator will have full opportunity on the tax bill, I am sure, for a number of days, to discuss the question of appropriations. If we cannot take bills of what we might call secondary importance, and get them through the Senate in 2 days, we are going to be tied up indefinitely and practically become a body that cannot transact ordinary business; we will be confined solely to the very important legislation, including appropriation bills. So I hope, when we have under consideration a bill which it may be said is of importance, but of secondary importance from a public-interest standpoint, and not in itself likely to create debate, that, if possible, unanimous consent may be granted so as to reach a conclusion on the bill. I hope the Senator may be willing to agree.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am very amenable. Let me therefore ask the Senator from West Virginia if he has had an opportunity to participate in the debate today upon this important question?

Mr. KILGORE. I have participated, mostly as a listener. Mr. President, if the Senator from Ohio will permit, I may say something to the Senator from Wyoming at this time in explanation of what has happened. At the time the suggestion of the unanimous-consent agreement was made, there were very few Senators on the floor. I canvassed those present, and it seemed to be the consensus that we could reach an agreement. I met with certain protests. I discovered that far more Senators were interested in the pending bill than I thought, and that they did not think there would be sufficient time allowed; they did not know what would develop. I went back to the Senator from Ohio and told him at that time that I knew of one objection which I was trying to straighten out, and that I would see what could be done about it. Since that time I have found the objection to be well founded. For that reason, I do not like to limit myself at the present time, and in particular, I do not like to limit other Senators who may want to discuss the amendments, and who will want to have something to say about the bill, even though it may be said to be of secondary importance.

Mr. TAFT. I did not mean to say it is of secondary importance. What I meant to say was that it is one which does not excite tremendous public interest and debate. It happens that nearly everyone interested in it wants the bill passed as rapidly as possible, but individuals differ with respect to various amendments to the bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senate gave unanimous consent that I may have

the floor tomorrow at the beginning of the legislative session to discuss the pending legislation. If the proposed unanimous-consent agreement were entered into what would happen to the consent which I secured to have the floor tomorrow? I do not know how long I shall speak. I hope I shall not speak long.

Mr. TAFT. I will say that I am sure the Senator will be given any reasonable length of time he wishes to have.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair asks the indulgence of the Senate at this moment to state for the benefit of Senators who were not present a short time ago, that within the last half hour unanimous consent was given to the Senator from Washington to be recognized at the beginning of the session tomorrow.

The Chair rules at this time that that agreement will not be set aside by agreement to the unanimous-consent request now proposed. Consequently the Senator from Washington will have the floor tomorrow, unless he himself voluntarily should relinquish that privilege.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, we were discussing the unanimous-consent request made by the Senator from Ohio. I understand from the Senator from Washington that he might proceed to speak for 30 minutes today. That would take 30 minutes from the time he would otherwise use tomorrow. For the reason that some of my colleagues have stated that they would object, I feel obliged to object to the unanimous-consent request, although I had previously stated that I would agree to it. I wish to withdraw such consent temporarily until matters are straightened out.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Chair understand that the Senator from West Virginia now does object to the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. KILGORE. I shall have to withdraw my previous consent due to the conflicts which have arisen on the question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is not clear whether the Senator from West Virginia is now objecting to the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I should like to say that because of the fact that so many Senators are absent from the Chamber, and that a number of Senators to my knowledge desire to speak on the subject referred to, I shall have to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

DELAY IN CONSIDERATION OF POSTMASTER NOMINATIONS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Maine yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I should like to have the floor in my own right.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Maine consent that the Senator from Illinois may have the floor in his own right at this time?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, on Monday, February 10, 1947, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], who is

chairman of the Civil Service Committee, made a speech in the Senate calling attention to what he said was a most deplorable condition in the Post Office Department. At that time the Senator from North Dakota made a request, by an appropriate resolution, for some \$35,000 for the purpose of investigating certain conditions in the Post Office Department which had existed prior to the time the Democrats took over the administration of the Government in 1932. In his speech the distinguished Senator from North Dakota notified the Senate and the country that there were pending in his committee at that time, roughly some 500 nominations of postmasters, and advised the Senate in no uncertain terms that no action would be taken on any of them until they had been subjected to the closest possible scrutiny, in order to determine whether certain practices referred to in the resolution submitted by him had been indulged in respecting the nominations in question.

Mr. President, since that time almost 300 more post office appointments have been submitted by the President of the United States to the Senate for confirmation. The nominations involve postmasterships in every State in the Union. As one United States Senator whose State is interested to the extent of 37 postmasters whose nominations are now being held up arbitrarily and without any reason whatsoever upon the part of the chairman and other members of the Civil Service Committee of the Senate, I rise at this time, in executive session, to voice a most serious protest against the procedure now being followed by that committee.

Mr. President, in order to accomplish what I have in mind and to give these nominees for post offices throughout the United States of America an opportunity to know that at least some United States Senators are interested in seeing that their nominations are confirmed, I am today taking the privilege in executive session of filing a number of motions to discharge the Committee on Civil Service from the further consideration of certain of the nominations in the hope that, perhaps, by that method it may be possible to secure action one way or the other by the majority party upon what seems, in the minds of some Senators at least, to be one of the most important questions which has been pending before the Senate for a long time.

Mr. President, from the minority views filed in connection with the resolution submitted some time ago by the senior Senator from North Dakota, I read the following:

In answer to a request by Senator HAYDEN, the First Assistant Postmaster General, on March 19, 1947, supplied the following information relative to the nominations that have been referred to the Senate Committee on Civil Service during the present Congress and upon which no action has been taken:

"Your questions will be answered in the order in which they have been submitted:

"1. Since January 3, 1947, 639 nominations have been submitted by the President to the Senate of persons to be appointed postmasters at Presidential offices, that is, post offices of the first, second, and third classes.

"2. Of the 639 nominations, 349 were selections of the highest eligible on the register

submitted by the Civil Service Commission. Of this 349, 156 have military preference.

"3. Eighty-one selections were made of the second eligible on the register submitted by the Civil Service Commission and of this 81, 48 have military preference.

"4. The third eligible on the registers submitted by the Civil Service Commission was selected in 38 instances and, of this number, 21 have military preference.

"5. Of the total of 639 nominations submitted to the Senate, 253 have military preference.

"6. Of these 639 nominations, 128 involve the reappointment of the incumbent postmasters where the offices have been advanced from fourth to third class. These reappointments were made under the act of May 20, 1944. Of the 128 postmasters nominated for reappointment, 13 have military preference.

"7. The promotion of a classified employee is involved in 40 of these nominations. That is, 40 nominations are for the promotion of employee in the classified postal service and of this 40 so recommended for promotion, 15 have military preference."

Then the committee gives its conclusions, which are highly interesting, but which I shall not read into the RECORD at this time.

Another very interesting factor in this situation can be found in the records of the Post Office Department, which show that of the 137 postmaster nominations pending before the committee, for offices which are advanced in class, 54 of the appointments were made prior to 1933. That is significant.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question? I shall not interrupt him if he prefers not to be interrupted.

Mr. LUCAS. It is perfectly agreeable to me to have the Senator from Maryland interrupt to ask questions he may wish to ask.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to point out to the Senator from Illinois the contrast, since he has mentioned the date 1933, as between the situation which existed after 1933 and the situation before that time.

In Baltimore we had a postmaster named Benjamin Woelper, who was an active Republican. He was appointed to the office before the Democrats came in in 1933. My colleague, Senator Radcliffe, and I decided that he was an efficient man, and we let him hold that office until he resigned many years thereafter, showing that where there was good service in the Post Office Department, even though a man had been an active Republican worker and officeholder, two Democratic Senators from Maryland thought the office was being well conducted, and ought not to be disturbed.

In my home town of Havre de Grace, Md., one of my boyhood friends, an active Republican, was appointed postmaster on my recommendation. In contrast, to that, the Senate Committee on Civil Service is now holding up all the post office appointments in Maryland. Many of the appointees are veterans, and some are disabled veterans. They are being kept out of their offices month after month when the overwhelming majority of them stood No. 1 on the register.

When we were in control of the Senate, by contrast, my colleague and I, in our respective home towns, where we both earn a livelihood, recommended the

appointment of Republican postmasters, and kept them there. That contrasts in a very significant way with the rather partisan approach which is being applied in the present session of the Congress.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator from Maryland for the contribution which he has made. I am glad to know exactly what was done in his State with respect to the appointments to which he has referred. What he has said bears out what this report shows with respect to the number of persons who were appointed prior to the time the Democrats came into power, and who have been reappointed, or are still serving as postmasters in their respective communities throughout the United States.

For the State of Illinois approximately 37 postmaster appointments have been sent to the Senate by the President of the United States since January 3; and I am glad to inform the Senate that 23 of the appointees whose nominations have been sent to the Senate by the President are veterans of either World War I or World War II. Ten of them are acting postmasters at the present time. Of the 37, 14 were appointed who were highest on the eligible list. Surely there can be no objection to the individual who is No. 1 on the register. Surely there can be no objection to the individual who is a veteran and also No. 1 on the register.

As the Senator from Maryland has said, it is strange that the Committee on Civil Service of the United States Senate has apparently taken a partisan approach to all these important appointments, involving veterans of World War I or World War II, who offered everything they had, if necessary, in the defense of their country. The gentlemen who are now holding up these nominations were among those who told the boys, "When you come back you can have anything we have in this community." Yet when one of them has been appointed to a small \$1,200 postmastership at Xenia, Ill., or some other city, we find partisan politics of the cheapest kind holding up brave men who were willing to die, if necessary, in order to help save this country.

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

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Speaking as a member of the Civil Service Committee, I wish to let the Senate and the country know that it is not the Democrats who are holding up the appointments. Several appointments have been made to postmasterships in South Carolina, and the appointees are now writing me and asking why I have not permitted their appointments to get out of my committee. That is the way they write. I want them and the other people of the United States who have been appointed to know that it is the Republicans who should have the blame or the credit, and not the Democrats.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator from South Carolina. I am happy that a member of the Committee on Civil Service is present while I am discussing this matter. I appreciate what he says. I understand that the Committee on Civil Service has had a roll-call vote on

whether or not these postmaster nominations should be reported to the Senate. Am I correct in that statement?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. Of course, it was a party vote.

Mr. President, the course which is being followed is not right. If there is a single thing against one of these appointees, let a protest be filed before the committee, supported by credible and competent evidence, and let the committee hear the complaint against the nominee. But to blanket all these appointees in one group and say that none of them is fit seems to me to be shameful and disgraceful.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I understood the Senator to say that of 37 nominees for postmasterships in the State of Illinois, 10 of them are acting postmasters, and all of them are veterans?

Mr. LUCAS. Not all of them are veterans. Twenty-three are veterans, or 62 percent.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of the acting postmasters?

Mr. LUCAS. No; of all 37. Twenty-three of the 37 are veterans.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. How many of the 23 are acting postmasters?

Mr. LUCAS. That I cannot say. I think probably three or four.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am sure the Senator is aware of the provision of the law that if an acting postmaster's nomination is not confirmed during the session of the Senate to which his name is sent he will no longer be able to serve in that capacity. So the result of the situation which the Senator describes will be that hundreds of veterans all over the United States who have been made acting postmasters, whose nominations have been sent to the Senate, and who are No. 1 on the eligible register, will be incapable of holding office unless the Senate acts upon the nominations.

Mr. LUCAS. I appreciate what the Senator has said, and I thank him for it. I know what the law is along that line. The Senator is absolutely correct.

I wonder if it is to be the policy of the majority in the United States Senate to adhere to the position they have taken to the extent that they will hold up these nominations during the entire session, so that when adjournment comes not a single nominee, regardless of the merits of his appointment, regardless of his background or his qualifications, will receive the appointment, because the majority will block his confirmation. In the name of all that is fair and just, in the name of economic justice, if you please, for these servicemen, I cannot believe that, without any other reason the majority of the United States Senate will continuously hold these nominations in committee and block the appointments. I am satisfied that once the nominations reach the floor of the Senate a majority of the Republican Members will vote for their confirmation.

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

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am glad the Senator has made the remark which he just made, because I think it is only fair to say that there are many Senators on the other side of the aisle who are not familiar with this circumstance. I am very hopeful that the Republican leadership, there being so much justice and equity in the claim of the Senator from Illinois, will examine into this matter and afford relief. It is very embarrassing to write a disabled veteran whose name has been sent to the Senate by the President and who is on the eligible list and clearly entitled above everyone else to the position, and say, "I am sorry, but as United States Senator I cannot do anything about it. The matter is in the Committee on the Civil Service." His natural reaction is, "What are you doing there if you cannot do something about it?" I am hopeful that those on the other side will take hold of this matter and, in a spirit of equity and fair play, provide some relief.

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

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. I want to be sure that I correctly understood the Senator in something which he said awhile ago which actually amazed and astonished me. Did I correctly understand him to say that a vote was taken in the committee on all of these nominations, in one lump, so to speak, and the committee voted not to report any of them?

Mr. LUCAS. That is my understanding. If I am wrong I shall be glad to be corrected.

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

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I was not present at that particular meeting, but that is my understanding.

Mr. HATCH. Was there any protest filed in the committee against these nominations?

Mr. LUCAS. I do not think the Senator will find a single protest filed against any one of the nominees whose names have been sent to the Senate by the President. If there is a protest, I should like to know about it. If there is any complaint about the 37 men who have been nominated to postmasterships in the State of Illinois I think I would know something about it. I keep a complete record concerning each and every one of the appointments in my State, and there is nothing in my office even remotely resembling a complaint. I have never heard of a complaint filed against any one of the 37, and I am satisfied that there are no such complaints.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Speaking as a member of the committee, I have not heard of any protests.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further—he may already have discussed it, but let me inquire what justification is given, if any, for the course of conduct which is being pursued by the committee.

Mr. LUCAS. I read in the beginning from a speech made by the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGE] in which he told the Senate of the United States that unless he got from the

Senate \$35,000 with which to investigate certain conditions in the Post Office Department running back even prior to 1933, not a single one of these nominations would be reported by his committee. That is the only justification. The Senator can find that on page 926 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 10, 1947.

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

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. It is evident that the distinguished Senator from North Dakota is a man of his word for so far none of the nominations has been reported. But am I to understand that the Senator from Illinois is not willing to accept the decision of the chairman of the committee and is about to move that the committee be discharged from the further consideration of the nominations.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from New Mexico is correct. I am not willing that these nominees, many of them veterans, shall continue to wait upon the Committee on the Civil Service without vigorous protest being made, without information as to the reason for the action being furnished, and without debate upon the floor of the Senate which will at least enable them to know that some Senators are interested in attempting to do something for them.

I shall cite a typical case, the case of a man who was nominated last November. There was nothing that could be done about it then, for the Senate was not in session. He was renominated on January 3 of this year. I want the Senator from New Mexico and the Senate to listen to this case, which of itself alone, should give every Member of the United States Senate serious concern.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, before the Senator proceeds with the case, will he yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I will yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. I have no desire to prolong this session. It is getting on to a quarter of six. It seems to me that if the Senator is going into typical cases he would wish the Senate to recess as in executive session so that he might proceed tomorrow when more Senators are present in the Chamber, and explain the cases which have been held up so that all will know about them. There are some veterans in whom I am interested, and I should like to follow the Senator from Illinois and ask the other side if it is the intention of the majority to hold up the nominations of these men. If the Senator speaks tonight I am afraid that many Members will not understand what is involved.

I make that as a suggestion.

Mr. LUCAS. I shall be glad to comply with the suggestion if it is agreeable to the majority leader.

Mr. TYDINGS. Let me ask the majority leader if he would be willing to recess as in executive session, so that we may continue the discussion tomorrow.

Mr. WHITE. I had the floor a while ago and was about ready to make a motion that the Senate recess as in legislative session. I did not know that I was to sit here and receive all this castigation from the other side. I have found

satisfaction in the good deeds to which the Senator from Maryland has made reference. I rather expected that from him, and I congratulate him that in those instances, at least, he has been right and has done rightly.

I do not want to enter into any agreements with respect to the procedure tomorrow. I am quite content to let the day take care of itself. A motion to recess, of course, would continue the discussion of the Foundation bill. I had hoped, and I now hope, that that might be the course to be taken and that there might be some more appropriate time found for this political discussion.

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

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Let me make this suggestion to the Senator: For example, suppose unanimous consent were requested that the executive session, in the event we recess in executive session—and let me inquire first, whether the Senate will meet tomorrow at 11 o'clock?

Mr. WHITE. The Senate will meet at 12 o'clock.

Mr. TYDINGS. Suppose that the executive session should terminate at 12:45 p. m. tomorrow and that the Senate should then go into legislative session. If that were done by unanimous consent it would assure the Senator from Maine that we were not intending to prolong the discussion.

Mr. WHITE. In the situation which confronts me I shall not consent to anything. If I have the opportunity to take the floor again in my own right I shall move that, as in legislative session, the Senate recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow. That will keep the bill which has recently been before the Senate in its position. I think it is vastly more important—and I say this with great respect to the Senators on the other side—that we proceed with the unfinished business as rapidly as possible and that the observations which are being submitted—I say this to the Senator from Illinois with great respect—be submitted at a more appropriate time.

Mr. LUCAS. I appreciate what the able Senator from Maine has said with reference to submitting observations at a more appropriate time, but I do not know of any more appropriate time than to submit them when we can finally meet in executive session.

Mr. WHITE. I make the suggestion that it would be a more appropriate time when some of the majority members of the committee of which complaint is made are on the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. I cannot control the majority on the floor. It is too bad that there are not more Members present on the other side.

Mr. WHITE. I should think that if the Senator from Illinois knew he was going to make the talk which he is making he might well have notified someone on the majority side that it was in contemplation, and members of the Civil Service Committee having jurisdiction over these nominations might have been present to speak for themselves.

Mr. LUCAS. Let me say to my able friend that if I had been certain that I could have obtained the floor and would not be deprived of it by an adjournment or a recess—

Mr. WHITE. The Senator knows perfectly well that I never refuse to yield to him.

Mr. LUCAS. I know that, but I am speaking of something else.

Mr. WHITE. I may say that Senators on the other side of the aisle will have difficulty in locating an instance when I have refused to yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I am not complaining at all about the able Senator from Maine. He has always been fair in his disposition toward the minority, ever since he has become majority leader.

Mr. WHITE. I think that disposition to be fair has gotten me into trouble in the present instance.

Mr. LUCAS. Oh, no; because when the Senator from Maine gave up the floor, the Senator from Illinois had a right to obtain it. I do not think the Senator from Maine would move that the Senate adjourn or take a recess, without giving me an opportunity to have the floor. The Senator would have had trouble following any other course.

Mr. WHITE. I did give the Senator from Illinois the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct; and I had a right to take the floor at the time when I took it.

Mr. WHITE. Of course, I do not know how long it will be before I regain the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. It will be some time, I may say to the Senator from Maine, unless he enters into an agreement with the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, in order to expedite settlement of the situation, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate convenes tomorrow, it proceed in executive session until 12:30, so as to give the Senator from Illinois an opportunity to present his case before a larger number of Senators.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, an agreement has already been entered into with respect to the proceedings tomorrow. The entire subject now under discussion can be debated during the time when the Scientific Foundation bill is before the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the Senator from Maine is correct about that, and probably we shall discuss this matter during that time. But, as the Senator from Maine well knows, at a time when the Senate is in legislative session, it is not proper for a Senator to move that a committee be discharged from the further consideration of an executive matter, such as the one we are now discussing. That is the primary reason why I obtained the floor. I shall move that the committee be discharged from the further consideration of all postmaster nominations in my State so as at least to place before the Senate and the country something in regard to what has been happening to these postmaster nominations.

A moment ago the Senator from Maine spoke of the importance of the proposed

Scientific Foundation bill, which is the unfinished business, and he indicated that we should not be considering matters of the kind I am now discussing until the unfinished business is disposed of. I wish to say to him that the unfinished business, the bill relating to the Scientific Foundation, is exceedingly important from the standpoint of the welfare of the economy of the United States, as well as of the world, but, on the other hand, if the Senator from Maine were to make such an argument in a small community such as the one to which I referred, to the postmastership of which one of these veterans had been nominated, he probably would be challenged from the beginning to the end.

Furthermore, Mr. President, the Senator from Maine has said that this is a political discussion. I do not know who brought on the political discussion unless it was the majority, because of their action in holding up the confirmation of these nominations. They can call it politics if they want to, but we on this side of the aisle did not start it.

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

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I wish to say that no one could be fairer than the Senator from Maine has been, and I certainly had no intention, either by innuendo or in any other way, of reflecting upon him or upon the other Members of the majority or, in fact, the entire group of Senators on his side of the aisle; but I say to the Senator from Illinois that when these men have had their appointments held up month after month after month, although they stand first on the list and are veterans—many of them disabled veterans—who served in the recent war, in my opinion, in the light of this long delay, we are justified in bringing this matter out into the open and giving these men their day in court, so to speak.

I propose that when the Senate takes a recess this evening it be taken as in executive session, so that we may have a showdown on this matter tomorrow, because I do not think there is any more important business immediately before the Senate than to give these veterans the justice which we said they would receive when they came back from the wars.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the Senator from Maryland is so correct about the entire situation that I thank him from the bottom of my heart for the statement he has made. Certainly they are entitled to attention.

I wish to refer to only one case, and to state it for the RECORD, so that the Senate and the country may know precisely what the Committee on Civil Service is doing. I refer, for instance, to the nomination of Roy M. Martin, to be postmaster at Springerton, Ill. As I said a moment ago, the appointment was made last November, and a reappointment was made in January. I now read an excerpt from a letter addressed to me:

I am now receiving 30-percent-disability compensation, which amounts to \$41.40 monthly; in addition to this, I can receive \$20 weekly social-security payments. Pre-

vious to entering the Army, I was making \$300 per month. My disability now prevents me from accepting the same type of employment. I have been waiting now 7 months for this appointment, and certainly cannot wait much longer.

I certainly appreciate your efforts in my behalf, and thank you sincerely for such.

Mr. President, he had 1 year and 8 months of service. He was in the Ordinance Department of the Army. He had 6 months' duty overseas. He is a married man, and has a wife and four children to support. Before he went into the service he made \$300 a month, working as a roofer. Now he is living off of disability compensation and social-security compensation, while the Senate of the United States deprives him of the compensation to which he is justly entitled under all the laws of decency, equity, and fairness. I understand that one of his children is 7 years old, one is 11 years old, and one is 13 years old, and one is 15 years old. He is not employed. He states in his application that he worked as a roofer for a service company at Fairfield, Ill., from the date of his discharge from the Army until April 1946. Because of the disability he incurred in the line of duty as a soldier he simply cannot do the heavy work he formerly did.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I understand that that appointee is not now an acting postmaster.

Mr. LUCAS. He is not.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. But he is number one on the eligible register; is that correct?

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I further understand that he has the service-connected disability of which the Senator from Illinois has spoken, and that he cannot get the position in the post office, because of the failure of the Senate to confirm his nomination.

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thought it important to have that situation clearly pointed out as a part of the RECORD, namely, that the man is number one on the eligible register, is a disabled veteran, with a family to support, and is waiting to assume the responsibility for which the Civil Service Commission has found him eligible and capable. Yet he cannot do so because the Senate of the United States will not act upon his nomination.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the Senator from Wyoming is quite correct.

Let me say that the letter which was addressed to me was written on March 6, 1947, and in it he states:

I have been waiting now 7 months—

And here it is May, 2 months after the time he wrote the letter—for this appointment, and certainly cannot wait much longer.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Was not that man, who was found eligible No. 1 by the Civil Service Commission, entitled to believe that inasmuch as there was no objection to his appointment and inasmuch as he had had that service in the Army,

the Senate of the United States would not delay as much as 24 hours in confirming his nomination?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, he certainly was entitled to believe that. All this delay is beyond my comprehension. I never have been able to understand this situation. I have waited days, weeks, and months for the Committee on Civil Service to make some kind of report on these postmaster nominations; yet nothing has been done. Such treatment is utterly unfair. I say with the utmost sincerity that it is shameful and disgraceful, in my humble opinion, when we consider the person whose case I have presented to the Senate, that he and his family are denied the rights to which they are justly entitled under the laws which have been enacted by the Congress of the United States.

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

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator from Illinois knows that the case to which he has referred can be paralleled by many others among the approximately 700 nominations that have been referred to the committee.

I ask him whether he has any idea what the monthly salary is for the position to which that veteran has been nominated.

Mr. LUCAS. I would say that probably that postmaster position carries with it a salary of not more than \$2,000 or \$2,400 a year.

Mr. TYDINGS. This is the case of a wounded veteran who has lost approximately \$1,200, who is on relief and drawing social security, entitled to \$1,200 from his country, but who cannot get it, who has to throw himself on the charity of the town and lose the \$1,200, which he will never recover as long as he lives.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is correct. Another temporary postmaster is taking the money to which this veteran is rightfully entitled.

Mr. President, I shall not take the time of the Senator much longer, but I should like to refer to one phase of the speech made by the Senator from North Dakota of February 10. He said:

The members of the Senate Civil Service Committee intend to do everything they possibly can to see to it that the civil service operates in such a manner as to insure that veterans will be given the preference of first-, second-, and third-class postmasterships which the Nation wants them to have. I believe this applies to Democratic and Republican members alike.

He made that statement, but he does nothing to comply with the statement he made. I think the \$35,000 for the investigation is still being held up somewhere in the United States Senate.

I do not care how much they investigate. I am not here attempting to defeat the resolution submitted by the able Senator from North Dakota providing for an investigation. They can investigate, and investigate, and fumigate, and fulminate throughout the Post Office Department so far as the Senator from Illinois is concerned. I am attempting only to defend the rights of men in my State

who have received appointments from the President of the United States to postmasterships after civil-service examinations, that is all.

Only yesterday I appointed as No. 1 to a little post office in my State a man who was a Republican, and there was a Democrat on the list who was a veteran I could have appointed, but the man I appointed had a great war record in World War II. He is a fine, upstanding citizen of the community, and I have attempted, since I have been a Member of the United States Senate, to do my best to follow out the spirit of the civil-service laws which have been passed by the Congress of the United States.

Mr. President, I have a number of resolutions I intend to submit. I shall read one; they are all of the same tenor:

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service be and it is hereby discharged from further consideration of the nomination of Roy M. Martin to be postmaster at Springerton, Ill.

Mr. President, I send the motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be received, and will lie over 1 day, under the rule.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I send Resolution No. 2 to the desk, and ask that the committee be discharged from the further consideration of the nomination of Guy E. Midget to be postmaster at Pittsburg, Ill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The same procedure will be followed.

Mr. LUCAS. I wish to say, with respect to this man, that today Mr. Midget is living on a disability pension. Every case I have presented has been for a serviceman.

The next one is with respect to Frank R. Johnson, to be postmaster at Geneseo, Ill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The same procedure will be followed.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Johnson is an old comrade of mine of World War I, who was wounded in France, and who now seeks to get a little compensation to help him out in the latter days of his life, but he is denied the opportunity because of the action of the United States Senate.

Here is another one for William P. Hohs to be postmaster at Skokie, Ill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The same procedure will be followed.

Mr. LUCAS. I think this man is acting as temporary postmaster. He had a wonderful record in the war. He was 43 months overseas, and won about all the medals any one man could win.

The next one is for Leland Adams to be postmaster at Dieterich, Ill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The same procedure will be followed.

Mr. LUCAS. If it is satisfactory with the able majority leader, I shall file the resolutions en bloc, without reading them.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. May I ask what the papers are that are being sent to the desk?

Mr. LUCAS. I am submitting a series of resolutions asking that the Committee on Civil Service be discharged from the further consideration of the nominations of these respective postmasters in my State.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator is merely filing the resolutions?

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct. That is all I can do at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will say, for the information of the Senator from Maine, that the Chair has ruled that the resolutions will be received and lie over 1 day under the rule.

Mr. LUCAS. That is my understanding of the parliamentary situation.

Mr. TYDINGS. At the conclusion of the offering of the Senator's resolutions I have here about 14 relating to cases in Maryland, many of the men affected being veterans. I shall not take the time at this late hour to describe them all, but the first one on the list is a veteran, Edward P. Harris, of Snow Hill. I would appreciate it very much if the Senator from Illinois would yield to me long enough to file those resolutions as in executive session.

Mr. LUCAS. I shall be glad to do that, when I conclude.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolutions presented by the Senator from Maryland will likewise be received and lie over 1 day under the rule.

Mr. LUCAS. I may say that I have certified copies of the discharges of every one of these veterans and whenever we enter upon a discussion of these cases, if that should happen, I shall discuss the record of each and every one of them. The records of many of them are comparable to the first case I discussed.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. Is it not the intention of the Senator from Illinois, and also probably of the Senator from Maryland, to call up these resolutions for action by the Senate in executive session at the earliest possible moment?

Mr. LUCAS. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. Am I correct in my understanding that these resolutions lie on the table for 24 hours, and that then Resolution 1 will automatically come up as a privileged matter?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that the resolutions will respectively lie over until the next executive session, whenever that may be.

Mr. TYDINGS. They will come up automatically.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. They will then be laid before the Senate, following the legislative procedure, before the calendar of the executive session is called.

Mr. LUCAS. They will be on the Executive Calendar?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. They will lie over 1 day under the rule, and they will be taken up as indicated by the ruling of the Chair a few minutes ago.

Mr. LUCAS. Am I to understand that they will not appear on the executive calendar?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct; they will not appear.

Mr. LUCAS. But they will have the same standing?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The situation is now analogous to what happens in a legislative session. The resolutions will lie over 1 day, and while they will not appear on the calendar, they will be automatically laid before the Senate at the next executive session. Each of the resolutions will come before the Senate for action at the next executive session.

Mr. LUCAS. They are in the nature of privileged motions, are they not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. They will follow the analogy of legislative procedure, and will be laid before the Senate at the next executive session for action.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. My reason for asking the question of the Senator was that I know that the majority leader has the feeling that he should have had some notice that this discussion was to take place. He has just informed me that yesterday the chairman of the Committee on Civil Service gave notice that he would be gone from the Senate for a week, and whatever the desires of the Senators are, it occurred to me the Senator from Illinois should make his notice specific and plain so that everyone would have ample opportunity to be present when these motions or resolutions come before the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. I want it distinctly understood that I did not bring this matter up today simply because the Senator from North Dakota happened to be out of the city. I did not have the slightest notion where he was when I began my remarks.

This matter has been pending for months, weeks, and days, and this is one of the first opportunities we have had in an executive session really to bring it to the attention of the Senate, in view of the tremendous amount of work the Senate has been doing on other important matters.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I would not suggest, much less say, that the Senator from Illinois made his remarks today in the absence of the Senator from North Dakota with any ulterior purpose. Everyone who knows the Senator from Illinois recognizes that he has the courage of his convictions in all matters.

Mr. LUCAS. I wish the whole Senate was here.

Mr. WHITE. But it is an unfortunate fact that the chairman of the committee gave notice yesterday that he would be absent for a week, and that today this assault comes on his committee and on the Senator as chairman of the committee. I feel that it is regrettable; I feel it is inexcusable.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not agree with the Senator. It may be regrettable that the Senator from North Dakota is not here, but it is not inexcusable, so far as I am

concerned, and I resent the statement that it is inexcusable, because there is not anything so important from the standpoint of certain individuals, who are entitled to their rights in this country, as having this matter brought before the Senate of the United States, whether the Senator from North Dakota is here, or whether he ever comes back.

Mr. WHITE. I agree they have the right to have this matter brought before the Senate of the United States. I was only commenting on the time when it is appropriate to do it.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield once more?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I certainly hope the Senator from Illinois will arrange with the majority leader to fix a time for the discussion of this matter when the Senator from North Dakota can be, and will be, present. I should like to have every member of that committee here on the floor to explain why he voted to postpone the nominations of men who have not had a word of protest filed against them. I hope the Senator from Illinois will cooperate to fix a time when the entire committee can be present.

Mr. WHITE. So far as I am concerned, Mr. President, if I may say a word—and I say it on my own responsibility; I absolve all others of any responsibility for what I am saying—I personally have no sympathy with holding up nominations, week after week and month after month, for no reason other than political considerations. If that is what is being done—and I make no assertion that it is—if that is what is being done, I have no fellowship with it whatever. If it were a matter of 2 weeks, or 3 weeks, or possibly a month, before a change of administration, I should feel that a party in power was justified in holding on to the nomination, or holding on to the opportunity of making nominations; but—I repeat it for emphasis—I have no fellowship with holding up nominations for a year, or for an indefinite period of time.

Mr. LUCAS. I appreciate what the Senator from Maine has just said. I know exactly how he feels about a situation of this kind, but I regret that more of the Members on his side are not present.

Mr. WHITE. It was understood that we were going to recess, when I yielded to the Senator.

Mr. LUCAS. That is true; but there were some Members on the floor of the Senate, including the senior Senator from Ohio, who was here and heard me start talking about postmasters. I do not know whether he understood what I was going to talk about or not, but I think it regrettable that they left the Senator from Maine here to hold the bag, when something extremely important is involved. At other times, I should not pay much attention to their absence.

Mr. WHITE. If there is one thing the Senator from Ohio has above all else, it is political courage.

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

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. What impressed me, Mr. President, was this: The chairman of the committee obtained permission to be absent. Are all the other Senators to suffer because of that fact? Senators talk about economy. My office has been wasting Government money on telegrams and telephone calls and everything else because of the delay in the consideration of these nominations.

The Senate may not realize it, but in certain sections it is difficult to obtain postmasters. There is no chance even to ask the applicant whether he voted the Communist or Prohibitionist ticket; we just need a postmaster; and then when one is nominated it is impossible to obtain his confirmation. In the meantime, a certain post office within my State is without even an acting postmaster at the present time, because the man who was recommended has not been confirmed, and it is impossible to get anyone else even to take the position of acting postmaster. It is a small post office; true.

It seems to me that if the chairman of the committee must be absent, he should certainly leave someone in charge of matters of this sort. A committee could not vote postponement indefinitely on such matters, without a majority of the membership voting on it. In the absence of the chairman, it seems to me the senior member of the committee should be present to defend the position of the chairman and of the committee. Would it be necessary for the Senate to wait on the chairman, in the event he obtained permission to take a 3 months' vacation or a 4 months' vacation? Would the Senate be precluded from discussing the matter?

I may say to the distinguished leader of the majority, he knows very well that I have the utmost regard for his sincerity. I know the situation in which the majority leader is placed. I am not talking about the conduct of the majority leader; I am talking about a committee that, in my opinion, has not performed its duty. It occurs to me the Senate ought to castigate not only the chairman but the entire committee as well.

Mr. WHITE. I may say that I am not a member of the committee, and I know only by repute and what I have heard on the floor about the attitude of the committee. I am disposed to give the committee the benefit of all doubts. I assume there are certain reasons which are motivating them, and which they will be able to state to the Senate and to the country when the time comes for that to be said, but I do not want to assume the obligation or attempt the burden of explaining what I do not understand or know.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions I have offered be printed in the RECORD, together with those offered by the Senator from Maryland.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. They will be printed, under the rule.

Mr. LUCAS. My request is that they be printed in the RECORD.

The resolutions submitted by Mr. LUCAS were ordered to lie over 1 day

under the rule, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Executive Resolution 1

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service be, and it is hereby, discharged from the further consideration of the nomination of Roy M. Martin, to be postmaster at Springerton, Ill.

Senate Executive Resolution 2

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service be, and it is hereby, discharged from the further consideration of the nomination of Guy E. Midget, to be postmaster at Pittsburg, Ill.

Senate Executive Resolution 3

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service be, and it is hereby, discharged from the further consideration of the nomination of Frank R. Johnson, to be postmaster at Genesee, Ill.

Senate Executive Resolution 4

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service be, and it is hereby, discharged from the further consideration of the nomination of William P. Hohs, to be postmaster at Skokie, Ill.

Senate Executive Resolution 5

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service be, and it is hereby, discharged from the further consideration of the nomination of Leland Adams, to be postmaster at Dieterich, Ill.

Senate Executive Resolution 6

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service be, and it is hereby, discharged from the further consideration of the nomination of LaVerne E. King, to be postmaster at Ashkum, Ill.

Senate Executive Resolution 7

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service be, and it is hereby, discharged from the further consideration of the nomination of Marvin Randall, to be postmaster at Forsyth, Ill.

Senate Executive Resolution 8

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service be, and it is hereby, discharged from the further consideration of the nomination of Charles H. Lawler, to be postmaster at Cortland, Ill.

Senate Executive Resolution 9

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service be, and it is hereby, discharged from the further consideration of the nomination of James H. Randolph, to be postmaster at Beason, Ill.

Senate Executive Resolution 10

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service be, and it is hereby, discharged from the further consideration of the nomination of Ray P. Callery, to be postmaster at Princeville, Ill.

Senate Executive Resolution 11

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service be, and it is hereby, discharged from the further consideration of the nomination of Mary E. McCarl, to be postmaster at Kinderhook, Ill.

Senate Executive Resolution 12

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service be, and it is hereby, discharged from the further consideration of the nomination of Eva S. Hoe, to be postmaster at Niantic, Ill.

Senate Executive Resolution 13

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service be, and it is hereby, discharged from the further consideration of the nomination of Charles J. Murphy, to be postmaster at Oak Park, Ill.

Senate Executive Resolution 14

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service be, and it is hereby, discharged from the further consideration of the nomination of George A. Brown, to be postmaster at Mahomet, Ill.

Senate Executive Resolution 15

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service be, and it is hereby, discharged from the further consideration of the nomination of Harry M. Ostrander, to be postmaster at Harmon, Ill.

Senate Executive Resolution 16

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service be, and it is hereby, discharged from the further consideration of the nomination of Joseph H. Pulcher, to be postmaster at East Carondelet, Ill.

Senate Executive Resolution 17

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service be, and it is hereby, discharged from the further consideration of the nomination of Ted Bauer, to be postmaster at Benton, Ill.

Senate Executive Resolution 18

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service be, and it is hereby, discharged from the further consideration of the nomination of Irwin C. Stoltz, to be postmaster at Bellmont, Ill.

Senate Executive Resolution 19

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service be, and it is hereby, discharged from the further consideration of the nomination of Waldo M. Hennings, to be postmaster at Wayne, Ill.

Senate Executive Resolution 20

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service be, and it is hereby, discharged from the further consideration of the nomination of Winifred Hughes, to be postmaster at Broughton, Ill.

Senate Executive Resolution 21

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service be, and it is hereby, discharged from the further consideration of the nomination of Oscar Hayward Holman, to be postmaster at Geff, Ill.

Senate Executive Resolution 22

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service be, and it is hereby, discharged from the further consideration of the nomination of Joseph J. Smaron, to be postmaster at Posen, Ill.

Senate Executive Resolution 23

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service be, and it is hereby, discharged from the further consideration of the nomination of Harold E. Hohenstein, to be postmaster at Mount Auburn, Ill.

Senate Executive Resolution 24

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service be, and it is hereby, discharged from the further consideration of the nomination of John G. Robben to be postmaster at Germantown, Ill.

Senate Executive Resolution 25

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service be, and it is hereby, discharged from the further consideration of the nomination of Jesse B. Thacker to be postmaster at Butler, Ill.

Senate Executive Resolution 26

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service be, and it is hereby, discharged from the further consideration of the nomination of Lincoln A. Hardeastle to be postmaster at Royalton, Ill.

Senate Executive Resolution 27

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service be, and it is hereby, discharged from the further consideration of the nomination of Gerald L. Hamer, to be postmaster at Olivet, Ill.

Senate Executive Resolution 28

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service be, and it is hereby, discharged from the further consideration of the nomination of Herbert M. Bowman, to be postmaster at Thompsonville, Ill.

Senate Executive Resolution 29

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service be, and it is hereby, discharged from the further consideration of the nomination of Donald R. Toberman, to be postmaster at Coffeen, Ill.

Senate Executive Resolution 30

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service be, and it is hereby, discharged from the further consideration of the nomination of James A. Giesler, to be postmaster at Cisco, Ill.

Senate Executive Resolution 31

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service be, and it is hereby, discharged from the further consideration of the nomination of Francis L. Weghorst, to be postmaster at South Pekin, Ill.

Senate Executive Resolution 32

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service be, and it is hereby, discharged from the further consideration of the nomination of Orville L. Glasford, to be postmaster at Trivoli, Ill.

Senate Executive Resolution 33

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service be, and it is hereby, discharged from the further consideration of the nomination of Pauline M. Hutchison, to be postmaster at Shirley, Ill.

Senate Executive Resolution 34

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service be, and it is hereby, discharged from the further consideration of the nomination of James P. McGannon, to be postmaster at Flora, Ill.

Senate Executive Resolution 35

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service be, and it is hereby, discharged from the further consideration of the nomination of Ada J. Ulrich to be postmaster at Thomasboro, Ill.

Senate Executive Resolution 36

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service be, and it is hereby, discharged from the further consideration of the nomination of Mabel H. Green to be postmaster at Alvin, Ill.

Senate Executive Resolution 37

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service be, and it is hereby, discharged from the further consideration of the nomination of Margaret Carlson to be postmaster at Bureau, Ill.

The resolutions submitted by Mr. TYDINGS were ordered to lie over 1 day under the rule, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Executive Resolution 38

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service be, and it is hereby, discharged from the further consideration of the nomination of Edward P. Harris, to be postmaster at Snow Hill, Md.

Senate Executive Resolution 39

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service be, and it is hereby, discharged from the further consideration of the nomination of Alice A. Keilner, to be postmaster at White Marsh, Md.

Senate Executive Resolution 40

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service be, and it is hereby, discharged from the further consideration of the nomination of Milton T. Holt, to be postmaster at Brandywine, Md.

Senate Executive Resolution 41

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service be, and it is hereby, discharged from the further consideration of the nomination of Vera M. Gordon, to be postmaster at Fork, Md.

Senate Executive Resolution 42

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service be, and it is hereby, discharged from the further consideration of the nomination of Cora L. Sappington, to be postmaster at Keymar, Md.

Senate Executive Resolution 43

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service be, and it is hereby, discharged from the further consideration of the nomination of Gertrude S. Chapman, to be postmaster at Lanham, Md.

Senate Executive Resolution 44

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service be, and it is hereby, discharged from the further consideration of the nomination of William E. Spoerlein, to be postmaster at Oakland, Md.

Senate Executive Resolution 45

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service be, and it is hereby, discharged from the further consideration of the nomination of Anita G. Swann, to be postmaster at Piney Point, Md.

Senate Executive Resolution 46

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service be, and it is hereby, discharged from the further consideration of the nomination of John T. Smullin, Jr., to be postmaster at Pocomoke City, Md.

Senate Executive Resolution 47

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service be, and it is hereby, discharged from the further consideration of the nomination of Cosette I. Hopkins, to be postmaster at Tyaskin, Md.

Senate Executive Resolution 48

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service be, and it is hereby, discharged from

the further consideration of the nomination of Grace H. Hudson, to be postmaster at Bishop, Md.

Senate Executive Resolution 49

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service be, and it is hereby, discharged from the further consideration of the nomination of Harry R. Ringler, to be postmaster at Bishopville, Md.

Senate Executive Resolution 50

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service be, and it is hereby, discharged from the further consideration of the nomination of Mary R. Schmidt, to be postmaster at Eccleston, Md.

Senate Executive Resolution 51

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service be, and it is hereby, discharged from the further consideration of the nomination of Cornelia W. Hickman, to be postmaster at Point of Rocks, Md.

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

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I have a great deal of respect as well as friendship for the able leader of the other side, the Senator from Maine, but several Senators on this side feel rather keenly about this matter. We tried to have the nominations reported, but have not been able to do so. It is a duty that we owe to the men whom we represent to try to exert every legislative and parliamentary effort to have the nominations considered, and so I hope the majority leader will not take any offense at what I am about to do. I move that the Senate, in executive session, now recess until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me for a moment I think probably the Senator from Maine would feel compelled to suggest the absence of a quorum, in that event, and I am going to ask the Senator from Maryland to withdraw the motion.

Mr. TYDINGS. No; I may say to my friend from Maine that the Senator from Illinois and I have been waiting for a month to get an opportunity, in executive session, to bring up these matters.

Mr. WHITE. Yes, Mr. President, that may be so; but the fact remains that the Senator from Maryland and the Senator from Illinois have found the occasion when the chairman of the committee was absent, when he had given notice that he was to be absent; and the Senators choose that time to bring it onto the floor of the Senate and to suggest certain procedure.

Mr. President, it is a small, trivial matter, who makes the motion to recess. I submit that I had the floor, that I was about to make the motion to recess; and I thought I was doing a courteous thing when I yielded to the Senator from Illinois. I now find myself in a position where the Senators on the other side propose to take charge and to make motions. I do not like it.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maine yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I may say to the Senator from Maine that I think if he will reflect a minute, he will concede that the position he takes is not altogether fair. Certainly, the Senator moved the various motions that were made, to handle and to expedite consideration of the Executive Calendar. We did not interrupt him. But then, if the Senator had kept the floor through all this, and had moved to adjourn, what he is saying in effect is that we, who wanted to transact business in executive session, should not have interfered with his making a motion to recess. That is untenable. Certainly we are Senators and we have got a right to rise and make any motions we see fit, before a recess is taken.

Mr. WHITE. I agree to that.

Mr. TYDINGS. And certainly I think we are duty-bound, in view of the long delay on the part of the Committee on Civil Service, headed by the able Senator from North Dakota, who has unwittingly perhaps punished certain veterans, some of whom were wounded, some of whom are entitled to the offices, from getting the bread they need to feed their wives and children. We are entitled to bring this matter to the attention of the Senate and have a show-down; and I think that is a superior right to any absenteeism that might be offered as a counter-right.

Mr. WHITE. I agree with the Senator as to the right of the veterans to have their cases passed upon; but I challenge the consideration and the courtesy of Senators on the other side, to whom I yielded the floor in courtesy, and then find that I have lost the right, which was mine while I had the floor, to make the motion.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President—

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I wish to say—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland will kindly allow the Senator from Maine to proceed.

Mr. TYDINGS. May I ask the Senator—

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

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TYDINGS. Has the Senator from Maryland the right to address the Chair and ask the Senator from Maine to yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland has that right, but the Senator from Maine has clearly shown that he is not yielding. The Senator from Maine has the floor and will proceed.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine will proceed.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine will proceed. The Senator from Maine has the floor and will proceed.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I decline to yield at the moment. I do want to say that I do not like the course of conduct followed here at this late hour this afternoon. It makes no really substantial difference whether the Senate re-

cesses on the motion of the Senator from Maryland or on my motion. I shall not raise the point of no quorum, and I am not going to adopt any dilatory tactics, which can only inconvenience other Senators.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator now yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I was trying to have the Senator yield to me to say to him that I thought it was unfortunate that he took our motions as any personal affront to him, but may I say that so high is my regard for him and so deep is my confidence in his innate justice, that I am going to withdraw my motion and trust to the fairness of the majority leader to see that we be given a proper chance to air this matter in the next executive session that is held, whether the Senator from North Dakota, the chairman of the Civil Service Committee, be present or absent. We owe it to these veterans and others on the list of those who have been nominated and whose nominations have been before the committee for 3 or 4 months, to give them their day in court without further delay.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, the Senator has passed up to me a proposition with respect to which I cannot make an answer with any authority. I cannot tell what the committee will do. I do not know what the committee will do. I know what I would do if the responsibility were mine, and mine alone, and I have indicated that to the Senator.

Now, if I may, I am going to return courtesy for courtesy, and ask the Senator from Maryland to make his motion to recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President—

Mr. WHITE. I hope it will not be coupled with embarrassing conditions, however.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President—

Mr. TYDINGS. I hope the Chair will recognize me next.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, let me say a word in conclusion.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HATCH. Who has the floor?

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

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, let me say in conclusion of the debate that this is the first time in my experience as a Member of Congress that I have filed a motion to discharge a committee from further consideration of legislative measures or nominations submitted by the Chief Executive. I filed the motions with great reluctance. I had hoped that some constructive action in accordance with fairness and justice would come from the Committee on Civil Service of the United States Senate, but as days dragged along and even extended into months, and no action was being taken to relieve these veterans and other worthy citizens of various communities in every State in America, I felt, as a United States Senator from Illinois, that it was my bounden duty to secure action by taking the procedure which is allowed a Senator under the rules of this body.

Mr. President, I propose to follow through on this matter. The opposition can term my actions anything they please. I know whereof I speak on this question. I know that I am right and that someone else is wrong. When I have deep-seated convictions upon such a question as this, I do my utmost to help those who are in distress because of political reasons for which they are not responsible. It may be called a political discussion, if anyone wants to call it such, but as I said previously, we have waited a long time to see whether or not those who are really playing politics with the post offices of this country in violation of the civil-service rules laid down by the Congress would finally yield to the right. I think the motions filed comprise our only remedy.

Mr. President, I wish to say to my good friend the Senator from Maine that I regret he has been here alone representing his side of the aisle and shoudering the responsibility that is his as majority leader. There is no man in the Senate on either side of the aisle for whom I have a deeper affection than I do for the Senator from Maine. But I do not keep track of which Senator leaves the Senate Chamber and which Senator remains. I did not know that the Senator from North Dakota was out of town. It would not have made any difference had I known it, because this was the first opportunity to present the case in executive session, and it was the only time I could do so. I looked up the rules carefully and examined into the matter thoroughly before I made the motions to discharge the committee with respect to these various nominations. I do not know when we will have another executive session. The majority can control whether or not we shall have another one. It has been days since we have had one, and it might be weeks before we have another executive session. But this matter is now before the United States Senate, and we are going to talk about it tomorrow and the next day and the next day until these nominees, these veterans, are given their just deserts. That, Mr. President, is no threat. It is no idle promise. We are going to have a show-down on this matter. That is all I have to say.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I did not call attention to it, but a motion to recess, I believe, is not debatable, and the occupant of the chair, who was very zealous in carrying out his duties, overlooked the fact that no Senator had the right to speak when the motion was pending.

Mr. President, I rose to say to my good friend and colleague from Maine that I appreciate his generosity in giving me the authority, so-called, to act for the Senate in making the motion but I could not do so as long as he is in the Chamber. No leader in either party could have better intentions of doing the fair and the right and the proper thing under any and all circumstances that he, and I think I would be a small imitation of his greatness and fineness and generosity if I were to accept his offer to make the motion, and I return the accolade to him with genuine affection.

Mr. WHITE. May I say just a word before I make the motion?

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

Mr. WHITE. I ask the Senator not to make a point of order.

Mr. LUCAS. I am not going to make a point of order. I merely wish to say that I am glad that the Senator from Maine is getting over on this side of the aisle. [Laughter.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let the RECORD show that the Senator from Maine has returned to the other side of the aisle.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I wish to say to Senators that the kindly things they have said about me personally, and which have distinguished their attitude during the entire time I have been here, amply repay me and atone for any moments of embarrassment I have suffered this afternoon.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I do not wish to let this occasion pass without making a brief observation. I have not joined in the general compliments to the Senator from Maine, and have not said a word. However, I wish to add that everything that has been said about his fine spirit of leadership and his spirit as a Senator and gentleman meets with my full and complete accord. I wish I could add something that would really give the Senator the praise to which he is fairly and justly entitled.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I repeat with added emphasis all I said a moment ago in expression of my gratitude and appreciation for the kindly things Senators have always said and the courtesies which they have always shown me.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the pleasure of the Senate?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, if we have reached an understanding, I move, as in legislative session, that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, May 15, 1947, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 14 (legislative day of May 21), 1947:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Robert A. Lovett, of New York, to be Under Secretary of State, vice Dean G. Acheson, resigned.

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND

Andrew N. Overby, of New York, to be United States Executive Director of the International Monetary Fund for a term of 2 years and until his successor has been appointed, vice Harry D. White, resigned.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 14 (legislative day of April 21), 1947:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Stanton Griffis to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Poland.

George R. Merrell to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Ethiopia.

TO BE CONSULS GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Edwin A. Plitt
Charles H. Derry

TO BE CONSULS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Richard D. Gatewood John Frémont Melby
Douglas Jenkins, Jr. Bolard More
John D. Jernegan Miss Katherine E.
J. Jefferson Jones 3d O'Connor
Charles R. Burrows J. Graham Parsons
William F. Busser Halleck L. Rose
Robert P. Chalker Fred K. Salter
Gilon Curtis, Jr. William P. Snow
Philip M. Davenport David A. Thomasson
Miss Constance R. Harvey

TO BE A FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER OF CLASS 3, CONSUL, AND A SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Albert E. Clattenburg, Jr.

TO BE FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF CLASS 3

William K. Allshie Douglas MacArthur 2d
E. Tomlin Bailey Elbert G. Mathews
Ralph J. Blake Gordon H. Mattison
Carl H. Boehringer Brewster H. Morris
Niles W. Bond Robert Newbegin
Charles R. Burrows J. Graham Parsons
Richard W. Byrd Marselis C. Parsons,
John Willard Carrigan Jr.
Norris B. Chipman G. Frederick Reinhardt
Walter C. Dowling Arthur L. Richards
John K. Emmerson Livingston Satter-
thwaite
Andrew B. Foster George F. Scherer
Norris S. Haseltone Donald W. Smith
L. Randolph Higgs William P. Snow
Outerbridge Horsey John D. Jernegan
U. Alexis Johnson Philip D. Sprouse
George Lewis Jones Carl W. Strom
Jr. Clare H. Timberlake
E. Allan Lightner, Jr. Ivan B. White
Evan M. Wilson

TO BE A FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER OF CLASS 3, A CONSUL, AND A SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

William Bruce Lockling

TO BE FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF CLASS 4, CONSUL, AND A SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Clarence Boonstra Hugh D. Farley
Willard O. Brown John C. Payne
Joseph L. Dougherty Edward J. Rowell

TO BE FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF CLASS 5, VICE CONSULS OF CAREER, AND SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Wymberley DeR. Coerr
Charles Robert Moore
H. André Weismann

TO BE FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF CLASS 6, VICE CONSULS OF CAREER, AND SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Arthur B. Allen John Calvin Hill, Jr.
John A. Armitage Elmer C. Hulen
Denis A. Baumhover John A. McKesson III
William B. Cobb, Jr. Paul M. Miller
Richard T. Davies Miss Susannah Mirick
Lambert John B. Frank Poe, Jr.
Eichner, Jr. Wells Stabler
Baird E. Emmons

TO BE FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF CLASS 1

Paul H. Alling David McK. Key
Charles E. Bohlen Edward B. Lawson
William W. Butter- Warwick Perkins
worth, Jr. Edwin A. Plitt
John M. Cabot Karl L. Rankin
Paul C. Daniels James W. Riddleberger
Howard Donovan

TO BE FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF CLASS 2

Theodore C. Achilles Homer M. Byington,
John M. Allison Jr.
H. Merrill Benninghoff Cavendish W. Cannon
James C. H. Bonbright Vinton Chapin
Philip W. Bonsal Warren M. Chase
John H. Bruins Oliver Edmund Clubb

TO BE CONSULS GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

William P. Cochran, Jr.
Robert D. Coe
Gerald A. Drew
Everett F. Drumright
Elbridge Durbrow
Walton C. Ferris
Raymond A. Hare
Cloyce K. Huston
Gerald Keith
John B. Ketcham
Charles F. Knox, Jr.
Foy D. Kohler

TO BE FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF CLASS 4

Charles W. Adair, Jr. J. Jefferson Jones 3d

H. Gardner Ainsworth M. Gordon Knox

John H. Burns William L. Krieg

Donald B. Calder Sidney K. Lafoon

V. Lansing Collins, Jr. Donald W. Lamm

Leonard J. Cromie Robert H. McBride

Richard H. Davis David H. McKillop

Irvin M. Eitrem John M. McSweeney

Robert S. Folsom Albert E. Pappano

Edward L. Freers Milton C. Rewinkel

Paul E. Geier Stuart W. Rockwell

Lewis E. Gleck, Jr. William Langdon

Richard E. Gnade Sands

Caspar D. Green Bromley K. Smith

Franklin Hawley Henry T. Smith

Martin J. Hillenbrand John W. Tuthill

John P. Hoover J. Kittredge Vinson

John Evarts Horner William W. Walker

Richard A. Johnson Fraser Wilkins

TO BE FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF CLASS 5

Alvin M. Bentley Charles E. Hulick, Jr.

Donald C. Bergus Armistead M. Lee

W. Wendell Blancké George T. Lister

Thomas D. Bowie Rupert A. Lloyd

Howard Brandon Albert K. Ludly, Jr.

Herbert D. Brewster LaRue R. Lutkins

William C. Burdett, Jr. James G. McCargar

George Carnahan Cleveland B. McKnight

David P. Coffin James L. O'Sullivan

A. John Cope, Jr. Henry L. Pitts, Jr.

Robert F. Corrigan Randolph Roberts

Forrest N. Daggett Ralph A. Schweitzer

Robert J. Dorr Cabot Sedgwick

Donald A. Dumont Richard M. Service

John F. Fitzgerald Robert M. Sheehan

William J. Ford Harold Sims

Douglas N. Forman, Jr. J. Ramon Solana

David L. Gamon Herbert D. Spivack

Michael R. Gannett Norman C. Stines, Jr.

William C. George Weldon Litsey

Charles C. Gidney, Jr. Richard E. Usher

Thomas A. Goldman Sheldon B. Vance

Marshall Green Edward L. Waggoner

Joseph N. Greene, Jr. Harvey R. Wellman

J. Brock Havron George M. Widney

Douglas Henderson William A. Wieland

J. William Henry

TO BE FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF CLASS 6, VICE CONSULS OF CAREER, AND SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

William M. Bates Bruce M. Lancaster

Robert O. Blake Miss Constance Mc-

Philip J. Halla Cready

Raymond J. Harris John B. McGrath

Robert S. Henderson James D. Newton

Peter Hooper, Jr. Kenedon P. Steins

Warren A. Kelsey

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

William E. Warne to be Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

CALIFORNIA DEBRIS COMMISSION

Col. Samuel N. Karrick to be a member, California Debris Commission.

ATTORNEY GENERAL OF PUERTO RICO

Luis Negron Fernandez to be Attorney General of Puerto Rico.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Owen McIntosh Burns to be United States attorney for the western district of Pennsylvania.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Otto F. Heine to be a United States marshal for the district of Hawaii.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MAY 14, 1947

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O King Eternal, as we come to our duties, take our thoughts, our motives, and our labors, that we may continue them with Thy blessed approval. At times we desire to do that which is beyond our strength; be gracious to accept the wish when we fail to do the deed. Let us feel Thy great mercy stirring the depths of our souls in closer dedication to our God and our country.

Do Thou endow us plenteously with those gifts which enlighten the mind, that we may realize that the world has no lasting honors for those who seek only self, while those who interpret their surplus as another's need will awake to find themselves immortal. Dear Lord, human hearts are failing, but in Thy sight no life is common or worthless; so bless us with the inspiration of hope and with a sense of dignity, that we may be real and abiding contributions to the moral and spiritual forces of our land.

Through Christ our Saviour. Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On April 16, 1947:

H. R. 1943. An act to establish a permanent Nurse Corps of the Army and the Navy and to establish a Women's Medical Specialist Corps in the Army.

On April 25, 1947:

H. R. 731. An act to establish the Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park; to erect a monument in memory of Theodore Roosevelt in the village of Medora, N. Dak., and for other purposes.

On April 29, 1947:

H. R. 2404. An act to suspend certain import taxes on copper.

On May 1, 1947:

H. R. 2849. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, 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. 3020. An act to prescribe fair and equitable rules of conduct to be observed by labor and management in their relations with one another which affect commerce, to protect the rights of individual workers in their relations with labor organizations whose activities affect commerce, to recognize the paramount public interest in labor disputes affecting commerce that endanger the public health, safety, or welfare, 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. TAFT, Mr. BALL, Mr. IVES, Mr. MURRAY, and Mr. ELLENDER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from a Wilmington, Del., newspaper.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a signed editorial appearing in the Chicago Daily News by John S. Knight on the subject Curb on Reckless Spending Requires Public Support.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I have a special order for Monday next, but that being the day set aside for memorial services I ask unanimous consent that I may have this same special order on Wednesday.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of 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 New York?

There was no objection.

PILGRIMAGE FOR GOLD STAR MOTHERS, SISTERS, AND WIVES OF DECEASED SERVICEMEN

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, President Truman recently called for approval of the provisions of the Gold Star pilgrimage bill which I introduced in the House in January 1945 and which I am once again proposing to Congress.

The Hall measure reads as follows:

A bill to provide for pilgrimages of Gold Star mothers, sisters, and wives to the graves of their sons, brothers, and husbands who died in the service of the armed forces of the United States during World War II and who are buried in foreign lands

Be it enacted, etc., That there are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to enable the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, under such regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for, as soon as possible, and to pay the necessary expenses of, pilgrimages of mothers, sisters, and wives of servicemen who died during World War II

and were buried in foreign lands, to their sons', brothers', and husbands' graves.

Every Gold Star mother, sister, and wife of the recent war should be given the chance to visit the grave of her loved one if it is at all practicable and possible.

The practice of bringing home remains of veterans who fell in battle is now being followed to some extent in accordance with the wishes of the individual family. But most people seem to prefer that graves of the fallen be left unopened. Many would rather the sorrow brought on by death be locked within the mound of earth on that far-off shore instead of renewing its pangs by the return of mortal clay.

It is logical and natural that those nearest and dearest to the deceased should want to make a pilgrimage to the place, however remote, yet hallowed, where he fell fighting for his flag and his country.

After the First World War, several thousand Gold Star Mothers visited their sons' graves in France at Uncle Sam's expense. They set the precedent which ought to be observed at the present. I hope Congress will not hesitate in providing funds and the authority with which to make similar pilgrimages possible in the near future.

I feel sure that all veterans' organizations in America, along with their auxiliaries, will be strongly in favor of the plan as outlined in my bill. The Gold Star mothers, sisters, and wives ought to be considered and included in any mass pilgrimage which finally takes place.

How soon action is to be forthcoming in this regard will depend upon the sincerity of all who give lip service to the relatives of these dead heroes. Let us, then, arouse ourselves to our duty. The Hall bill provides for these pilgrimages of Gold Star mothers and sisters and wives to the graves of their closest ones, who died in service during World War II, and are now buried in foreign lands. There should be no delay in our making such a measure the law of the land.

LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS ACT, 1947

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3020) to prescribe fair and equitable rules of conduct to be observed by labor and management in their relations with one another which affect commerce, to protect the rights of individual workers in their relations with labor organizations whose activities affect commerce, to recognize the paramount public interest in labor disputes affecting commerce that endanger the public health, safety, or welfare, and for other purposes, with Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment 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 New Jersey? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. HARTLEY, LANDIS, HOFFMAN, LESINSKI, and BARDEEN.

FOREIGN RELIEF

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, the fact that under House Joint Resolution 134, the so-called foreign relief bill, the United States undertakes relief to Italy and Hungary, while under the proposed peace treaties Italy is to pay Russia \$100,000,000 in war reparations, and Hungary is to pay Russia \$200,000,000 for the same cause, is anomalous and inconsistent to a great many American people. While Italy will not begin payments, as I understand it, until 2 years after the treaty, Hungary is already charged with that obligation, and it was freely said in the hearings that Hungary would not need relief if she did not have to pay reparations.

It seems to me that this difficulty could be obviated if President Truman, in exercise of the powers vested in him by the Lend Lease Act, negotiate with Russia for an assignment of these war damage claims against Hungary and Italy, for which we in return would give her credit on the \$11,000,000,000 she owes us. We could then cancel these obligations against Italy and Hungary, which would do more for European recovery and good will than almost any other thing we could do.

We could even go further and do the same with the \$300,000,000 proposed as war damages to Russia by both Finland and Rumania. In fact, there is no reason why we could not carry this to other countries faced with payment of war reparations to Russia, in each instance giving Russia the credit on her indebtedness to us under lend-lease, and canceling the obligation of the debtor nations. This would, of course, not directly interfere with either House Joint Resolution 134 or the peace treaties.

Russia could not complain, and there is no reason why the President should not undertake negotiations to accomplish what seems to me is one of the biggest steps toward peaceful relations in Europe and world peace.

MEMORIAL SERVICES FOR DECEASED MEMBERS

Mr. BISHOP. 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. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Memorials, I take this time to advise the Members of the House that all necessary arrangements have been made for the annual memorial services to be held next Monday, May 19. The families of our deceased Members who passed on during the past year have been invited, and many of them, no doubt, will be here. We should make every effort to be here next Monday, just before noon. It is a mark of respect we owe to our deceased colleagues.

The memorial addresses will be delivered by the distinguished gentleman

from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] and the distinguished gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD]. The distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. TIBBOTT] will sing two selections during the services. The music will be furnished by the United States Marine Corps orchestra.

AID TO KOREA

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, when I came into the Chamber I noticed that one of the Democratic Members of Congress was reading this newspaper carrying the caption "Truman asks \$200,000,000 for Korea" in big headlines. Now, you know that Mr. Truman asked for \$300,000,000 for Greece; Mr. Truman asked for \$100,000,000 for Turkey, and he is asking for millions and millions for various countries of the world. This administration is at home asking Congress to appropriate the great, large gifts. If you pick up the statement issued by the Treasury Department you will notice that on May 9 we were \$275,639,000,000, and many more dollars, in the red. This administration has always been in the red. We have been in the red so long that since the New Deal came into power we have increased our national indebtedness over 1,200 percent. Think of such an increase. Oh, it is terrible. Now you are coming in here with appropriation bills asking the Congress to cut down our home appropriations—and rightfully so. We should cut down these appropriations everywhere we possibly can at home, but how can you cut down your own people when you are asked to give millions and hundreds of millions to every country in the world? It does not make sense. This morning the United States News says that Britain is going to ask for another loan for Great Britain in 1948. Do you fellows not know that you gave Great Britain \$4,400,000,000 last year? That is enough. Now they want another loan in 1948. So, if you give any more money to those fellows to socialize Great Britain, you are just simply nuts. That is all it is. We must economize or bust. We will wreck our country unless we can balance our budget. Think of increasing our debt over 1,200 percent. That is what you have done in 14 years. You were elected to economize—the majority of you. Let us do it. Again, I tell you 10 pennies make a dime and 10 dimes make a dollar. Let us squeeze the eagle and make him holler. Be wise and economize.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COLE of Missouri asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include an article appearing in the American Bar Association Journal by John R. Nicholson of the Chicago bar entitled "Pensions for Partners: Tax Laws Are Unfair to Lawyers and Firms."

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

Record and include a report of Policy Committee to members of the Rochester United Nations Association.

CONDITIONS AT IWO JIMA

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, this morning I received a letter from a young friend of mine currently stationed on Iwo Jima. At this time when committees of the Congress are considering merger of the armed forces, appropriations therefor, and huge gifts for the relief of destitution, the following excerpts from this young man's letter seem to me to be particularly pertinent:

1. The Air Force is in very bad shape, both as regards equipment and maintenance. Also, it makes a very poor job of running, or trying to run, as a separate unit. It has neither the quantity or quality of personnel to do two jobs—the work of the air corps and the ground forces. It has to call on other branches such as Engineers, Ordnance, Signal Corps, etc.

2. The dependent housing situation is bad. Many officers are leaving the service because they cannot bring their families overseas. It has caused a distinct lowering of morale even among Regular Army. They were promised housing within 3 months and even after 6 months' duty there is no prospect of obtaining it. On a place like this they could have all the houses they need in 1 month. There are literally hundreds of quonsets which require only minor repairs, which could be utilized.

3. The civilians (excluding the teachers) have not been utilized fully or properly. Many of them are having a vacation at a high salary, but it is not their fault. They were sent here as instructors and supervisors of equipment, maintenance, etc., but they are not being used for that purpose. One Diesel mechanic, who lives with me, has not done 2 hours' work in the 2 months he has been here. He wants to work, but there is nothing for him to do.

4. There seems to be some animosity between Air Forces and Ground Forces, between Army and Navy. I hope the merger will allay some of this feeling.

5. The waste of equipment is shocking. Lately, it seems, they are beginning to do something about it, taking inventory and shipping it to China, Korea, etc., but for months very valuable material has lain exposed to the elements and "cannibalized" by scroungers. As a taxpayer, it hurts. * * * My over-all reaction is that somebody had better "get on the ball" and do something to bring the Army to some degree of discipline and efficiency.

BIPARTISAN FOREIGN POLICY

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, the controlling factor motivating the vote of many on the bill for aid to Greece and Turkey was the fact that the President had announced to the world that we would come to the aid of these countries in the struggle which they faced to pre-

vent being submerged by outside pressures. It was felt that to defeat this measure would be a repudiation, not of the President, but of our own position of world leadership, and that such action would be construed as an indication that we are a divided nation and would furnish an invitation to further aggressive and expansionist tactics.

I, for one, and I know I speak for many of like mind on this side of the aisle, strongly endorse our pursuit of a bipartisan foreign policy. We earnestly desire, in complete good faith, to subordinate partisanship completely over this crucial issue which will determine the entire future of our country and, perhaps, our survival as a Nation and a people.

With the utmost deference and respect, therefore, I call to the President's attention the fact that bipartisanship is a two-way street. Our policy, to be effective, must be bipartisan in its conception, as well as its execution.

Every effort should be made to call on the legislative team of both political parties frequently and sincerely in the formulation of our foreign policy. It is disturbing to have loose talk going about by those in high authority regarding \$5,000,000,000 loans to other foreign countries until such a program has been discussed and approved in substance by at least the leadership of both parties.

This is a warning, issued in the friendliest spirit and the most sincere desire to keep foreign policy on the high level which it has recently enjoyed. The Congress does not wish to be presented with any further fait accompli. If that happens again, the comparatively clear sailing which the Greece-Turkey aid bill enjoyed may not be repeated.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the New York Times.

Mr. GARY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial which appeared in the Richmond (Va.) Times-Dispatch on April 28, 1947, entitled "Expensive Penny-Pinching in Washington."

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and in each to include editorial comment.

Mr. LUCAS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a telegram he received from Allen Rubottom, manager of the municipal airport at Fort Worth, Tex.

Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two newspaper articles.

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

OUR AIRPORT PROGRAM MUST BE CARRIED OUT—PROPOSED REDUCTIONS IN APPROPRIATIONS, IF EFFECTED, WILL RETARD IT

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a telegram from

the mayor of Chicago and also a telegram from the city council of Chicago.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago in the city of Chicago we were fortunate in electing as mayor one of our foremost citizens, a splendid, efficient and experienced businessman, and an economy-minded executive. I refer to Hon. Martin H. Kennelly who succeeded Mayor Edward J. Kelly under whose 14 years of splendid and efficient administration many improvements and betterments were made to our city which time will not permit me to enumerate, yet I cannot resist in calling attention briefly to the construction during Mayor Kelly's regime of many new schools, the demolishing and rehabilitation of many blighted districts upon which many splendid housing projects have been erected, the building of our subway, the construction of one of the country's largest airports, the beautifying and enlargements of our parks, and the widening and construction of over 100 miles of connecting boulevards. It is gratifying that he has been succeeded by a man of the capacity of Mayor Kennelly who, I know, will set an example to the mayors of other cities as to how a municipal government can and should be administered in the interest of its people and taxpayers. Mayor Kennelly was elected by an overwhelming majority of 274,000 votes and this notwithstanding that the Republican National Committee, and the city, county, and State committees, made the municipal election a national issue. I know that he will have the cooperation of all our outstanding businessmen as well as laboring men who have displayed, and justly so, their confidence in him.

Mayor Kennelly will not only follow in the footsteps of such former Democratic mayors as the old and young Carter H. Harrisons, each of whom served five terms; Mayor Dunne; Mayor Dever; Mayor Cermak; and Mayor Kelly, in all of whose administrations the people were efficiently served as compared with the administration of former Republican Mayor Thompson, but he has the interest and welfare not only of his city but that of the Nation at heart, as is evidenced by a telegram which he has addressed to me and to other Members from Chicago, wherein he urges sufficient and proper appropriations in carrying out our Federal airport program. The telegram speaks for itself, and I insert it at this point as part of my remarks:

CHICAGO, ILL., May 12, 1947.

Hon. ADOLPH J. SABATH,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.:

Washington, D. C.:

Reference to House Appropriations Committee eliminating all funds for Civil Aeronautics Administration operation of traffic-control towers and reduction in the amount of money to be allotted for building new airports. Control-tower operations is proper function of Government. Such a move would doubtless create improper control conditions throughout the Nation. Reduction of aid in building airports will defeat entire airport program. Amounts now appropriated and authorized are woefully inadequate to effect purpose of Federal Airport Act. Without Government aid increased rather than dimin-

ished, Chicago's Douglas Airport cannot proceed, although it is of vital importance to the continuation of interstate and international traffic and to military operations in case of national emergency.

MARTIN H. KENNELLY,
Mayor of Chicago.

Mr. Speaker, I subscribe to Mayor Kennelly's request for the appropriation of these funds and in the carrying out of the program initiated under the Federal Airport Act and appeal to the fair-minded Members of this House to vote for the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], to increase the appropriation for Civil Aeronautics Administration to \$70,982,000.

I have also received a request from the members of the Common Council of the City of Chicago protesting these proposed cuts and a telegram from the chairman of the aviation committee, of the Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry, which I insert as part of my remarks. It reads as follows:

CHICAGO, ILL., May 13, 1947.
Hon. ADOLPH J. SABATH,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Current attempt in H. R. 3311 to curtail appropriations by eliminating from Civil Aeronautics Administration appropriations the Federal operation of airport control towers is believed by our aviation committee to be inadvisable as without such Federal control each city having important airports might otherwise operate arbitrarily with great probability of serious confusion to pilots of scheduled airlines and danger to traveling public at a time when new era of safety can be foreseen through operation of ground control approach system and instrument landing system which also must be under Federal control for obvious reasons.

Respectfully submitted.

ERWIN SEAGO,
Chairman, Aviation Committee, the
Chicago Association of Commerce
and Industry.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that these telegrams attest to the vital interest of the people of the Chicago area in this subject legislation and it is my belief that besides these proposed unfair cuts that there are other unjustifiable reductions recommended by the committee which conditions do not warrant. I believe in economy but not a false economy that would jeopardize the lives of thousands of air passengers and I sincerely hope that the amendment of the gentleman from New York will be adopted.

MAKE SOCIAL SECURITY A FACT AND NOT A FICTION

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, in the name of humanity and national security, we have spent billions of dollars for the relief of people in other lands while neglecting the needs of our own citizens.

We are withholding assistance from the people who helped to build our Nation and giving it to strangers who may, at some future time, be our enemies.

Such a contradictory policy is beyond understanding. It is hardly calculated to inspire in our people that faith in representative government upon which our national security primarily depends.

Democracy will not survive and develop on words alone. It must prove that it can work for the good of all. In the first quarter of 1947 many business corporations made greater profits than in any other quarter of their history, not excluding the fantastic years of the 1920's.

In that same quarter of 1947 prices rose steadily toward inflationary peaks, while the aged, the blind, and dependent children, who try to exist on fixed payments that were meager to begin with, have seen their few dollars buy less and less. Slowly but surely they are being squeezed toward extinction.

In addition to the billions we have spent abroad for relief, we have hurried through legislation to provide other billions in loans—more properly called gifts—to foreign governments. But when our own dispossessed citizens ask for the relief they are met with a stony silence.

A little more than a year ago the national average payments to 2,047,446 recipients of old-age assistance were only \$39.60 a month; 70,882 needy blind received an average of only \$33.35 a month. Since that time the cost of living has risen rapidly. With controls off, there was a mad scramble for excess profits, and our needy citizens became the first victims. Again there are ominous signs that our Nation is on the roller-coaster of boom-and-bust, yet with the terrible experience of the 1930's still fresh in our minds, we are taking no steps to cushion the shock for those who are least able to bear it.

It should be plain to every mature person in our country that the tremendous productivity of our economy is meaningless unless all of our people have the purchasing power to buy the products of agriculture and industry. We cannot survive half rich and half poor. Let us not forget that the "have and have-not" issue which caused, and is causing, so much trouble for the world can also cause us domestic trouble.

With callous disregard for this emergency, the House Appropriations Committee has lopped off \$77,800,000 from the Labor-Federal Security budget.

Hundreds of thousands of persons over 60 years of age, too young to get present old-age assistance, must become subjects of direct relief. I know many of these oldsters who have given the best years of their lives to their country. The humiliations they are forced to undergo add insult to injury. I say that we have no right to help the people of other lands unless we are prepared at the same time to help our own. Economy has its place in Government, but it must never be at the expense of the needy. Our present social security program is only a beginning. It must go forward and not backward. One of the first amendments to aid its developments must be the lowering of the eligible age to 60, so that American men and women may apply for old-age assistance in time as a right, and not as a charity.

A recession, mild or severe, with a consequent loss of employment to many is

inevitable. We do not want to see our veterans, trying to make a delayed start in life, become its first victims. Far better to retire the old folks who are still working, to make way for the young upon whom the future of our country in the uncertain future immediately ahead depends than to stir up resentment within families.

In the case of those oldsters who are not working, and who will never be hired by industry, the need for reducing the eligible age for assistance to 60 is particularly urgent. Furthermore, there should be no enforced contributions from children. The law must be amended so that those who apply for old-age or blind assistance will be able to stand on their own qualifications. This provision will not prevent children from contributing to their parents' support if they wish to do so on moral grounds. Support-your-relatives or responsible-relatives clause is now invoked in many States, although it is not a Federal requirement. Too often this is used by the States as an excuse to deny aid to a deserving applicant. And where the children are forced to contribute, the cost of the collections greatly exceeds the amount collected. This has caused much misunderstanding and hard feelings among families and has broken up many homes. To show to what extreme such an unworkable law will go, may I quote the experience of Connecticut. In that State, under the responsible-relative clause, it was stipulated that liability rests on a husband or wife, father or mother, grandfather or grandmother, and children or grandchildren.

They call this social security.

It is high time that we as a people put first things first and develop a social security system that will give adequate protection to the aged, the blind, and dependent children, lest democracy become a mockery in our own eyes.

The homes of America must be free from want and free from fear.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

JOHN PAUL JONES BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

Mr. LECOMPT. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 144) providing for the comprehensive observance of the bicentennial of John Paul Jones.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That there is hereby established a commission to be known as the John Paul Jones Bicentennial Commission (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission") and to be composed of 15 members, as follows: The President of the United States;

the President pro tempore of the Senate; the Speaker of the House of Representatives; 6 persons to be designated by the President of the United States; 3 Members of the Senate to be designated by the President pro tempore of the Senate; and 3 Members of the House of Representatives to be designated by the Speaker of the House. The members of the Commission shall serve without compensation and shall select a chairman from among their number.

Sec. 2. The Commission is authorized and directed to arrange for memorial meetings and exercises in the year of 1947 in the city of Washington and other cities and places in the United States particularly associated with the memory of John Paul Jones, and in universities, schools, and colleges throughout the United States.

Sec. 3. (a) The Commission may at its discretion accept from any source, public or private, money or other property to be used for the purpose of making surveys and investigations, formulating, preparing, and considering plans and estimates for the improvement, construction, or other expenses incurred, or to be incurred.

(b) The Commission is authorized, without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, to employ and fix the compensation of such personnel at it may deem necessary to employ. Such compensation will be made from funds obtained in accordance with section 3 (a).

(c) To the extent deemed by the Commission to be necessary in carrying out its functions, the Commission is authorized to have printing, binding, lithographing, and other work done at establishments other than the Government Printing Office. Compensation for such work will be made from funds obtained in accordance with section 3 (a).

(d) The Commission is authorized to procure advice and assistance from any Government agency, including the services of technical and other personnel in the executive departments and independent establishments, and to procure advice and assistance from and to cooperate with individuals and agencies, public or private. The Superintendent of Documents shall make available to the Commission the facilities of his office for the distribution of portraits, pamphlets, and booklets herein authorized.

Sec. 4. That the Commission shall, at the conclusion of its activities, submit to Congress a comprehensive report of the progress of its work.

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

There was no objection.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEMORIAL TO FIRST INFANTRY DIVISION, WORLD WAR II

Mr. LECOMPT. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 188) authorizing the erection on public grounds in the city of Washington, D. C., of a memorial to the dead of the First Infantry Division, United States Forces, World War II.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to grant the Memorial Association of the First Infantry Division, United States Army, permis-

sion to erect on public grounds of the United States in the city of Washington, D. C., adjacent to the monument to the dead of the First Infantry Division, American Expeditionary Forces in World War I, a monument to the dead of the First Infantry Division, United States Forces in World War II; the site chosen and the design of the monument and pedestal shall be approved by the Joint Committee of Congress on the Library with the advice and recommendations of the National Commission of Fine Arts, and the United States shall be put to no expense in or by the erection of this memorial.

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

There was no objection.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CANNON'S PROCEDURE IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 190) authorizing the printing and binding of a revised edition of Cannon's Procedure in the House of Representatives and providing that the same shall be subject to copyright by the author.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That there shall be printed and bound for the use of the House 1,500 copies of a revised edition of Cannon's Procedure in the House of Representatives, by CLARENCE CANNON, to be printed under the supervision of the author and to be distributed to the Members by the Speaker.

SEC. 2. That, notwithstanding any provision of the copyright laws and regulations with respect to publications in the public domain, such revised edition of Cannon's Procedure in the House of Representatives shall be subject to copyright by the author thereof.

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

There was no objection.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEMORIAL TO ANDREW W. MELLON

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 170) authorizing the erection in the District of Columbia of a memorial to Andrew W. Mellon.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to grant authority to the Andrew W. Mellon Memorial Committee to erect a memorial fountain on public grounds at the intersection of Pennsylvania and Constitution Avenues, in the District of Columbia, such grounds being now owned by the United States: *Provided*, That the design of the

memorial shall be approved by the National Commission of Fine Arts, and the United States shall be put to no expense in or by the erection of this memorial: *Provided further*, That unless funds, which in the estimation of the Secretary of the Interior are sufficient to insure the completion of the memorial, are certified available, and the erection of this memorial begun within 5 years from and after date of passage of this joint resolution, the authorization hereby granted is revoked.

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

There was no objection.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN PAUL JONES

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings by which the House passed the joint resolution for the John Paul Jones Bicentennial Commission be vacated, and that the resolution be laid on the table.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution offered by Messrs. Hulse, Parkman, Burns, Ward, and Powers, of the Senate of the State of California.

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT SHOULD PAY TAXES FOR LAND IT OWNS IN CALIFORNIA—MCDONOUGH BILL, H. R. 2030, PROVIDES THIS—46 PERCENT OF CALIFORNIA OWNED BY UNITED STATES

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, many of our States are facing a serious curtailment in tax revenue because of the huge Federal land holdings within their boundaries. The Federal Government has acquired vast acreage that has been set aside as national-forest land, and during the war has expanded its holdings for military and naval bases and for use by the multitude of agencies and enlarged departments which sprang up in the war years.

All of this land is tax-free, and the State and local governments are deprived of the revenue which would be paid on this land if it were under private ownership. At the same time both State and local governments must expend thousands of dollars for the protection of life and property in many of these areas owned by the Government, and must maintain roads and other facilities for the use of people living and working on property owned by the Federal Government.

In the State of California alone, the accumulation of land by the Federal Government has increased in 10 years from 37 percent to 46 percent of all land within the State. Federal acquisition

has extended to 50 percent of all the land in 17 California counties. And in 11 western States, 47 percent of all the land is owned by the Federal Government.

This presents a serious situation since all of this land is tax free. It means that the property owners must pay higher taxes to compensate for the loss of tax revenue on Federal Government-owned lands. It curtails the expenditure for improvements in local communities and in the counties. It deprives the State of legitimate sources of revenue.

I believe it is time that the Federal Government accept its responsibility to compensate the States at least in part for the loss of tax revenue on lands that are owned by the Federal Government. I have introduced H. R. 2030 for this purpose.

My bill would authorize annual payments to the States, Territories and insular governments by the Federal Government based on the fair value of national-forest lands situated therein for the benefit of the local political subdivisions where such lands are situated. Such payment will avert embarrassing fluctuations of income to counties to which stable income is essential to the efficient conduct of local functions of government. It will also remedy inadequacies of contributions to costs of local government in localities where national-forest lands yield little or no revenue.

Legislation such as H. R. 2030 is urgently needed, and I ask the Members of the House to give consideration to this problem during the present session of Congress. The California State Senate has also passed a resolution requesting such action as follows:

Senate Resolution 79

Resolution relative to Federal ownership of property within States and local governments

Whereas the problem of the acquisition and ownership of Federal lands in the several States is causing considerable concern because of the reduced evaluation base upon which local property taxes can be levied; and

Whereas such lands are and have been acquired for game reserves, forest reserves, public parks, public monuments, mineral reserves, Federal building for governmental purposes, expanding military facilities, property acquired and used in a proprietary sense, and land remaining in public domain; and

Whereas the accumulation of land for governmental purposes in the heart of metropolitan areas of large cities has substantially reduced the tax base laws used in the determination of the ad valorem tax; and

Whereas the accumulation of land for these several purposes has increased in 10 years from 37 percent to 46 percent of all the lands in California; and

Whereas such accumulation has extended to 50 percent of all the lands in 17 counties of said State; and

Whereas in all the 11 Western States 47 percent of the land is owned by the Federal Government; and

Whereas such large accumulation of land by the Federal Government in California and the other 10 Western States has been destructive to the fiscal structure of local government; and

Whereas the withdrawal of such large amounts of land from taxation has left local government without adequate revenue for its support; and

Whereas this loss of revenue cannot be supplanted by other sources; and

Whereas it is necessary for local government to provide protection of life and property, the maintenance and construction of streets, roads, and highways, and other local facilities to service the properties acquired by the Federal Government and the people living thereon; Therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of California, as follows:

1. That the Federal Government assume its financial responsibilities in relation to local governmental jurisdictions where such property is located; that Congress immediately enact legislation to this end;

2. That said legislation provide that local government be reimbursed in amount equivalent to taxes lost by virtue of such acquisition by the Federal Government; or that such property as is owned by the Federal Government be permitted to be taxed locally in the same manner and to the same extent as other local property;

3. That property now held by the Federal Government which is not clearly necessary for a public purpose be disposed of in order that it may be returned to the local tax rolls for the purpose of local taxation and support of local government; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the senate is hereby directed to send copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of the Treasury, to the Secretary of the Interior, to the Secretary of Agriculture, to the President pro tempore of the Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each of the Senators and Congressmen from California in the Congress of the United States, and that the Senators and Congressmen from California in the Congress of the United States are respectfully requested to urge such action.

(Resolution read and, on motion of Senator Hulse, adopted.)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BENDER asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in five instances and include a series of articles written by Mr. Ralph J. Donaldson of the Cleveland Plain Dealer.

BIPARTISAN ACTION

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the idea advanced some time ago in the other body by an international statesman that the Congress should consider our foreign policy from a bipartisan standpoint is being extended to cover the domestic situation; that is to say, we are told now that, if the President, or anyone else in authority in the administration, suggests a measure, that we in the Congress ought to go along because if we do not someone in some other country might think we are not united here in America in the defense of our country and do not consider our national welfare. The same thought was advanced when we were considering the Greek-Turkish gift. It was advanced again today by the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING].

Now, that argument that the Congress must blindly follow the lead of the President or his advisers or members of his administration is neither sound, logical, nor consistent. The Congress and the Members of Congress have certain responsibilities under the Constitution.

Unless we want to surrender the major part of those responsibilities and duck our obligation to the people who sent us here, there is no reason in the wide world why we should accept every idea that comes out of the White House, which may have been suggested to the President by someone who has something other than the welfare of America in his mind.

There is no reason why we here in the House should follow international statesmen over on the other side of the Capitol when they tell us that we should cut down appropriations, as we are going to do today, which are for the benefit of our own people, and then pour out our money to every country and every people in the world who may ask for it or who can be persuaded, if we suggest it, to come and get it or let us take it to them. Eventually, we cannot protect ourselves if we continue to pour out our money and natural resources to every corner of the world in a vain and hopeless effort to give everyone everything they want or ask. America and her welfare should be our first objectives.

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

BIPARTISAN ACTION

Mr. VURSELL. 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 Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, this morning I received a letter signed by 200 people, members of a civic welfare organization in my county at Odin, Ill., in which they would like the Government, which ran out on them on a contract just prior to the war, to go through and help finish the building of a sewer project. I do not know just how I can answer that letter if I tell them that the Government cannot afford to keep its contract when last week we voted \$650,000,000 to go overseas, which presages a few billion more to follow.

As far as this bipartisan policy is concerned, it is a one-way street, and you might just as well know that now. There will be no cooperation, there will be no bipartisan cooperation except as the Republicans take a "me too" attitude and go along. We will find that out when labor legislation and tax legislation go to the President for his signature, and we find it out every day on the floor of the House when an appropriation bill is presented. The sooner the majority party understands that the people expect them to stand on their own two feet and protect the interest of the people of America first, and then deal out our largess afterward, if we can stand it, the better off the country will be and the better off the Republican Party will be.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL] has expired.

Mr. BENDER. 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 Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I hope the Republicans will take heed when they hear the words of wisdom uttered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL]. The Republicans are in the majority in this body. Yesterday we were lectured by New Deal members of the Subcommittee on Appropriations because we were not cutting enough; that we promised to cut \$6,000,000,000, and that we had not even scratched the surface. We will be lectured every day about the very same thing. How can we economize when we vote as we did here last week on the Turkish-Greek deal? The parade is on. Remember, Members on the Republican side, you will be asked to vote for universal military training, you will be asked to vote on any number of military bills, you will be scolded by the administration about not looking backward. Remember your campaign pledges of last fall. Remember that we did not promise to spend money all over the world for all kinds of boondoggling projects, but we did promise to balance the budget and cut expenditures.

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

FASCISM IN ACTION

Mr. HOLIFIELD. 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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, some time ago the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] presented a resolution which would, in effect, authorize the printing of some half million booklets entitled "Communism in Action." Congress I think rightly took action on that and authorized the printing of them. It was a research analysis by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress.

Since February 5 there has been a similar resolution in this House regarding Fascism in Action. The Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress has prepared an analogous report on Fascism in Action which, in my opinion, is just as important to the American people as Communism in Action. That particular resolution has been called to the attention of the Committee on Printing. I understand it is before the full committee today. It is my hope that the full committee will act upon this resolution, bring it to the floor of the House, and let the Members pass the resolution authorizing the printing of this research analysis on Fascism in Action in America.

I refer to an editorial in today's Post entitled "Let the Chips Fall."

We as American citizens are just as much opposed to fascism as to communism.

The editorial reads as follows:

LET THE CHIPS FALL

Today the House Appropriations Committee is scheduled to come to grips with fascism. The issue is House Resolution 83, sponsored

by Representative PATMAN, which calls for publication of a pamphlet, *Fascism in Action*, prepared for him by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress. This booklet ought to be circulated as the counterpart of *Communism in Action*, prepared some time ago for Congressman DIRKSEN. Nearly a million copies of the Dirksen publication already have been printed. A clear precedent is thus established. We hope that the House committee will grasp its responsibility for bringing to the attention of Americans the workings of a force equally as sinister as communism. They are faces of the same repugnant medal.

In this respect the record of the Subcommittee on Printing, which handled the resolution after Mr. PATMAN introduced it February 5, has been anything but encouraging. At first the subcommittee bottled up the resolution. Then, after repeated inquiry, it reported the measure out to the full committee without recommendation. This was, indeed, a strange reaction on the part of men supposedly dedicated to oppose all forms of totalitarianism. If the resolution is allowed to stagnate, Congress will be placed in an exceedingly unfortunate light. It will have, in effect, given its blessing to an anti-Communist crusade while at the same time remaining oblivious to a force no less dangerous to our way of life.

THE SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

MR. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include the editorial in my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—PORTAL-TO-PORTAL PAY BILL SIGNED (H. DOC. NO. 247)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States which was read, referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I have today signed H. R. 2157, the Portal-to-Portal Act of 1947. The primary purpose of this act is to relieve employers and the Government from potential liability for billions of dollars in so-called portal-to-portal claims. These claims have emerged since judicial interpretation of the wage-and-hour law raised the possibility that employers might be required to pay back wages for certain activities which in most industries had not previously been considered by either workers or employers to be compensable. I believe that, in the interest of the economic stability of our Nation, it is essential to clarify this matter by statute.

The Portal-to-Portal Act should end this uncertainty with respect to claims of still undetermined magnitude. Current wage negotiations can proceed more readily to a satisfactory conclusion, and businessmen will be able to plan with assurance for full production and price reductions. This will be of real value to labor and management in the maintenance of a continued high level of employment.

I am confident that the purpose of the main provisions of the act is to eliminate the immense potential liabilities which have arisen as the result of the portal-

to-portal claims. It is not the purpose of the act to permit violation of our fundamental wage-and-hour standards, or to allow a lowering of these standards. This is evident from the findings of the Congress set forth in section 1 of the act as to the need for legislation.

Some doubts have been expressed to me, however, concerning the effects of this legislation upon our wage and hour standards.

Section 2 of the act relates to existing claims. From my consideration of this section, I understand it to be the intent of the Congress to meet the problem raised by portal-to-portal claims, but not to invalidate all other existing claims. The plain language of section 2 of the act preserves minimum wage and overtime compensation claims based upon activities which were compensable in any amount under contract, custom, or practice. Various provisions of the act such as sections 3, 9, and 12, would be rendered absurd or unnecessary under any other interpretation. Moreover, a contrary interpretation would raise difficult and grave questions of constitutionality.

As to section 4, relating to future claims, the legislative history of the act shows that the Congress intends that the words "principal activities" are to be construed liberally to include any work of consequence performed for the employer, no matter when the work is performed. We should not lose sight of the important requirement under the act that all principal activities must be paid for, regardless of contract, custom, or practice. I am sure the courts will not permit employers to use artificial devices such as the shifting of work to the beginning or the end of the day to avoid liability under the law.

I wish also to refer to the so-called good faith provisions of sections 9 and 10 of the act. It has been said that they make each employer his own judge of whether or not he has been guilty of a violation. It seems to me that this view fails to take into account the safeguards which are contained in these sections. The employer must meet an objective test of actual conformity with an administrative ruling or policy. If the employer avails himself of the defense under these sections, he must bear the burden of proof. He must show that there was affirmative action by an administrative agency and that he relied upon and conformed with such action. He must show further that he acted in good faith in relying upon that administrative action.

Section 11 of the act gives the court discretionary authority to waive liquidated damages. Under the language of the section, however, it continues to be the duty of the court to award liquidated damages unless convinced that the employer has, in good faith, sought to comply with his obligations under the act. I do not believe this section will be used to permit employers to engage in violation of the law with impunity.

I am aware that this act introduces new and possibly ambiguous language, the effects of which can be accurately measured only after interpretation by the courts. I have therefore instructed the Secretary of Labor to keep me cur-

rently informed as to the effects of this act upon the preservation of wage-and-hour standards. If those effects prove to be detrimental to the maintenance of fair labor standards for our workers, I shall request the Congress to take prompt remedial action.

The enactment of H. R. 2157 makes necessary additional appropriations for the administration and enforcement of the wage-and-hour laws. The 2-year statute of limitations under this act will in most cases substantially reduce the period of time within which workers' claims may be asserted under the wage-and-hour laws. It will be necessary, therefore, to augment the Government's program of inspection and enforcement in order to detect violations early enough to protect workers from undue losses. Other provisions of the act also place additional responsibilities upon the Department of Labor. I shall submit estimates to the Congress for the necessary appropriations.

Prior to its adjournment last year, the Congress had reached a large measure of agreement as to legislation to increase minimum-wage standards. I trust that with the passage of the Portal-to-Portal Act, relieving the business community of a heavy burden of doubt, the Congress will now turn to a reexamination of minimum-wage standards.

In enacting the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, the Congress declared it to be our national policy to eliminate labor conditions detrimental to the maintenance of the minimum standard of living necessary for health, efficiency, and general well-being of workers. It has become increasingly evident that the minimum wage of 40 cents an hour established by that act is far from adequate to meet that national policy. I am convinced that immediate amendment of the act to provide a minimum of at least 65 cents an hour is necessary. In addition, minimum-wage benefits should be extended to many persons not now protected by the law, as I have recommended in previous messages to the Congress.

I recommend that the Congress take action upon these matters now.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, May 14, 1947.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BROOKS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial on soil conservation appearing in the New York Times.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Obviously a quorum is not present.

Mr. HALLECK. 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. 57]

Allen, Ill.	Bell	Boykin
Andresen,	Bennett, Mo.	Buckley
August H.	Bland	Buffett
Auchincloss	Bloom	Bulwinkle
Bates, Ky.	Boggs, La.	Butler

Byrne, N. Y.	Fuller	Miller, Nebr.
Clements	Gifford	Morrison
Clippinger	Gregory	Nodar
Coffin	Harless, Ariz.	Patman
Cooley	Hays	Pfeifer
Cox	Hendricks	Powell
D'Alesandro	Jones, N. C.	Rayfield
Davis, Tenn.	Kearns	Sarbacher
Dawson, Ill.	Kefauver	Taylor
Dawson, Utah	Kelley	Thomas, N. J.
Dirksen	Keogh	Thomas, Tex.
Dondero	Kerr	Vinson
Doughton	Lemke	Vorys
Ellis	Lyle	Wadsworth
Fellows	McDowell	West
Fernandez	McGarvey	
Flannagan	Mansfield, Tex.	

THE SPEAKER. On this roll call 366 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND THE JUDICIARY APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1948

MR. STEFAN. 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 (H. R. 3311) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3311, with Mr. CURTIS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

MR. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

THE CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

MR. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] on yesterday in an eloquent and powerful manner gave to the House and to the Congress convincing reasons why our short-wave broadcasts abroad, known as the Voice of America, should be continued. As a part of its strategy in making ideological advancement in taking country after country over, an important part of the Soviet Union's war of nerves is in intense radio propaganda. While exact figures are not available, sufficient information is available for our officials and for us to know that Russia is spending for this purpose several times what we are spending, and other countries, recognizing the value of this type of activity, are spending more than we do. It is a well-known fact that adherence, even a limited adherence, to the truth in its propaganda activities is not one of the elements of the Soviet Union's policy. It is also a well-known fact that an intensive drive is being made everywhere possible to place the United States in a false light. Japan, China, Asia, and elsewhere in the Far East did the same thing before and during the recent war.

In the light of world conditions, in the light of the false propaganda being directed at us, it seems to me to be a wise investment to present America in its proper light and to expose the falsity

of propaganda the purpose of which is to undermine our prestige elsewhere and to create doubt, uncertainty, and disbelief in the minds of people elsewhere that there is any future for them except through the road of communism. A powerful weapon of Hitler in the technique of the war the Nazis had developed in its first and open stage was propaganda of all kinds, prominent among which was the radio that brought division among the intended victims through fear and uncertainty, the appeal to all kinds of emotionalism, principally fear and hatred.

The same technique is being used now, except instead of the actual attack by the Soviet Union following when a people are weakened and divided from within, the Communist group within a country takes over, and then the real viciousness starts into operation.

The false and vicious types of radio propaganda being given to the peoples of other countries against our country should, and must, be met.

In the Middle East, for example, I have been informed that Russian broadcasts accuse the United States of having diplomatic agents over there to gobble up all oil deposits. They cite in support the fact that we have oil attachés at our embassies and legations, and from this fact alone, being termed "oil attachés"—their title—that we have hundreds of them over there for the purpose of stealing the oil fields of the Middle East. Built up, as they cleverly do, the Russian radio—although it is false except as to the title—and I have been informed that we have only six or seven such attachés—makes out a case that appeals emotionally, and the reaction, as intended, is to create fear and hatred of the United States.

This is an illustration of how the truth is completely distorted. I have suggested to the State Department that the titles of these attachés be changed as an effective means of meeting this false propaganda.

Every kind of deception or falsehood is resorted to—that which they think will assist in producing the desired results—fear and hatred of the United States or Great Britain—and when concentrating their efforts on a particular country, sending out propaganda that will confuse and divide a people, and to further the aims and objectives of the Russian or Communist Party within a country—thereby spreading as far and as rapidly as possible communism internationally, resulting in a more powerful and dangerous Soviet Union internally, and more dangerous as a world power and a world threat.

Their broadcasts on the Moscow Conference is a distortion of the truth. The United States is pictured to unfortunate and starving and distressed persons of other countries—already subjected to fear—as a country that is responsible for their condition in some places, and in other places as a greedy and selfish imperialistic nation.

The blame is placed on the United States principally, and also Great Britain—and France will probably now be included—for the unfortunate conditions that exist elsewhere, for the failure of

peace, and being clever propagandists, the Russians portray a discolored picture and a distorted argument that is productive of the results they desire.

The fact that the Soviet Union is responsible for the negative Moscow Conference results is well known to us, but there are many countries in which only the Russian distortion of the story of the Conference is known.

We know that the failure is due to Russia's refusal to cooperate with understanding. Secretary Marshall, in substance, told the world that after his return, but great parts of the world were unable to get his report. In his report Secretary Marshall told us that the Soviet Union—and I quote from the New York Times editorial of April 29—"made agreements impossible by insisting on conditions in both Austria and Germany which made inevitable not only a further drain on American resources, but also a continuous economic deterioration in all Europe, leading to new dictatorships and new strife."

The editorial—and I quote from it again because I agree with it—further says: "And though Mr. Marshall refrained from saying so, it is no secret that it is in such a situation that the Communists put their hope for further expansion."

Under these conditions, in the light of the intense and false propaganda over the radio, what are we going to do? What should we do?

Without discussing the value of the frequency we will lose, it is my opinion that it would be unwise to terminate this activity completely.

The views of Secretary Marshall in the matter have been strongly expressed. It seems to me that his views are worthy of deep consideration. Next to the President, Secretary Marshall is charged with the duty and responsibility of steering our ship of State. He has a duty and responsibility of a primary nature. Unless substantial progress is made toward a real peace settlement at the next meeting of the Big Four foreign ministers which is scheduled for next November, I cannot see where any good can come of further efforts. As I interpret world conditions and world events, the deadline or time limit is the next meeting of the Big Four foreign ministers. In the meantime, contrary to the recommendations, in fact, the urgings of Secretary Marshall, should we completely discontinue this activity?

We are also aware that private industry cannot properly carry on this activity, particularly outside the Western Hemisphere. The evidence from leading figures in the radio field is evident in this respect.

You will note I have confined my remarks to the basic question of the continuance of this activity. While I have opinions which in part agree and in part do not agree with the criticisms of personnel and type of broadcast, I refrain from entering into them because they can be corrected if funds are appropriated to continue the broadcasts. I agree that with the continuance the best brains in this country in this specialized field should be obtained, even if some have to respond and do so at a sacrifice

to themselves as they did during the war, in order that the maximum results for our country may be obtained. While World War II is over, peace does not prevail, and the peace is not won. Those in the radio field in whom everyone has confidence should, if necessary, respond to bring to this activity the maximum of success. I am sure they will gladly give their country of their brains and their time in the months ahead, and particularly between now and next November, as they so willingly did during the war period.

My remarks today are addressed to the basic question of the immediate necessity for continuing these broadcasts. I have hopes that this will be done in the House. In a sense it is still not too late. However, if it is not done in this body, I hope it will be done in the other branch, and that the conference committee will see that the funds the Senate makes available are finally appropriated to assure the continuance of this important and necessary type of broadcast.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me we should approach this problem knowing what we are doing and realizing what we are doing. We should approach this problem with the idea that if the Voice of America is to be continued it shall be the voice of America, and not something that will discredit and destroy America and the good will of other countries toward us.

The trouble with me is that I like to know what I am doing. Would to God that that idea would spread. Every time this broadcasting business has been up I have done something that I do not believe anyone else in the Congress has done. I have asked for copies of the broadcasts and I have read them. I know something about them. I am not so sure but that something must be done some time, and some time soon, with reference to these broadcasts; but for one solid year and a half the same management has been in charge of that operation, and there has been no accomplishment of putting the thing on a sound business basis where it was pulling ahead.

These broadcasts which I shall refer to are of recent origin, coming within the last few weeks, and I do wish some of those who are advocating this would come into my office and read these broadcasts.

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

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Why is it not possible to print a copy of the broadcasts in the RECORD so that we can all see them? Why are they so secret? What is so secret about these broadcasts?

Mr. TABER. There is nothing secret about them. The only question is as to the volume of them. To print those broadcasts in the RECORD would make a RECORD 40 times the volume of the regular daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the lot of broadcasts that I have in my office.

Let me give you an illustration of what is involved. There are 15-minute broadcasts to foreign countries upon the life and character of Carrie Chapman Catt,

an estimable woman who died within the last several months, but concerning whom the rest of the world would have very little idea and the present generation of Americans would also have very little idea.

Let me read to you one of the broadcasts to Russia:

The hero of today's Herald Tribune report has found a brilliant solution of his problem. On Long Island, in New York State, there are a number of abandoned railroad branch lines. Our bright veteran has surveyed the available plots and found himself a cozy railroad station built of red bricks. He then contacted the railroad authorities and leased the empty building for a song. Within a short time the abandoned station was transformed into a cozy house, consisting of a bedroom, living room, kitchen, and bath. The house is equipped with electricity, steam heat, radio, a kitchen range, electric refrigerator, and all other modern living equipment.

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

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Here is another line. They broadcast a number of book reviews covering a long period of time. Amongst the books was a book about the city of Denver. They tell how they used to shoot each other on sight and about the fellow who built an opera house there and the architect put Shakespeare's picture in the lobby. The man who had had the theater built, a silver tycoon, came in and ordered Shakespeare's picture taken out of the lobby and had his picture placed in the lobby instead.

Then there was another book on the anthology of American cities, by Robert S. Allen, telling how corrupt those cities were. There was a broadcast of that. Both of those things were designed deliberately to hold America up to ridicule. When an outfit does not know any better than to do those things, it is time we began to wake up and to get things straightened out. What I demand and what I believe must be done, if we are going to have a Voice of America, is that those things be cleaned up and that we have an outfit that is pulling for America and not trying to make us perfectly ridiculous and asinine.

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

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The gentleman in mentioning book reviews that have been given over this Voice of America broadcast, has evidently failed to mention the most famous of all reviews, the review of the book on the Wallace family, in which Mr. Henry Wallace was held out as the great American of all times, and the broadcast was made at the very moment he was in Europe attempting to sabotage the President's so-called foreign policy program.

Mr. TABER. That is correct, and it is pitiful. The only way we are going to get that thing cleaned up is to have it cleaned up before we make appropriations. I called this to the attention of

the head of the State Department immediately after he was appointed. If we are going to have a Voice of America, let me suggest something. Amongst the best of our broadcasters today are Lowell Thomas and Fulton Lewis, Jr. They have probably as much range as any two broadcasters. There may be others. I am not trying to freeze anybody out. But those two men have staffs of six or seven. Four or five people with their proper staffs could take care of the broadcasting that needs to be done, with translators and people who would have to broadcast in those languages. Cut out the kind of thing that is just pusillanimous and silly.

I want to see a decent job done wherever we have a job to do. I want to see an end to those in the Department, who have no business being in charge of this kind of thing, and have them taken off the Federal pay roll, and the Federal pay roll carry only a set-up that may be necessary to do a decent job.

I hope the House will take an American position on this thing and not a position designed to destroy America, and not propose to continue something that is not being done right.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for one additional minute to answer a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Is it not a fact that this Voice of America broadcast has more than four times as many, or over 1,500 employees in New York—more than four times as many as any of the American networks have employed in New York City?

Mr. TABER. More than that. They have a whale of a force in Washington.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. But over 1,500 in New York?

Mr. TABER. Yes, and \$6,500,000 pay roll right here in Washington alone.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened with considerable interest to the statements of both the minority whip [Mr. McCORMACK] and the chairman of the House Appropriations Committee [Mr. TABER]. I would like to make sure that all of the members of this committee understand another aspect of this problem which has not been discussed or explored thus far in the debate.

It happens that I am now serving as Chairman of the subcommittee of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs which is holding hearings on a bill providing for a United States Information Service which includes this Voice of America program. It is H. R. 3342, which I introduced a week or so ago.

Our hearings have now been under way for several sessions.

The report of the Appropriations Committee raises three questions about this particular program. The first is that it is not authorized by law. With that I can find no quarrel. I recognize that a point of order can be raised against this appropriation at this time. I anticipate that such a point of order will be raised because there is obviously enough opposition to the program so that any individual Member of the House can insist that it be authorized by law before it becomes a governmental practice.

Let me say frankly that with that position I have no quarrel. I am one of those who for a long time has felt that the function of the Appropriations Committee is to act as the fiscal committee of this House, to appropriate money to finance projects which have been authorized by legislation. I am glad that this somewhat belated, but I hope firm, attitude of the Appropriations Committee of the House has been announced. I hope it will become precedent. I hope that the Appropriations Committee will not write legislation into appropriation bills at this time or any other time because I think the integrity of the legislative committees of the House should be sustained.

So if the action on this appropriation is the forerunner of a firm and permanent and consistent program certainly I find no quarrel with this attitude of the Appropriations Committee which says simply that from now on they are not going to appropriate money for any purpose which has not been authorized by legislative action and which says that the legislative committees of the House are going to be protected in their position as legislative committees. Members of Congress generally will applaud this decision by the Appropriations Committee. We shall expect it to become a prevailing rule in the future and not simply be used as an isolated device for denying money for Voice of America broadcasts.

The second protest raised against this bill, however, deals with the heart of the program. It says that the Government should not be in the news business. That sounds perfectly reasonable to disciples of the free enterprise system such as we all are in this House. However, the stubborn fact remains that since the war we are appropriating or have appropriated between ten and twenty billion dollars for a reconstruction job to be done in the occupied areas in the world which we have recently defeated, or to be used in other sections of the world where we are interesting ourselves to the extent of granting funds or giving materials or lending money. It is nothing more than good, canny Yankee business judgment to spend a small fraction of 1 percent of that amount to advertise abroad the objectives we seek with those many billions.

This matter of telling the true American story abroad is a job it seems to me that everybody agrees must be done, and I think the chairman of the Appropriations Committee is on record saying that he too believes that job must be done. We must help the rest of the world un-

derstand the purpose for which we are spending these billions of dollars. We must make certain that this burden upon the American taxpayer is not entirely a gesture of futility. Unless our purposes are understood abroad it is apt to become just a gesture of futility. It is imperative that we accompany these vast expenditures with a program of information and edification which will help them to procure and protect the peace.

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

Mr. MUNDT. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. I think it is not only necessary that the world know why we are appropriating this money but also that it would help a great deal if we ourselves knew why we are appropriating the money.

Mr. MUNDT. I think that is correct.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I read with interest the gentleman's bill and wish to ask him whether in connection with what we are discussing today it would not be possible to include in the bill provisions to prevent these broadcasters from defaming America and conducting themselves in un-American ways.

Mr. MUNDT. I am coming to that aspect a little later in my remarks. It certainly is possible. My bill stipulates such safeguards specifically.

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

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, it is perfectly apparent the gentleman will not have sufficient time to present his statement. I ask unanimous consent that his time may be extended for five additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Thank you, Mr. McCORMACK. Let us now get down to the problem we face. Here is a job of publicity for the American program which we all recognize must be done. Unfortunately, the private information sources in this country are unable to do it. They themselves have come before Congress and before governmental agencies saying they cannot provide the types of service in the areas of the world which require them. At this time there are 7 licensees of short-wave broadcasting in this country and they all say they are utterly unable as a commercial venture of their own to provide the programs required in various portions of the earth.

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

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The gentleman's statement is entirely true, that they cannot afford through commercial support alone to furnish these broadcasts. Is it not also true that the privately owned broadcasting companies of this country that have short-wave radio facilities can furnish this service, can furnish information for the State Department and for the other governmental

departments, to foreign lands at a much lower cost than has been the case under the present program?

Mr. MUNDT. They cannot do it without financial assistance from the outside.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I say at a lower cost to the Federal Government.

Mr. MUNDT. Perhaps a better bargain can be driven through the terms of a new contract; however, the Federal Government contracts with these licensees and 50 percent of the programs are arranged by them.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. These contracts with the licensees are for the use of the physical facilities only. Cannot these same licensees furnish the programs under direction of the Government at much less cost than at the present time?

Mr. MUNDT. Fifty percent of the programs themselves are arranged by private licensees.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Does the gentleman mean to say that 1,500 employees of the State Department in New York are only doing half of the work of this broadcasting arrangement that we now have, and that these six or seven hundred in Washington are only doing a part of the work, that half of the service is being furnished by private industry?

Mr. MUNDT. The gentleman is correct. Half of the information and half of the programs are being furnished by private interests.

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

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. Is it not a fact that these employees to which the gentleman refers are not only engaged in broadcasting but they are engaged in various other methods of disseminating the facts about America, such as moving pictures and the other activities of the department?

Mr. MUNDT. The gentleman is absolutely correct and to that should be added that they are also engaged in monitoring the broadcasts which Foreign Governments are sending out and which all too frequently are devoted to distorting and perverting our American principles and purposes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Does the gentleman believe that these broadcasts, the art and the material that has been furnished by this "Voice of America" and by this division of the State Department are directly representative of the American life and the American way of doing things?

Mr. MUNDT. The gentleman believes that the broadcasts and the other informational services are rendering great support to the American concept abroad. The gentleman speaking is not willing to defend every single individual broadcast, nor the "Circus Lady" nor the Wallace book. I recognize mistakes have been made and, if I may be permitted to proceed, I will explain why under the basic legislation which I have introduced those types of mistakes will be less frequent.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. May I ask that the gentleman explain to the House if he believes the people who are doing this work are all good Americans?

Mr. MUNDT. If the gentleman will give me time, I will enter into that question also. If they are not, however, my bill, H. R. 3342, contains a section which will definitely and completely correct that situation.

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

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

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I understood that private broadcasting companies, in connection with Harvard University and certain other universities, were presently carrying on a program.

Mr. MUNDT. One of the seven licensees is a foundation, which includes the broadcasting of programs sponsored in part by Harvard University.

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

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. I am happy to know that the gentleman's subcommittee is considering this matter, because, as he says, it is vitally important. It is also vitally important that we recognize what private resources are doing in the direction of our foreign relations. It was brought out in a conference at which the gentleman was present, that World-Wide Radio was broadcasting in Greek on their own three times a week, but the State Department only admitted that after we questioned them in detail. We want the whole truth. It is true, of course, that they conduct some moving-picture exercises; however, the moving-picture industry itself is spending today \$2,000,000 of their own money in the field of foreign relations. Those things should be brought to the attention of the American people. We have had no success at all in getting the State Department to admit that anybody else but themselves were in this field. The American people are entitled to the truth.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended five additional minutes.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I see no point in discussing a matter that is in this bill which we are going to go into at some length when an amendment is offered to restore the item. I wonder if, for the reason of conserving time, we could not discuss and debate these matters when we come to them at that point in the bill. However, I shall not object.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Thank you all, sincerely, for your forbearance. I shall not yield at the moment because I want to continue with the points which I was endeavoring to make, and in another 5 minutes I shall conclude.

The second point is that we have asked that to be done which private industry, unaided, cannot do; there is no question about this fact.

The third point is the controversial one. The Appropriations Subcommittee says, with some accuracy in its report, that this program has not been efficiently administered. Certainly, it has made some very serious mistakes. It has done some things which I might even call blunders. But I call to the attention of the committee that this is a new venture; that it is an entirely new experience for the American Government in peacetime to present to areas of the world, with many, many different languages, broadcasts which are going to have the right kind of receptivity and the right kind of result in these countries.

Among the people now administering the program there is real honest controversy as to whether this program, for example, should be sort of a showcase for America, such as you have in front of a big department store, in which you place the items which you have for sale, but in which you place only your best items, the ones of which you are proud, the ones you think will have the biggest appeal to the passers-by. There is one line of argument holding that these broadcasts should be devoted exclusively to that kind of program. They insist with considerable persuasiveness that this information program should be in fact what I would call a showcase for America abroad.

There is also a valid argument that can be presented that these broadcasts should not be a showcase for America, but that, rather, they should be a mirror of America; that they should reflect what happens here; imaging abroad some of the bad things as well as some of the good things.

The Secretary of State leans in the direction of supporting those who believe that we should make these broadcasts a mirror of America. Secretary Marshall says these broadcasts should employ what he has so aptly called "the strategy of truth." Mr. Marshall stresses that you have to develop on the part of the listeners a respect for the objectivity of the programs; a respect for the fact that they do mix the bitter with the sweet.

I am not prepared to say whether this information service abroad should be a show case or a mirror for America. I am prepared to say however, that as this bill is developed during the hearings and through amendments, and as it is then screened through the Committee on Appropriations for the purpose of securing money for the services we authorize, Congress can write in the precautions which make it possible for us to voice our will as to whether this program should give only the sunshiney, pollyanic, happy side of America or whether it should present both sides of the picture. In my opinion America is great enough and good enough so that even if our foreign broadcasts are just an honest mirror of what America is and how Americans live we will continue to develop and increase respect for the United States abroad.

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

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman said a minute ago that he thought we should give both the good and the bad side.

Mr. MUNDT. I said I was not prepared to say, because there is great argument among those administering the program whether the program should be used as a show case or a mirror of American life. Whichever idea is used, however, I favor keeping the voice of America articulate abroad.

Mr. JENSEN. Can the gentleman tell me just when the new concept of salesmanship took place? I always thought that when a salesman went out to sell his goods, he told about the good things about his goods; he did not tell of the bad things. Now, if we are going to embark on a program to tell the world about the bad things of America, I think we are going far astray from the purposes of these broadcasts.

Mr. MUNDT. I think the gentleman has been approached by too many of those blue-sky stock salesmen who prey upon the rich farmers of Iowa, and who certainly give only the bright side of a picture. A good salesman these days does present an honest picture and does not try to sell his product as Utopia.

Mr. JENSEN. That is just talk. I am getting down to brass tacks. I am not floating around in mid-air here and saying a lot of words for nothing. I am trying to find out from the gentleman if it is necessary to spend millions and millions of dollars on this Voice of America to tell the people of the world of a lot of bad things that may be going on here. I do not think that is a good policy. The gentleman is putting himself in the role of a salesman now, he is trying to sell us right now on the idea that this is a good thing to keep up. We know there are a lot of bad things in it, but if we did not know it, would the gentleman as a salesman trying to sell this job to us tell us about all the bad things?

Mr. MUNDT. Yes. In fact, the burden of my speech has been to present the facts and to point out that this program is not above reproach; it is not above criticism. We are now holding hearings before my subcommittee on my bill for making this the proper type of program so that we can do what the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] says we should do, have the Voice of America articulated in such fashion that it is clearly and convincingly a real American voice.

Mr. Chairman, may I call attention to title IX, section 901 of my proposed legislation, H. R. 3342, as it is designed directly to eliminate some of the causes for most of the criticism which has been made against this idea to set up a permanent and continuing United States Information Service abroad.

Here is the language of that section:

No individual may be employed or assigned to duties under this act unless the director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, after such investigation as he deems necessary, certifies that, in his opinion, such individual is loyal to the United States and such employment or assignment is consistent with the security of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, that provision assures us all that real, sturdy, Americans—proud of the American concept and eager to protect, preserve, and promote it—will administer and staff this information program. We can be positive under

that provision that no Communists, or parlor pinks, or crypto-communists, or fellow travellers will have any part in this program in any way, shape, or form. That provision should permit us to consider the program on its merit without fear that it will be sabotaged by disloyal or apologetic Americans. That provision makes certain we will have as complete a house cleaning as is necessary and is warranted. It does precisely what the chairman of the Appropriations Committee [Mr. TABER] has been suggesting. It sets up safeguards for the staffing of this program which are unequaled in almost any other legislation ever passed by Congress—they are as complete, in fact, as those which made certain of the loyalty of the men working on the so-called Manhattan project, the atomic-bomb project, during the days of war.

Colleagues, if the Voice of America has had a faulty lisp at times or a foreign accent, let us not cut the throat of the Voice of America to correct either its diction or direction. Let us rather guide it by congressional mandate and supervision to make certain it develops the sturdy American twang which we all desire it to demonstrate. All of you are invited to bring your ideas and suggestions before my subcommittee which is meeting daily. Any amendments you propose will be most carefully considered. It is our hope to bring this legislation before you at an early date and in such form that its safeguards and provisions will assure you all that this enabling legislation for an American information program abroad merits your approval so that new finances may be provided for it before the ending of the current fiscal year next July 1.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened with a certain degree of apprehension and bewilderment to what I have just heard. Just what are we trying to do? Are we undertaking to convince the world that we are crazy? If we are, this is a fine program. We propose now to take how many million dollars to do this thing? If it were \$5 it would be too much.

Are there those in this body who are apprehensive that the libelers and the slanderers who are undertaking to whittle this country down the wind will not tell enough lies to make the people of foreign countries think we are as bad as they want the world to think we are? Who is it among this motley crew who has sense enough to mirror the people of this country to the world as we really are? I have seen some of this stuff they have been putting out. The representatives of the State Department say they want the people of foreign countries to know what American women look like, and they get up a caricature, a squat creature of the muck and mire and hold this misshapen thing up to the world as an American circus performer taking a rest.

We have Henry Wallace. He has been on the loose. He is not costing the tax payers of the country anything now. He has been to Europe and has misrepresented this country pretty thoroughly. He said we have a malicious purpose to police the borders of Russia in order to

impose American imperialism upon the Russians. I noticed in yesterday's paper that Henry said the time has now come in this country for the Federal Government to nationalize the coal mines.

If it were not that some of the inmates are violent, we could empty our lunatic asylums and put the lunatics on the air. I just cannot bring myself to vote any money to finance a fool program like this.

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

Mr. JENNINGS. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. After reading what Wallace said in Europe and hearing of the broadcast boosting him at the time he was over there, I thought of the Irishman who came back after the First World War and said he found the French so darned ignorant he could hardly make them understand their own language. I am afraid Mr. Wallace had quite a good deal of trouble explaining communism to the Communists of Europe.

Mr. JENNINGS. Generally speaking, when someone is not using him to broadcast a record full of his malevolence he is as clear as mud on any subject to which he addresses himself. We just do not have competent people to carry on a program like this. If we have them, the State Department has failed to employ such persons. If the people of Europe, in spite of the billions of dollars that we have showered upon them—if the people of Europe after having been snatched as a brand from the burning—if the people all over Europe do not know that we are the kindest, most generous, and most sympathetic people on the face of the earth, no amount of silly broadcasting will enable them to realize these facts.

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

Mr. JENNINGS. I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. RIZLEY. Referring to the statement made by the distinguished gentleman from South Dakota that he thinks we ought to sell the good as well as the bad, I understand that in this same program, before Mr. Wallace made his trip over there, the State Department used a great deal of money that we had appropriated to sell the countries of Europe on the merits of Henry Wallace, and most Republicans ought to know this—they used part of the money to sell the whole world and this country especially on the evils of the Republican Party.

Mr. JENNINGS. I never knew whether Mr. Truman sent boomerang-throwing Henry Wallace up in a trial balloon and forced him to jump out without a parachute, or whether Henry did it while running true to form on his own.

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

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, let me point out just one other thing about selling America. I have been trying law-

suits for a long time. If any lawyer should go into court and try a case with the purpose of showing the weak points of his client's case instead of leaving that to his adversary, such a lawyer should be bored for the simples. No man need ever worry that his adversary and his enemies will not point out his weak points. The thing to do if you have a cause that you wish to sell is to put your best foot forward.

What is wrong with this country anyhow? If these people do not know that this is the one free Republic in all the world, if they do not know that this is perhaps the only solvent country in the world, if after we have paved the road of victory to Berlin and Tokyo with the dead and broken bodies of more than a million of our finest, our bravest, our strongest and best men, if they do not know these facts there is nothing in the world that will convince them of what the people of this country have done for them.

Let us keep this money and, if necessary, use it to feed the hungry and clothe the naked.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last five words and ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, there is much that I lack in many ways so far as education and training is concerned. For instance, I have not been highly educated in art, but I am sure that we do have in the Congress many Members who are well trained in the arts and sciences and who have studied, with a great deal of care, during the last few weeks some of the material that is being sent out by our Government, at the expense of the American taxpayers, to give to the people of the world a true picture of American life so that they may know something about America; so that they may have some idea of what representative government stands for; so that they may learn what real liberty and true freedom actually mean.

In order that those of you who, like myself, have not had the opportunity to study art at home or in foreign lands may become better informed, I am going to take the liberty of passing around among you some of the pictures we are now spending good money to send abroad. I hope you will be kind enough to return them to the table. I hope that on your own time, and at the proper time, you will be kind enough to give to the House the benefit of your deductions and your understanding of just what these pictures represent in American life.

This picture, I think, represents sleepy-eyed potatoes in the springtime. Here is a very fine illustration. I am sure that from it some of you may now be able to understand what a great contribution we are making to peace abroad. I would like especially to have the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] explain just exactly what this picture represents.

Here is one that has a colonial hat placed jauntily upon a skeleton. I am

sure the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] can explain its meaning in his own time. I am certain he will be interested in it.

I have quite a number of other pictures if anyone wants to see them. Any one who ever lived along the seashore would recognize this picture, either as a fish or the Wreck of the Hesperus. You may make your own decision.

Mr. ST. GEORGE. Have you some that you can show the ladies?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Oh, yes. I have some that I can show the ladies. I will ask the lady if she ever saw another lady with the physical characteristics that this particular picture portrays? Is it representative of our American womanhood? I pray not.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I never saw her pose for a picture.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. That is what is known in the newspaper business as leg art, in case the lady is interested.

Here is a very, very symbolic picture. I am not sure just what it is, but I am certain the Members would like to look at it.

Here is a picture of a maze that I am sure all of you can find your way out of, if you will look at it carefully and study it. Is it truly representative of American life?

Here is another beautiful picture I think you may all enjoy. It is a remarkable conception of what our Republic stands for, and here is a picture which I believe should be entitled "Congress at Work."

This is a hunting scene that I am sure is typical of some of the work of our aboriginal ancestors here in America.

Here is another picture I am sure you can understand. Of course, there is no congressional mind that cannot grasp the full significance of this picture. I would like for the gentleman from California to study it. If he wishes he can interpret it for us. Perhaps he can give us some idea of what it really means.

Of course, everyone recognizes this picture. This is the Washington trolley system that we have here in our Capital city. It is typical.

I am sure the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox], will be interested in this particular picture. Perhaps he can explain it to his constituents when he gets home.

Here is another picture. The only thing I can recognize is the word "Smith." So I am convinced it is either a portrait of Dr. SMITH of Ohio or Judge SMITH of Virginia, but I am not sure which one. This is supposed to be an exhibit, by the way, which truly represents what is going on here in America.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, is it important that it be determined which one it is?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Oh, yes. I think we should address a resolution of inquiry to the State Department.

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield briefly.

Mr. BUSBEY. I merely wish to advise the gentleman from Ohio that if he will read today's RECORD he will see where I inserted information showing

that 20 of these artists have definite Communist affiliations and backgrounds.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Thank you, Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. BENDER. Is this picture supposed to be some part of a horse?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I am not sure; it may be one of our modern State Department employees, at rest.

Mr. RANKIN. This one is of the Eleanor Club, I may say to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I am glad to have that information, because I am totally uninformed as to what these pictures really do represent. I am just a dumb American who pays taxes for this kind of trash.

Let me say, with all the seriousness at my command, that if there is a single individual in this Congress who believes this kind of tripe is doing any good toward the advancement of world peace, or toward bringing a better understanding of American life, then he should be sent to the same nut house from which the people who drew this stuff originally came. Why, it is simply ridiculous that we put up with this kind of waste of the taxpayers' money for one moment. After all, we do have some responsibility, here in the Congress, to the people we represent. This material, of course, is quite humorous, but it is also a great tragedy that we have representing us today in our Government—in a State Department—those who would spend the people's money for this sort of stuff. We ought to be ashamed of ourselves and we should clean out those who are responsible for such a situation.

However, I have no criticism of General Marshall. He is a great man, with a reputation as an organizer, but he has not had an opportunity to reorganize the State Department. I say, however, that it is about time he starts to reorganize the State Department, or it will wreck him while he is abroad trying to represent the United States in world conferences. Until he does reorganize this department, until he does get rid of these people who not only are not truly representative of America, but actually do not understand America and cannot speak our language, we can only say: "No more appropriations for such nonsense."

I will support an information program whenever the State Department comes here and presents to the Congress the right kind of program; but until it does bring to us a proper kind of information program, which will be run by people who understand America and who are loyal to America, then I am going to oppose any appropriation whatsoever for this type of "bunk."

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the statement just made by my friend from Ohio, and the reaction he got from the Membership shows just how impossible it is for us to make progress with this activity of the State Department until confidence in personnel is established.

I have been saying to friends in the State Department for some time that until Congress became convinced that the influence of the old OWI had been completely eliminated it would be impossible to get any money whatsoever for the carrying on of this work. The photographs which the gentleman from Ohio has distributed here on the floor is in the main a picture of the old OWI which I think was completely controlled by those who exercised an influence detrimental to our country as a whole. I feel, however, that it is due the assistants in the State Department who is in charge of this activity at the present time that I should say that I am convinced that since he took the position which he holds he has endeavored to clean up that branch of the Department over which he presides. I am not convinced, however, that the progress in this respect has been made that might have been made if the cleaning up operation had been handled with less care and tender consideration for the people who were responsible for the bad repute into which this branch has fallen. Mr. Benton is a man of great ability and if given fair support he would make a record of which all would be proud. There is no abler man in the State Department.

I want to make this observation, and I think I am correct, that in the expenditures that we are making abroad in order to promote our influence and protect our welfare it will not be possible to get full benefit of the money which is being expended unless we can take our story to the people that we are trying to help. You are not going to be able to combat successfully this foreign influence with money. It is going to take more than that. The good will and informational program which the State Department is carrying on is a thing that must be continued, but again I want to say for the benefit of the State Department it is perfectly apparent they will not get a dime until they have washed out this whole set-up and regained the confidence of the Congress to the extent that the Congress will believe that only those who are pro-Americans will be used to administer the program. This is something that Mr. Benton can do and will do if given proper support.

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

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. COX. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I just want to call the attention of the gentleman from Georgia to the fact that no American drew those crazy pictures.

Mr. COX. I cannot think it reasonable to suppose that a sane person drew them or that a man with any common sense at all would have distributed them.

Mr. RANKIN. They are Communist caricatures that are sent out to mislead

the rest of the world as to what America is like.

Mr. COX. These pictures are the same kind of art that you saw so prominently displayed during the World Fair in New York. It is not the sort of Americanism which I, like the gentleman from Ohio, am able to understand.

Mr. RANKIN. Until there is a house cleaning of the State Department that is the kind of embarrassment the American people are going to be subjected to.

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

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, the distinguished and able chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] is one of the most valuable Members of this House. He is hard-working and conscientious. He is diligent in the discharge of his duties. He is utterly devoted to the unpleasant task that has been assigned him, and he should have the sympathetic understanding and full cooperation of every Member of this House in trying to cut the cost of Government to the bone. I could say the same fine complimentary things about the chairman of the subcommittee, my good personal friend, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN], who is handling this particular bill. Therefore it is with some reluctance that I must say that on this measure—and much to the amazement, no doubt, of many of my friends—I am forced to differ with these gentlemen.

I know you can resort to the art of satire and ridicule. Frankly I have practiced it myself on occasion. But this is too serious a matter to laugh out of court. This Foreign Information Service is in its infancy. It is a new set-up. I am aware that it has made many grievous mistakes; many of the parts of its program have been silly, and some of it has been downright dangerous. And, I agree with former speakers who have said that we need a housecleaning in the State Department. God knows that housecleaning is long overdue. Jimmy Byrnes got rid of a lot of the Reds, but some pinks still remain. I think General Marshall, if given a fair opportunity and sufficient time, wil' get rid of them. It is going to take more than a stiff broom furnished us by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER]. We will need a pitchfork and a scoop shovel. But, why should we kill a foreign-information program simply because of some mistakes that have been made?

I declare unto you that ideas are the most powerful weapons on earth. An idea is something that cannot be destroyed by a shell or a bomb.

Mind is more powerful than matter. John Huss, the Bohemian reformer and martyr, was burned at the stake, but the cause he espoused was not destroyed. Eighty-three years later a great Italian soul with irrepressible energy, unconquerable convictions, and flaming eloquence was hanged and burned, but his love of liberty, his sense of decency, and justice still live. Girolamo Savonarola is not dead! Abraham Lincoln was assassinated but freedom of the colored

race was not destroyed in this country, the Union was not divided, and the ideas of the Great Emancipator still live in the minds of men. Indeed, the Great Teacher of all time was nailed to a cross by an angry mob, but the Crucifixion did not destroy, rather it only served to encourage the growth and spread of Christianity throughout the world. Such is the power of an idea and an ideal.

"As a man thinketh, so is he." That is not only good gospel; that is sound psychology, and history is replete with instances that prove the truth of that statement. A nation is no different from an individual. As a nation thinketh, so is it. And, logically and inevitably, action follows thought.

What gave rise to nazism? What made Hitler possible? It was because of the philosophy of Friedrich Nietzsche. It was the doctrine of a superman, the super race that brought forth Hitler, Himmler, Goering, Goebels, and all their murderous gang. It was the philosophy on von Freitschke and von Bernhardi that "might makes right" and "necessity knows no law."

Perhaps one of the greatest mistakes from a selfish point of view, Great Britain made in the First World War was when she brought a million Indians and Hindus from India to the Western Front to do the housekeeping of the allied Armies. That million Hindus got a look and taste of European life. They became indoctrinated with Western ideas. They saw for the first time in their lives how other people were living. When the war was over and they returned to India, there were a million ambassadors clamoring for India's freedom. Gandhi, a successful barrister and honor graduate of Oxford, left South Africa and returned to India, and that movement for freedom has been going on in India until 375,000,000 people today are seething with revolt and rebellion, and the Indians will obtain their independence next year. Whether it will be for good or ill remains to be seen. Only time can tell.

I want to say to you gentlemen here this afternoon, in my opinion one of our greatest assets in dealing with Soviet Russia—and we will reap the benefit before too long—is the fact that for the first time in their lives hundreds of thousands of Russian soldiers were allowed to leave their own country and to penetrate the countries of central and eastern Europe. In spite of the devastation, wreckage and ruin, these Russians saw villages and towns and the way of life of other peoples in Rumania, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Germany, and Austria, preferable to their own.

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

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. I appreciate very much this additional time.

These hundreds of thousands of Russians who came into central and eastern

Europe and mingled, more or less, in spite of the restrictions imposed upon them, with the peoples of other countries, have seen people living in devastated areas much better than most Russians have ever lived. Russia is recalling these soldiers from the occupied areas because she is fearful of the views they might express in clandestine meetings on their return home. She does not want her people to know the actual conditions in other lands. Recently I was talking to a good friend of mine who has spent several years in Russia and who speaks the Russian language fluently. He talked to me off the record. I asked him about conditions. He said, "Dewey, conditions inside Russia are terrible. The people are war-worn and weary. They do not want to fight anyone again." Of course, we know there are about 40 men who would set up world-wide communism at any cost, using every artifice, lie, trickery, and device in order to destroy the bourgeoisie and establish the rule of the proletariat. But I am convinced that these Russian soldiers who are coming back from Europe to their own country are dissatisfied with things in Russia. They are beginning to question, after all, this utopia that has been dinned into their ears and the lies that have been told them. They have seen for themselves life outside Soviet Russia and are now asking, Is life at home so good after all? They are thinking even though they cannot talk.

I say to you, the only way we can penetrate the iron curtain at this time is by the same sort of psychological penetration practiced by the Soviets themselves. It is that infiltration, that psychological penetration practiced by the Soviets that goes into every country in advance of their conquering armies. They soften the enemy before they attack. Their motto is, "Divide and conquer." How foolish it would be because of certain errors and grave mistakes made by this new infant agency to wipe it out altogether. If we hope to establish the free economic, democratic, way of life in this world, then we must assume these enormously increased responsibilities that have been bequeathed to us at the close of this global conflict. The only way we can penetrate this wall of secrecy today, unless we are willing to declare war and go in with our armies and drop our bombs, is by way of radio, the newspaper and the psychological warfare that saved the lives of hundreds of thousands of our soldiers both in the First and the Second World Wars.

In 1922 when I was a student at Heidelberg, I asked my professor, Herr Hoopes, one day who won the war. The answer was, "Lord Northcliffe's newspapers and Woodrow Wilson's 14 points are what won the war," because literally hundreds of thousands, in fact, millions of pamphlets containing the 14 points were dropped over the German lines. When the Germans picked up those pamphlets and read about the right of self-determination, of territorial integrity, they threw away their rifles and went home and refused to return to the front lines. In fact, the revolution broke out in Munich 60 days before the armistice in 1918, and that revolution assumed

far greater proportions than the outside world has ever guessed.

From this global conflict that has just closed General Eisenhower knows the value of psychological warfare, "Wild Bill" Donovan knows the value of it, and so does George Marshall, who only recently has made a plea that the Congress not abdicate these functions and obliterate this agency.

Let us clean it up and put it in order. Do not kill it. These men know that the psychological penetration we made not only to the armed forces of our enemies but to the subjugated peoples in occupied territories and citizens of the neutral powers did much to win us support of the underground and brought the war to a speedy termination, thus saving thousands upon thousands of American lives. So let us not act here wholly in a spirit of emotion or prejudice. William Benton, after all, regardless of what anyone here thinks about him, has proved himself successful businessman. You do not have to argue to hard-headed practical businessmen in America about the value of advertising. Just read any magazine or newspaper. I know that Bill Benton is reasonable—he is approachable and agreeable—and I think he will welcome any constructive criticism that Congress may have to offer.

Mr. Chairman, today we are facing a war of ideas, a war between the totalitarianism of communism and the freedom of a constitutional representative Republic. Through the Office of International Information and Cultural Affairs the Department of State provides a vehicle for presenting democratic ideas overseas and combatting the misrepresentations of the United States so prevalent abroad. I believe it is most important to this country that we maintain a vigorous foreign information program, and I hope that Congress will pass the bill recently introduced by the gentleman of South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], giving basic authority for the Department's foreign information activities, and I hope also that Congress will make available adequate appropriations for this important work. I realize that the appropriation in this bill for this specific activity is perhaps subject to a point of order because it is unauthorized and might be considered as legislation on an appropriation bill.

Recently some of us returned from the Near East, where we attended a meeting of the Interparliamentary Union at Cairo, Egypt. In Turkey and Greece we found that the Voice of America is coming through and reaching many people. If the Voice of America is stilled, and other activities of the United States Information Service terminated, we would have no effective way of combatting the wave of misrepresentation of the United States daily beamed to these and neighboring countries by Radio Moscow. We would be playing a game with two strikes already called against us.

As Ann O'Hare McCormick pointed out in a recent editorial article in the New York Times, the national interest requires that the Voice of America be heard where at present it cannot be heard.

In the World as it is, a world of competitive systems and competitive propaganda, the

United States has to compete in every way it can—

Mrs. McCormick said—

To win in this competition, nothing is so important as to make our system work politically, socially, economically. Retreat on any of these fronts is fatal to the cause of democracy everywhere. The next important thing is to let people know that it works. Money has to be spent to tell the story, to give the population of the Soviet Union and eastern Europe some idea of America other than the image etched on their minds by incessant false propaganda. If a thousand listeners in the upper ranks of the Communist Party hear the Voice of America it is worth the investment. Congress takes a grave responsibility in silencing a whisper that has already begun to echo as far away as Siberia and Baku.

For the fiscal year beginning July 1 the State Department has asked for approximately \$31,000,000 for its overseas information program. This is but a minute fraction of the amount proposed for the budget of the armed services. It is perhaps a fourth of the cost of a modern battleship, and represents only the cost of a few bombers. Expenditures for overseas information must properly be considered a premium for peace insurance, and if this money can help in promoting a better understanding of the United States abroad it will be producing dividends that will accrue to the benefit of future generations of Americans.

We must not lose the war of ideas by default. Today we battle for men's minds. Through the Voice of America and the other activities of the United States information service the facts about America and the American way of life reach into the countries behind the so-called iron curtain, giving support and nurture to the idea of representative self-government. We must always remember the potency of an idea. You cannot prevent people from thinking by bayonets. Keep the idea of freedom alive, and it may well be that in the long run the peoples now exposed to totalitarianism, terrorization, and communistic propaganda will halt the tide of communism and enable freemen to move forward as the basis of a new and peaceful world order.

We need friends abroad, and to win friends, it is essential that our policies be understood and fully known to the peoples of the world. We must be strong, with a stable economy, and the world must know that we are strong, with a sound economy, and not on the verge of an economic crash as hinted by the Moscow propaganda.

The information program is really part of our defense program, for one of its principal missions is to overcome the misrepresentations and correct the distortions that are one of the factors that may lead to another war. And another global war will spell the death of our modern civilization.

Short-wave radio is an effective instrument for reaching foreign peoples. It can reach illiterate people, and no censorship in the receiving country can distort or suppress its message. Outside the United States it is estimated that there are 20,000,000 radio sets capable of receiving shortwave programs. It is es-

sential that American democracy be able to speak with a voice of its own on the international stage. To silence the Voice of America, and halt the overseas information program would deprive us, in this critical period in international affairs, of an instrument vitally important in carrying out our peaceful objectives.

Mr. Chairman, perhaps it is because of my abysmal ignorance due to lack of education and travel and my brief service in this Body that it is utterly beyond my comprehension why or how Members in this Chamber can vote \$400,000,000 aid to Greece and Turkey and then refuse to vote less than one-twelfth of that amount to be spent in this essential work by our own Department of State.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last four words.

Mr. Chairman, I was in the Chamber at the time the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] gave the membership the benefit of looking at photographic proofs of some of the paintings that have been used by the State Department in its program. I noticed that as many Members looked at them it created a feeling of levity and there was some outright laughter. There has been a good deal of criticism about the paintings selected by the State Department.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know who selected these paintings for use in this information program, but I would not be surprised if perhaps nearly every one of the paintings that were exhibited had either received a prize or at least honorable mention in some of the exhibits of this country. I say that for the reason that it only occurred to me as I looked at some of them that my district has the honor of having located in it the Carnegie Institute, and that there for many, many years we have held national exhibitions of art, as well as international exhibitions, and within the past 15 or 20 years I would say that at least three-fourths of the time the paintings that won first prize were what is called abstract painting.

I know that I have never understood them, nor really appreciate their artistry. I believe that if it were left to the votes of the general public that the paintings awarded first prize, and which were selected by the board of artists who make the awards, would never have won first prize.

So, I suggest to you Members here today not to let the exhibitions of these paintings sway you in your judgment. Do not let it sway you in making up your mind as to whether or not this program being carried on by the Secretary of State is a good program or in the interests of the United States.

I know that every time in the last 5 years that first prize was awarded in an art exhibition at Carnegie Institute in Pittsburgh practically every newspaper ridiculed the selection, ridiculed the award, and asked, in effect, "Who knows what this means?" "Is it art, and if it is art, I assume we do not know anything about art."

Even columnists who are nationally known, take it as their theme that we had better give up on the subject of art; that the general public does not know what art is. So I am jumping at

the conclusion that perhaps every one of these paintings that were shown to the membership this morning were paintings that had received either honorable mention, or a first prize, or other prize in an exhibition.

I join in everything that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] said, particularly when he called attention to the fact that we should not use ridicule or levity in order to arrive at a just and fair conclusion on this subject of an information program by the Department of State.

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

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield.

Mr. JARMAN. In other words, if I understand the gentleman correctly, he means to indicate that he is not a connoisseur of art.

Mr. EBERHARTER. That is correct.

Mr. JARMAN. But that he doubts seriously whether the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] and other Members of this body, are any more connoisseurs than he is? I thoroughly agree with him if that is his position.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The gentleman is absolutely correct. I just hope that a view of these reproductions will not have any effect in arriving at the proper conclusion.

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

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield.

Mr. CHELF. I sincerely believe that if Members of Congress and the American people as a whole throughout this country cannot understand these pictures, that most certainly they ought not to be sent overseas.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I do not know how any board would select the pictures to be used, but I do not know of any better group to select than the board selected by the Carnegie Institute of Art. I do not think we should leave it to any lay group or to Members of Congress or any other such group. I do not see how we might do anything better than to select pictures that had won approval and prizes.

Mr. CHELF. If any pictures are sent abroad, we should see to it that they represent the American home or family life. Not some silly thing that resembles the north end of a south-bound freight train which inadvertently is headed west.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Probably there would be more disagreement about that than there is about these.

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

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, the omission from this appropriation bill of money for continuing the Department's information program should not be taken to mean that we are abandoning the program of broadcasting information about the United States to the nations of the world. There is now pend-

ing H. R. 3342 which proposes by specific legislation to authorize not only the broadcasting of such information to other nations but a program of cultural and educational interchange as well. The bill will undoubtedly be revised as the hearings and the debate show need for revision but the essential idea is there. The important point now, however, is that the failure to appropriate for the Voice of America broadcasting activities in this bill should not be considered anywhere as an abandonment of the basic American program for letting other nations know how we live, what we think, and what are our intentions. Such a program is a basic function of our foreign policy; for what is foreign policy if not a combination of men's hopes, aspirations, fears, and prejudices. Is it not true that the very thing we complain about now is lack of information in foreign countries about why we in the United States are spending enormous sums of money to help the world to reconstruct itself? The peoples of the world want to know whether this is cooperation in reconstruction or some new form of imperialism. Only information about ourselves will put down rumor and misrepresentation about our motives. Stories about the aggressive intentions of the United States, or its dollar diplomacy, will be found to have no validity by peoples who are given the facts about the United States. Even an expenditure of \$30,000,000 for such a program if it is found to cost that much to do the job right, should be found justified on the facts, for it is only one-third of 1 percent of the minimum amount of \$10,000,000,000 we are estimated to have invested in world reconstruction since VJ-day. An appropriation only for institutional advertising by any company in that percentage would be considered very modest. We have specifically written into the foreign relief bill the other day and the Greek-Turkish aid bill passed last Friday, provisions that representatives of our press, radio, and movies shall freely circulate in the benefited countries. We want to know a lot about them. Is it not just as sure that we want them to know a lot about us? I agree that such a program must be dignified, factual, and truly representative of the best in our country. But we are the leaders of the world in the techniques of telling a business story. It is high time we became leaders of the world in telling our economic, political, and social story. I fail to comprehend the limited view which would vote hundreds of millions for relief and foreign assistance and stop at voting a few millions for the right kind of a program to tell what we are doing and why. For the lack of these few millions the world and ourselves could easily lose the benefit of all the hundreds of millions. The bill for a foreign information program will come before the House in due course and I trust that it will be well received and passed, for that and that alone can be the justification for leaving out the appropriation now.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened with a great deal of interest to this debate. I

cannot refrain at this time from expressing my opinion upon this very important piece of legislation.

We have lately concluded hostilities engaged in by more than 10,000,000 of our young men and young women. Many of those young men who survived that struggle sit before me in this House today. We are now engaged in a great struggle to win to our concept of government the peoples of the earth, because the future peace is bound up in the success or failure of the United Nations.

I am disturbed about the lack of an appropriation for the State Department Information Service.

In these days, following the close of the shooting period of war, we look hopefully toward a just and lasting peace. The whole world does. Many want peace the easy way. They want to shun self-denial and to run away from the hardships incident to obtaining peace. In our urge to forget the blood and tears of war and to return to the pursuits of peace in which we engaged before the war, we often lose sight of the fact that we have invested at least \$300,000,000 in this war and the peace which we hope will follow it. A considerable sum of money, to say the least. This vast sum of money is a minor item, however, when compared to the thousands of our finest young men and young women who lost their lives in this war. There are also the countless thousands returned to us broken in body and mind who are in our hospitals all over the world—victims of the fight to bring peace to the world.

America must be strong physically and spiritually to be able to help finish the work which these, our gallant sons and brave daughters, have begun at so great a sacrifice. We cannot do it by running from the issues. We cannot do it by dodging the responsibility.

We are not a warlike people. This makes it hard for us to keep prepared for peace. The realization that we must be strong for peace as well as for war is hard for the average American. The one necessity tends to confuse the other necessity in our concept of duty.

During these unsettled days before the treaties of peace are signed; before the United Nations, now in its infancy, has grown strong enough to keep the peace, it is necessary that we remain strong. We are a friendly nation and a generous people. We desire no advantage. Our hope is that the nations of the world will learn to live together as good neighbors. Nothing, therefore, can be a greater force for peace than a strong America, spiritually sensitive to justice.

My belief is that the first line of defense for peace in America is the composite will of the American people to see the United Nations succeed. To do that with the same unselfish spirit which we manifested during the war; it is essential that we have unity at home; that we be determined that all the suffering and heartache of this war were not endured in vain.

The second line of defense is our armed services. We must have an Army, a Navy, and an Air Force strong enough to make our presence felt wherever our

word is given in a world struggling for peace. Our armed services must be arms of justice and decency and freedom for all peoples and not for conquest, as they have always been in the past.

Our third line of national defense is a strong domestic economy. Right now we are having difficulties, including strife between labor and management, high prices, shortages, taxes, debt reduction, and all the myriad problems of our daily living.

Fourth in our line of defense is rarely mentioned in that connection, and it is the one that I wish to stress today.

I refer to the request of the State Department for funds to permit that Department to engage in selling America to the world in those places where our privately owned press, publications, and radio cannot go and do not go.

All over this land chambers of commerce are busy day and night selling to their neighboring communities and to the world at large those things which set these particular communities apart as special attractions to the home seeker, the industries seeking locations for plants, and as places of rest and recreation for people on tour. Millions of dollars are spent this way each year in the United States selling good will.

The United States today is the leading country in the world in its freedom, its culture, its industry, and its religion. We must keep that leadership. Developments in radio and air transportation have made us next-door neighbors to every other place on earth. We are only 60 hours away from the farthest part of the globe in travel and only an instant away by radio.

It is not enough that we be strong physically. As I have said, we must be strong spiritually. We must have an abiding belief in the concept of the brotherhood of all mankind; to be aware of the hunger and heartache of our brothers in all places. If we have that spirit, then we will want to tell our story to the world and we will tell it with our heart in it.

Unfortunately, selfishness still plays a big role in world affairs. We, ourselves, do not have entirely clean hands on that score. As a result, misunderstandings and jealousies have arisen between neighbors, and in some places our story is not told nor is it received. America must accept that challenge in its true sense of good will and tell her story in its full light wherever there are people to receive it—by press, by radio, by messenger. When people know all the facts they can be trusted to solve the most difficult problems. Let us give the State Department the funds needed to carry on this work in conjunction with the press and radio of our country. The State Department must go where private means of communication cannot go because of the cost involved and consequent loss to private enterprise in the effort. No greater defense from war nor a greater force for peace can be developed than a complete understanding of one another's problems—and that understanding can never be had without the people of the world having the full and complete truth.

If we can get our story told, the most doubting neighbors will completely un-

derstand that we, in America, long for peace above everything in the world; that we have neither the desire nor the intent to try to impose our ideology of government upon anyone on this earth; that it is our ideal of government that the lowliest citizen has the same rights as the most powerful; that a man can worship God in the manner which pleases him; that he can get up anywhere at any time and criticize his public officials from the President of the United States down to a constable in the smallest township. He can do this and have no fear that he will be stood up against a wall and shot for doing it or of even being punished at all; that his son or daughter, born and reared in the most humble of circumstances, can become the President of a great university, the head of a great hospital, the pastor of the greatest church, or even the President of his country. Yes; when people all over the world understand what our heart is and what our soul is, then we will be far nearer to a just and lasting peace.

Often the news from this country is distorted as it reaches other lands. Where nations are in strife economically or in war, the news is often colored to fit the pleasure of the one sending it or disseminating it. The opposition pounces upon the mistakes which have been made and magnifies them and never mentions the good which may have been done. Statements are studied and selections from the statements are taken which are least favorable. They are pulled from the context and told as the truth. This happens, unfortunately, among nations and is not conducive to better understanding.

What we are endeavoring to do is to get the truth across firmly but in friendship.

When some other nation misunderstands an act of one of our citizens and erroneously jumps to the conclusion that his acts and statements represent the thought and will of America, we must combat that with the most powerful weapon we have—the truth.

What we want the world to know is that here in America we are a country of divergent interests yet withal we are one of the other. The mills of the North and the East, the grain of the great Midwest, the cotton of the South, the cattle ranges of the West and Southwest, the booming new industry of the Pacific coast, are all part of this great land; labor, and management, and Agriculture dependent upon each other to such a degree that the economic illness of the one affects vitally the other two. Our churches, our schools, our hospitals, are all monuments to the free expression given to the everyday, average American. It is America.

This one ideal must exist throughout the world. Otherwise, from generation to generation, the youth of our country will be called upon to go forth to fight to preserve this democracy. And that because those of us before them failed in our duty and ran from our responsibility.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, we have been quite liberal in the matter of time for general debate. So far we have merely read the enacting clause of the bill. We have not started reading the

bill itself. I am sure there will be plenty of opportunity for every Member to speak under the 5-minute rule.

I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the enacting paragraph do now close and that we start reading the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF STATE

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE

Salaries and expenses, Department of State: For necessary expenses, including personal services in the District of Columbia; salary of the Under Secretary of State, \$12,000; health service program as authorized by the act of August 8, 1946 (Public Law 658); not to exceed \$26,000 for expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the work of the Department of State; purchase of uniforms for chauffeurs; purchase of 14 passenger motor vehicles, including 1 at not to exceed \$3,000; and dues for library membership in societies or associations which issue publications to members only, or at a price to members lower than to subscribers who are not members, newspapers, teletype rentals, and tolls (not to exceed \$15,000); rental of tie lines; stenographic reporting and translating services by contract and services for the analysis and tabulation of technical information and the preparation of special maps, globes, and geographic aids by contract, all without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; expenses as authorized by title VII (except sec. 705), of the Foreign Service Act of 1946; refund of fees erroneously charged and paid for the issue of passports as authorized by law (22 U. S. C. 214a); not to exceed \$40,000 for deposit in the general fund of the Treasury for cost of penalty mail of the Department of State as required by the act of June 28, 1944; the examination of estimates of appropriations in the field; and maintenance and operation of passport and despatch agencies established by the Secretary of State; \$20,000,000, of which \$2,000 is for claims determined and settled pursuant to part 2 of the Federal Tort Claims Act (act of August 2, 1946, Public Law 601): *Provided*, That not to exceed \$3,000 of this appropriation may be expended for necessary expenses, except personal services, in carrying out the provisions of section 4 of the act entitled "An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930," approved June 12, 1934, as amended (19 U. S. C. 1354).

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GARY: Page 2, line 18, after the semicolon insert "acquisition, production, and free distribution of informational materials for use in connection with the operation, independently or through individuals, including aliens, or public or private agencies (foreign or domestic), and without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, of an information program outside of the continental United States, including the purchase of radio time (except that funds herein appropriated shall not be used to purchase more than 75 percent of the effective daily broadcasting time from any person or corporation holding an international short-wave broadcasting license from the Federal Communications Commission without the consent of such licensee), and the purchase, rental, construction, improvement, maintenance, and operation of facilities for radio transmission and reception, the acquisition of land and interests in land (by purchase, lease, rental, or otherwise) for radio broadcasting and

relay facilities, and the acquisition or construction of buildings and necessary improvements on such lands; purchase and presentation of various objects of a cultural nature suitable for presentation (through diplomatic and consular offices) to foreign governments, schools, or other cultural or patriotic organizations, the purchase, rental, distribution, and operations of motion-picture projection equipment and supplies, including rental of halls, hire of motion-picture projector operators, and all other necessary services by contract or otherwise without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes; not to exceed \$13,000 for entertainment."

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order this is not authorized by law and it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, may I ask that the gentleman reserve his point of order?

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order so that the gentleman may be heard.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to restore the information and cultural program to this bill.

May I say that if the information and cultural program is one-tenth as effective abroad as it has been in this country, it is worth 10 times the amount that we spent or will spend for it. In this country it has the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], chasing the Circus Lady and the sedate chairman of our subcommittee reading the *Memoirs of Hecate County*.

Now let me read to you what the committee offers as an alternative program to the present information and cultural program of the State Department. On page 7 of the committee report there appears this language:

The alternatives to this program, it would seem, are (a) UNESCO, a United Nations undertaking and in which a tremendous interest is developing, and which, as established, will truly represent the views of American people.

I have no disposition whatever to criticize UNESCO. To the contrary, I hope that it will accomplish the purposes for which it was organized. But let me read you what the same committee in the same report on page 12 has to say about UNESCO:

The committee could not understand why, out of the total of 132 executive personnel already employed by UNESCO, only 14 are from the United States, and out of a total of 259 clerical personnel only 7 are from the United States. It is hoped, however, when this Organization is more firmly established, that a proper ratio of personnel from the United States will be employed.

The committee recommends as an alternative for the Voice of America that we turn this program over to UNESCO, and in the same breath complains that UNESCO at the present time has a personnel recruited almost entirely from other countries. I submit that the Department of State is the more logical and

a better qualified agency to interpret America to the rest of the world.

We have heard a lot of criticism of this program. The Wallace program was mentioned on the floor a few moments ago. I hold in my hand a copy of the Wallace broadcast that was sent over the Voice of America. I challenge any one in this House to point out any place in this broadcast where Henry Wallace is praised. As a matter of fact, it is a review of a book on the Wallace family, a family which for a long time adhered to the Republican Party. Now, here is what the broadcast said:

Through the history of this family there runs, like a red thread, the eternal struggle for an improvement of the situation of the American farmer. Whenever the members of this family turned to agriculture and its problems, their achievements were considerable. When they turned to other problems, the success was dubious.

I know of no program which has been more abused than this program which has been conducted by the Information and Cultural Service.

Gentlemen, we should not junk this program at this time, over the protest of General Marshall, and over the protest of other men who are serving this country in foreign fields. Secretary Harriman has said, "I could not properly have discharged my duties either at Moscow or in London without it."

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

Does the gentleman from Nebraska wish to be heard further on the point of order?

Mr. STEFAN. I make the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Virginia desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. GARY. I do not, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule. It is the opinion of the Chair that the amendment does propose legislation on an appropriation bill, the functions therein referred to not being authorized by law.

The point of order is sustained.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GARY: On page 3, line 1, strike out "\$20,000,000" and insert "\$30,000,000."

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is this: On yesterday I called the attention of the House to the fact that not only had we eliminated the program of the Information and Cultural Service from the bill but in the office of the Secretary of the Department of State we had tremendously reduced the regular appropriation. The Secretary of State under the item of salaries and expenses in the Secretary's office and for the work in this country asked for \$47,046,000. This amount was

reduced to \$20,000,000, which was a reduction of \$27,000,000. Of that \$27,000,000, \$21,874,000 was for the Information and Cultural Service. One million seven hundred and sixty-nine thousand dollars was for the Intelligence Service, and the balance was for the regular activities of the Department.

The \$21,874,000 has been ruled out on a point of order. I seek by this amendment to restore \$10,000,000 of those funds, \$5,000,000 for the regular activities of the Department and \$5,000,000 for those activities within the Office of Information and Cultural Affairs which are authorized by law.

There are certain activities which are definitely authorized by law. One of those is the Interdepartmental Committee on Scientific and Cultural Cooperation, which is a definite program of the Department of State and is carried on by this office. Another is the UNESCO staff itself. In other words, we have recognized the international organization of UNESCO, and we have placed in the State Department and in the Office of Information and Cultural Affairs the necessary funds for the State Department to cooperate with that organization in an effort to work out its program. That amount is \$157,000. In addition, we have the Division of Libraries and Institutes, which is authorized by law, and the Exchange of Persons Division, which provides for the exchange of students and technicians between the various countries.

The amendment which I have offered will merely restore to the Office of the Secretary the amount he requested of Congress and which he said is essential to carry out the functions of his office. It also restores the cuts in the intelligence program, a very essential program, and those portions of the information and cultural program which are authorized by law.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment seeks to restore the OIC, which was taken out of this bill on a point of order. The Committee on Foreign Affairs is holding hearings at this time to get some legislation to restore this program.

We have to start cutting down some of the expenses of government. The people have been asking us to do it. It is necessary. Let me point out to the Congress the statement regarding the growth of the Department of State and the number of employees. We state in our report that the salaries and expenses totaled \$2,728,347 in 1940. They jumped to \$3,453,000 in 1941. In 1942 they jumped to \$4,377,105, and in 1943 the salaries jumped to \$5,986,800, and even up to something over \$13,000,000 in 1946. With a total of personnel running from 1,010 in 1940 to 5,270 at the present time, and proposed for 1948, excluding personnel for the information and intelligence programs, it is extremely difficult for this committee, during this period of need for economy and when the people are asking for economy, to reconcile itself to a need in excess of \$18,000,000 for the regular activities. This amount is included in the bill.

The increase in salaries for the Foreign Service under the act that was passed by the House places a burden of \$7,000,000 annually on the backs of the taxpayers.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, I urge you to vote down this amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY].

The amendment was rejected.

MR. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

I trust the Committee will indulge me for a moment, and, if necessary, for the purpose of being in order under the rules of the House, I shall have to address my remarks to the last two words in line 21 on page 2; namely, the words "penalty mail." It has no doubt come to the attention of the House that through editorials and circulars and statements by postmasters and by protests from home that through the alleged action of the Congress a great many substitute clerks and carriers have been dismissed from the postal service. It has been made to appear that this is due to some lack of action on the part of the Congress. We have noticed some headlines in aggravated areas, such as Boston, where hundreds have been dismissed, and in Long Beach, Calif., where an aggregate of 150 were dismissed. The Subcommittee on Appropriations convened a hearing this morning for the purpose of isolating rumor and confusion from the truth so that the country might well know just exactly what happened. Copies of these hearings will be published and made available to the Members in short order. There you will find a statement by Mr. Jesse Donaldson, First Assistant Postmaster General, as to exactly what the facts are. It was through no laches on the part of Congress and through no negligence on the part of any committee of the Congress that these sundry gentlemen, including a great many veterans, have been dismissed from the rolls. The fact of the matter is that the Post Office Department knew there was going to be a deficit for the current fiscal year as early as January 1947. To be sure, they could not ascertain the amount of the deficit, because the postmasters make only quarterly reports. Yet Mr. Donaldson told us this morning in the hearing that it was obvious to them that a deficiency of at least \$10,000,000 would exist as a result of the increased cost of Christmas mail and various strikes along the seaboard and the maritime strike, but they could not ascertain the dollar amount of that deficiency until the quarterly reports had been filed. Just as soon as those had been compiled, an estimate was referred to the Bureau of the Budget. They had a hearing before the Budget Bureau on the 21st day of April 1947. I want you to anchor that date in your memory. The Budget Bureau sent up a deficiency estimate on the 9th day of May 1947, which was Friday of last week—a deficiency estimate in the sum of roughly \$11,000,000 for the purpose of taking care of the salaries and expenses of the hundreds of veterans and others who have been dismissed from the rolls in every section of the country. So that estimate came up on last Saturday and in consequence there has been no opportunity for the Congress of the United States to take action thereon.

We confronted Mr. Donaldson point blank with the question whether or not there had been any fault or any lack of

diligence on the part of the members of the committees of Congress, and he said, "None whatsoever."

There, then, you have the answer to such things as a 2-inch headline that has been appearing in the Boston newspapers that through lack of action on the part of Congress, hundreds of veterans and substitute clerks and carriers have been dismissed from the rolls. There you have the answer to the headlines that appeared in the Long Beach newspapers and in other sections of the country as to whether or not the Congress has been at fault in bringing about the dismissal of literally hundreds of people. The negligence has been somewhere else besides Congress.

In addition thereto I might say a great deal of confusion arises from the fact that while we are dealing with 1948 estimates, that matter should have been taken care of before now in a deficiency estimate that is chargeable to 1947 appropriations, and for reasons best known to the Post Office Department, to the Budget Bureau, and to the President himself, that was not done.

THE CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

Representation allowances, Foreign Service: For representation allowances as authorized by section 901 (3) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 (Public Law 724), \$500,000.

MR. REES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REES: On page 7, line 21, strike out "\$500,000" and insert "\$250,000."

MR. REES. Mr. Chairman, I am offering an amendment to strike out the item of \$500,000 for so-called representation and to insert in lieu thereof \$250,000. What we ought to do is to strike out the entire item of \$500,000. I trust, however, the Committee will go along with me and save at least \$250,000 of the taxpayers' money that ought not to be spent for such purpose. There is no good reason at all why this item should be in the bill.

I do want to pay tribute to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN], who has given this bill and this particular item a good deal of attention, not only on this but on other occasions.

The State Department, through its representatives, asked for more than \$1,000,000 for this representation. Just think of it. You would not believe such request would be made right now when we are trying to economize. The committee did a good job in cutting it to \$500,000, but it ought at least be cut in half again.

MR. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

MR. REES. I yield to my distinguished friend from Illinois.

MR. MASON. What is this "representation"? I do not know what that word means.

MR. REES. That is just what I was about to explain to the Members.

This money for what is called representation is spent for liquor. I will say that probably 90 percent of this money goes for liquor.

MR. MASON. What?

MR. REES. Yes; liquor of various kinds. "Representation" is a high-powered phrase, but the money buys high-powered liquor; and it is used by our representatives to entertain foreigners abroad. Also, in some instances, to entertain themselves.

As I said on yesterday in discussing this matter, we fall to a pretty low ebb in our diplomacy when we resort to this method in order to get along with, and cultivate friendships with, the representatives of other countries.

Here is what has happened: In 1938 we spent about \$125,000 for this purpose; in 1939, about the same amount. Then the allowance was doubled and we spent \$250,000.

MR. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

MR. REES. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York.

MR. ROONEY. The gentleman said, "The same amount." He does not mean the same amount of liquor, does he?

MR. REES. No; I do not know how much liquor was bought; I am talking about the amount of money they spent. We do not know how much liquor was purchased because the thing is covered up. The gentleman from New York and I discussed this matter on yesterday. I thought he might have access to rather accurate figures as to the amount of money spent for liquor, but it seems you cannot do it because these vouchers are regarded as confidential information and we just cannot find out. I will venture the statement, however—from the information I have gathered—that at least 90 percent of the fund is spent for liquor.

MR. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

MR. REES. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois.

MR. MASON. There is a question of consistency which bothers me. This House only a day or so ago voted \$5,000 to entertain the WCTU here in Washington. Today it is called upon to spend \$500,000 to buy liquor for entertainment.

MR. REES. It is sort of blowing hot and cold with the same breath in my estimation except that this item is 100 times the amount allocated the WCTU. They will, in my opinion, do more good with \$5,000 than the State Department with the \$500,000.

MR. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

MR. REES. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from New York, a member of the committee.

MR. ROONEY. Is it not the gentleman's position that in order to do away with liquor that might be served with the meals that we should also do away with the meals?

MR. REES. Not necessarily. Let me come to that.

MR. O'KONSKI. The liquor costs more than the meals, does it not?

MR. REES. It would be interesting to get figures as to how much is spent on

meals. The meals cost \$5, \$7, \$9, and even \$12 apiece. This money is spent by our representatives not only to entertain foreigners but to entertain themselves and their friends.

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

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield briefly?

Mr. REES. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Michigan who has always supported me on similar amendments.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I just wondered, following up the statement of the gentleman from New York, about doing away with the meals, that if you gave them enough liquor they would not care anything about the meal they got.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, I just do not believe the members of this committee understand that our representatives abroad receive pretty fair pay. The distinguished chairman of the subcommittee called attention yesterday to the fact that many of them get as much as \$50,000 a year. As a matter of fact, all one of these representatives has to do is pack his suitcase. Everything else is fixed for him abroad. His home is there ready for him and for his family, with all of the equipment and all of the help necessary to run it, everything he wants for himself and family all paid for by his Government. I do not criticize that in this discussion. If the representative happens to be located in a warm climate and is transferred to a colder climate the Government will care for him and his family and see that they get the proper accessories to go with the colder climate. And yet in addition to that you put this additional sum in here to be used for so-called entertainment. It does not make sense.

I do not know whether the membership realizes it or not, but under suspension of the rules last year we added \$7,000,000 in funds to provide for these representatives we are sending abroad. It was for additional salaries and expenses. You come to the House with this item of a half-million dollars, which is all unnecessary and uncalled for.

I would like to call attention to something else. I believe I am right in this, and I shall ask the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Nebraska, if he wants to tell me. I want to refer as to how some of this money was spent over in Yugoslavia. I understand they have even gone so far as to use similar funds to entertain General Tito over there, spending a considerable amount of money entertaining him and in entertaining him I am sure there was a goodly supply of liquor. Surely no one thinks any good was accomplished by that entertainment. May I ask the gentleman from Nebraska if he wants to comment on that? I think he might be able to furnish some information.

Mr. STEFAN. Of course, I am going to oppose the gentleman's amendment

because I think the committee has done a pretty good job in reducing this \$618,000. With reference to Tito, there has been premature publicity regarding that.

Mr. REES. I saw some publicity on it and for that reason I am asking the gentleman to explain this matter to this committee.

Mr. STEFAN. It has been published but I did not give permission to publish it. It was the premature publication of some information I had. It is true that some of this money has been spent unwisely and for that reason the committee made these cuts.

Directly answering the gentleman's question, I feel very deeply about spending the American taxpayers' money to entertain a dictator like Tito and his Communists who murdered our heroic aviators. I think I am duty bound to answer the gentleman's question. It is true that before Tito and his Communists murdered our five aviators they did entertain Marshal Tito and his friends with the American taxpayers' money at a dinner costing \$600. Shortly after that they entertained him again with your money at a dinner costing \$400 or more.

Mr. REES. A total of more than \$1,000 for a party given in honor of Marshal Tito.

Mr. STEFAN. There were other entertainments and then they shot down 5 of our aviators. They were continually entertaining Marshal Tito with their representation allowance, which is, in fact, a prestige allowance. I accidentally ran across some vouchers. I did not look for them purposely, I did not look for this information on purpose, but I did find an item for a wreath for the victims of this so-called air accident in the amount of \$13.40. Shame on them. Of course this committee, the minority members as well as the majority members, was shocked.

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

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Of course, the distinguished ranking minority Member [Mr. ROONEY], the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY], and the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'BRIEN], and the rest of us took cognizance of this terrible thing. Of course, we took cognizance of the wrongs they do with their money sometimes, but we do not want to castigate the fine Foreign Service officers who are in our employ, and who cannot be blamed for some of the wrongs that some of these people do. We have been giving representation allowance to our Foreign Service officers ever since we sent our first missions to foreign countries to represent us. It is absolutely necessary, and I want to pay a tribute to those Foreign Service officers who have been decorated during the war and who rendered such a wonderful service to the United States in every part of the world. There are many fine Foreign Service officers among them,

and this representation allowance is something that has to be appropriated for from year to year, but it must be a modest sum. I have great faith in General Marshall. I have great faith in men like the Under Secretary and others who are watching this fund, and we have to give General Marshall a chance to clean this up. I want a good State Department and a fine Foreign Service Department, and so does every member of this committee. We may have political differences among us, but they are not displayed in committee. Sometimes on the floor of the House it does creep up. As I say, we have to have a good Foreign Service and a good State Department. But, we have to have authority in law for everything that is done, and it must not be done without the consent of the peoples' Representatives here in Congress. I oppose the gentleman's amendment, I am sorry.

Mr. REES. I appreciate the gentleman's position. He is here on the floor and expected to defend this particular item, and I appreciate his statement. But, here is a fair certainty I do not castigate the services of our representatives abroad. Not at all. They have rendered impressive service. But that does not justify the waste of taxpayers' money in this way. The gentleman from Nebraska has given a glaring example where more than \$1,000 was spent in Belgrade for two dinners to entertain Marshal Tito. How our representative could do it in view of the circumstances just recited by the gentleman from Nebraska is more than I can understand.

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

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent the gentleman be permitted to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. ROONEY. I wish to say to the gentleman from Kansas that I fully agree with my distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Nebraska. As far as I am concerned, I would not buy a glass of water for Marshal Tito. However, insofar as this item now under discussion is concerned, I would like to say to the gentleman that I recall recently having had a conversation with Secretary of Commerce Harriman who told me that when he was Ambassador to Great Britain, in London, he had a luncheon, which was expected of him because of the fact that all of the Embassies in London representing the various countries served a luncheon at some time or other during the year. This one social event at which about 1,200 people attended more than ate up the entire annual allocation of funds to our Embassy in London for the purpose which we are now discussing.

Mr. REES. I realize these representatives are called upon to do a consider-

able amount of entertaining, but it is terribly overdone. And the liquor part of the thing is beyond all reason. If you have \$500,000 to be used to cultivate friendship with foreign people, you will go a lot further in creating understanding by using it to buy food for some of the hundreds of thousands of human beings who are on the brink of starvation. Last year this committee allocated more than \$600,000, most of which went for liquor. I just do not believe we can point with pride of any accomplishments in the way of mutual understanding by reason of that expenditure. If you can see anything worth while that was done in this respect, I would like to know about it. Cut this item \$250,000 and you are still spending about as much as was spent in 1942 and in 1943 before the State Department went on this spending spree.

Before I leave the floor I call your attention briefly to a copy of a magazine that was handed me a few minutes ago. It is entitled the American Foreign Service Journal. It is a monthly magazine published here in Washington. I am informed that the Government in some way renders some assistance to this magazine. It is a rather small magazine. The thing to which I call your attention is that six full pages of this publication are devoted to advertisements of liquor. I trust you will support my amendment and save at least \$250,000 for the Federal Treasury.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I remember 2 years ago the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] offered an amendment, and I supported the amendment at that time, to reduce the amount from \$800,000 to \$400,000. I rise at this time first to compliment the committee. The administration raised the request from \$800,000 2 years ago to over \$1,118,000 for this year. I find a change in the House this year. The committee has reduced this amount from over \$1,118,000 to \$500,000. That is just an idea of economy on the part of the majority party that is now in control of the House. The committee should be commended. I should really like to see this amendment adopted further reducing the amount to \$250,000. Two hundred and fifty thousand dollars will buy considerable liquor with which to supply our Ambassadors and other people who represent us with that little extra that goes into entertainment at state dinners. I really think when economies are so hard for us to make here, by reason of the opposition by the administration on every appropriation bill that comes up, that we ought to save \$100,000 or \$200,000 or \$250,000 at every opportunity that presents itself. I should like to see this committee vote to reduce this amount by 50 percent, \$250,000. I am sure it will not hurt our Foreign Service. Just think, that would buy a lot of food for the starving children of Europe, which would do a great deal more good than to oversupply our Ambassadors with this opportunity for entertainment by the use of liquors, which are not at all times absolutely necessary, to say the least. I hope the amendment is sustained by the House. There are a thousand places here in our

own country where we can do a real service in the expense of this saving of \$250,000. Why not vote now against this waste?

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I call the attention of the Committee to the fact that we cut this representation allowance from \$1,118,000 to \$500,000, which compares with \$800,000 they had last year. It is my sincere feeling that General Marshall, the head of the Department of State, and the Assistant Secretary for Administration and others are now going into these matters. The Foreign Service, from what has been said on the floor of the House today, should know that the funds we are allowing today should be used for the purpose originally intended; that is, as a prestige allowance, which has been in the foreign service of all governments since we have had a mission in foreign countries. I hope the amendment will be defeated.

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

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. I would hate for the impression to go throughout the country that we are appropriating any such sum as \$500,000 for liquor. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] has suggested that he thought that 90 percent of this fund was spent for that purpose. As a matter of fact, this item covers all the entertainment, including banquets and the various functions that are given in all the embassies in foreign fields. Is that not correct?

Mr. STEFAN. Yes; of course, it is included for all representation allowances. If our Ambassador is invited by the Ambassador of the United Kingdom to some function, he returns the courtesy. This money is expended for music and flowers and service, food, and so forth.

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

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. REES. The gentleman does not mean that this \$250,000 is the amount that is expended for all these meals and parties and all of these things that are going on, including the entertainment here at Blair House, where we spend so much money for liquor? The gentleman does not mean to impress us with the idea that that is all the money that is spent on these dinners?

Mr. STEFAN. No; I am not trying to impress on you anything of the kind.

Mr. REES. I know the gentleman wants to be fair.

Mr. STEFAN. I am trying to impress upon you that it has been the custom, since we have been sending missions to foreign countries, to have prestige allowances.

Mr. REES. They call them prestige allowances and, therefore, we proceed to spend money to buy liquor and we use that as a means of trying to get along with foreign countries. That is the whole sum and substance of it.

Mr. STEFAN. Does not the gentleman feel that this has been cut considerably?

Mr. REES. I feel the gentleman has done a splendid job in cutting from over \$1,000,000 to \$500,000, but to me it is perfectly silly that anybody would ever have the nerve to come in and ask for this money. I will warrant that General Marshall did not come before the gentleman's committee and ask for this \$1,000,000. He did not ask for \$500,000. He did not even ask for \$250,000. Some representative of the State Department must have come down here to take care of this allowance, and I will warrant that even though I was not present, that I am sure is the way it happened. It was not any of the top-flight men who came and asked for this money, you can be sure of that.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to call to the attention of the Members that the hearings on Department of State appropriations are available to all the Members of Congress, and the hearings are complete insofar as the representation allowances are concerned.

Mr. REES. The hearings are available, but the items for which this money is spent are not available to the Members of Congress, are they?

Mr. STEFAN. I am sure that I would be very happy to give the gentleman all the information that I have in my possession.

Mr. REES. I would certainly be happy to have it and look over it.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman would be very enlightened and surprised.

Mr. REES. And I would be surprised, I am sure.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. REES) there were—aye 32, noes 65.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, in order that the House may receive a message, 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. CURTIS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 3311, had come to no resolution thereon.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 153. Joint resolution providing for relief assistance to the people of countries devastated by war.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the foregoing joint resolution, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. VANDENBERG, Mr. WILEY, Mr. SMITH, Mr. CONNALLY, and Mr. GEORGE to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. D'ALESANDRO asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD as of May 16, 1947.

ASSISTANCE TO PEOPLE OF COUNTRIES DEVASTATED BY WAR

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table House Joint Resolution 153, providing for relief assistance to the people of countries devastated by war, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON]. [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Mr. EATON, Mr. VORYS, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. BLOOM, and Mr. KEE.

DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE, AND THE JUDICIARY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1948

Mr. STEFAN. 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 (H. R. 3311) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and the judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3311, with Mr. CURTIS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I probably could criticize these appropriations as well as anyone in the Committee, but I wish to direct my remarks to the information and cultural program of the State Department in this section of the bill. I concur in the statement of the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN], in expressing confidence not only in Secretary of State Marshall but also in his Assistant Secretary of State, Mr. Peurifoy. I think it was very unfortunate that General Marshall had to go to Moscow so shortly after taking office.

I repeat, I probably could criticize the State Department as well as anybody, and I propose to show where it should be criticized.

It was very unfortunate that, by Presidential directive, so many people who were Communist and pro-Soviet in their thinking were transferred from the OSS, the OIC, the OIAA, and various agencies to the State Department.

Mr. Chairman, I have given considerable time and study to the activities and composition of the Cultural and Information Division of the State Department. Therefore I wish to take a little time to discuss this matter which is at present under consideration by the Congress.

Let no one assume that my attitude is one of hostility toward a constructive

program of international information in behalf of the United States. Such a program is an urgent need, in the light of the propaganda barrage emanating from the Soviet Union and its Communist agents all over the world, attacking the United States as a war-mongering tool of the monopolists seeking world conquest, oppressing its own people, lynching Negroes, and guilty of every crime in the calendar of human sins. But the activities of the Cultural and Information Division of the State Department must not be confused with a sound program. As carried on today, they are a monstrosity costing the Nation millions of dollars, and serving no constructive purpose for the United States. Conducted by a group of pro-Communist fellow travelers and muddle heads, they fill the ether and tons of paper with a combination of material favorable to the Soviet Union and the Communists, or just plain twaddle.

Let me give you some idea of the personnel conducting the present program. Top-flight assistant to Mr. William Benton is William Treadwell Stone, Director of the Office of International Information and Cultural Affairs. Here is his record:

Member of the editorial board of Amerasia from 1937 through November 1941. Chairman of this board was Frederick Vanderbilt Field, now a regular columnist for the Daily Worker and a member of the Communist Party. Managing editor was Philip Jacob Jaffe, indicted and fined for the possession of confidential Government documents, charged by Hon. GEORGE A. DONDERO on November 28, 1945, with being in close touch with Earl Browder, until recently head of the Communist Party, United States of America, and Tung Pi Wu, Chinese Communist delegate to the San Francisco Conference. Mr. Stone's membership on the editorial board of Amerasia covers the period of the Stalin-Hitler Pact during which this magazine described the war in Europe as imperialistic, declaring that—

Germany, industrially powerful but poor in resources and weak financially, is attempting to take by force what Great Britain possesses.

Jaffe's Communist alias was J. W. Phillips—Washington Daily News, June 7, 1945, page 1. Mr. Field was executive secretary of the American Peace Mobilization, a Communist front which picketed the White House during the period of the Stalin-Hitler Pact.

Writing in Amerasia of August 1937, together with such well-known defenders of Soviet foreign policy as Frederick V. Field, Edgar Snow, and Harriet Moore, Mr. Stone comments as follows on relations with Japan:

Nevertheless, the case against invoking the Neutrality Act, as presented by the State Department and a considerable section of the press, is not altogether convincing * * * on the other hand, if the events at Shanghai have precipitated a general war, as seems likely, a policy of drift which allows munitions shipments and trade in war materials to continue would not advance the cause of peace or reduce the dangers of American involvement. * * * Furthermore, the possibilities of collective action under neutrality have apparently not been explored by Washington (p. 293).

This statement should be compared with the official line of the Communist Party, U. S. A., at the time as expressed by Earl Browder, its spokesman in an NBC broadcast on August 28, 1936, as follows:

How long will the American people, who have so convincingly shown their unmistakable desire for peace, continue to hold aloof from collective efforts for peace which alone can check the war plans of the Japanese militarists in the Far East and of their ally, Hitler, in Europe? * * * President Roosevelt—hangs on to a policy of so-called neutrality or isolation which in practice has encouraged the Fascist aggressors. * * * It was this ineffective method which emboldened the Japanese militarists to advance their war plans against China and the United States.

The following article—quoted in part—is taken from Amerasia of October 1940 published under joint editorship of Mr. Stone, Mr. Jaffe, Mr. Field, and others, apparently with their full knowledge and approval. The article is entitled "American Far Eastern Policy; For Democracy or Imperialism?" by Frederick V. Field and reads in part as follows:

Our Government is, as it has repeatedly stated, interested in the imperialist status quo. * * * Finally, it may be said that I am expressing an isolated, private view. * * * Over the Labor Day week end more than 22,000 men and women, of whom 6,000 were delegates, met at the Emergency Peace Mobilization in Chicago. * * * Two thousand went on to Washington to lobby and demonstrate against the conscription bill. * * * Because to them the building up of a great military machine for the purpose of becoming a partner in a war of rival imperialism is not consistent with true national defense. I say, therefore, that the views I have expressed are not those of an isolated individual. Rather, they are the views, springing from deep convictions, of millions and millions of Americans who refuse to be duped into war or into an American form of dictatorship and fascism.

No statement appeared in Amerasia to challenge this viewpoint, by Mr. Stone or anyone else.

Again, under the joint editorship of Mr. Stone, with Messrs. Jaffe, Field, and others, there appeared in the January 1940 issue of Amerasia an article by Harriet Moore entitled "Two Wars or One," from which the following excerpt is quoted:

It—

The United States—

should exert its influence to stop the European conflict as soon as possible by means of negotiated balance-of-power peace.

No statement appeared to challenge this viewpoint.

Mr. Stone was formerly with the Budget Bureau as administrative consultant at \$9,800. He is said to have drawn up the plan for the Cultural Division of the State Department.

He has been in charge of selection of personnel for foreign broadcasting.

He is reported to have appointed George Shaw Wheeler, while Stone was in London for the Board of Economic Warfare. Wheeler has a long record of Communist affiliations and activities. Because of this record, Wheeler was removed by the Civil Service Commission

and later reinstated as a result of left-wing pressure.

Next we have Haldore E. Hanson, Assistant Secretary of the Office of Information and Culture. Here is his record:

Assistant Secretary and the official lobbyist for the Office of Information and Culture.

Mr. Hanson has spent most of his adult life since leaving school as a freelance writer in China. He wanted to study, but, as he says:

When the school year drew to a close, I decided to join a group of professors and journalists in Peiping, headed by Edgar Snow¹ and his wife,² who were organizing a new political magazine.

He held other positions which some of his superiors considered so important that he was excused from military service. One of these positions was in the Department of Agriculture.

A further indication of the varied and colorful background which he brought to the Department is in an article written about him—Review of Reviews, February 1937, page 95—in which he is referred to as smuggler, soldier, and diplomat. In view of the fact that his military service was not with the United States armed forces, it would be well to learn with whom and for what he fought.

Mr. Hanson can best be judged, however, by his own writings: A. The People Behind the Chinese Guerrillas, published in Pacific Affairs, September 1938:

In this article, he shows that he enjoyed the complete confidence of the Chinese Communists—and that they do not tolerate anyone who is not completely on their side—the official Communist position.

First. Page 285:

To assess the strength of the self-defense governments and the mass movement supporting the guerrillas, I spent 2 weeks traveling through guerrilla territory in central Hopei in March 1938 and brought back copies of nearly all of the official documents of the government in addition to my own observations.

That is, he was given official documents by the Communists, and given safe conduct through their lines.

Second. He shows that the central Hopei mass movement with which he was identified was definitely a part of the official Communist plan.

Third. Mr. Hanson, apparently himself a well-grounded student of the writings of Marx and Lenin could judge the actual knowledge of Marx which the Chinese Communists had.

Page 290:

Naturally the political leaders trained in the anti-Japanese academy are familiar with the writings of Marx and Lenin and have not abandoned their hopes for a socialist republic.

Page 303:

MAO TZE-TUNG'S LONG VIEW

China has the second largest Communist Party in the world. The leader of the party lives at Yenan. Next to Stalin he is the most powerful Marxian thinker and leader

in world politics today. I asked for an interview with Mao Tze-tung. (From *Humane Endeavor*, p. 303.)

Fourth. Mr. Hanson, further, proudly—almost boastfully—shows how completely the Communists accepted him into their confidence. He states:

(a) The guerrillas do not tolerate neutrality: A man is either for or against them (p. 296).

Mr. Hanson was at all times given safe conduct through the Communist lines.

I have traveled in the commander in chief's motor car.

(b) I spent 4 months at the close of 1938 with the north China guerrillas. (The Nation, April 8, 1939, p. 401.)

Page 254:

(c) Thirty miles south of Wut'ai I came upon two Canadian doctors. One was Dr. Norman Bethune,⁴ a surgeon from Toronto who was sent to China by the American Committee for Medical Aid to China.

Fifth. Mr. Hanson, with more enthusiasm than objectivity, tells of the aims and achievements of the Chinese Communists.

Page 296:

The Communist agents frankly tell their visitors that they hope the present war will produce a democratic government in China, which will be only one step toward the ultimate goal of a socialist state. * * * This goal was asserted by Mr. Huang Ching, the Communist representative at the Fuping conference when he stated: "The Communist Party is determined to support the formation of a democratic republic and to execute the tasks laid upon it by this new political power."

Page 298:

Despite this continued vision of a future Chinese Soviet the qualities of leadership at the Central Hopei headquarters would seem to indicate that the Communists will not fight any more civil wars. * * * This Red leadership is characterized by a bulldog attitude toward the ultimate goal, a flexibility of methods, an attitude of self-criticism toward all present work, a willingness of experiment, and a complete absence (so far as I could see) of personal ambition. The same qualities have marked every great movement in history which has survived the decades of adversity to reach the pinnacles of power. (North China, May 1938.)

Humane Endeavor, page 32:

The Red leaders organized the masses, gave them discipline and something worth fighting for.

Humane Endeavor, page 79:

Russian policy among the Outer Mongolians appealed to the common people by exposing the corruption of both the priests and the princes; aristocratic privileges were abolished; machinery for a democratic government, dominated by Russian advisers but employing whatever educated Mongols were available, was set up at Urga in 1924.

Page 101:

Despite all these apparent handicaps the Communists became the most powerful peasant armies in the history of revolution.

¹ A prominent pro-Soviet writer on China.
² Under the pen name of Nym Wales, wrote extensively in support of Soviet policy.
³ Page 30, *Humane Endeavor*, by H. Hanson.

They had three qualities which brought armies success * * * a mastery of mobile warfare, skillful political propaganda, and superb leadership. * * * The revolutionary land policy was a second reason for Red success.

It would be well to see who in the Department as well as outside the Department urged Mr. Hanson's appointment to Cultural Affairs, and who in the Department urged his rapid promotion. Evidently under fire of recent criticism, Mr. Hanson has been transferred to the Political Affairs Committee of the State Department.

Another member of the leading triumvirate in Mr. Benton's office is Charles Alexander Thomson. In a study entitled "The War in Spain," published in Foreign Policy Reports of May 1, 1938, page 39, he has the following eulogy of the work of the Communists:

To the Communists must go the major credit for the introduction of order and unity in this nondescript army. * * * On the Government side, the most important political developments have been: (1) the rise of the Communist Party; (2) the working alliance effected by the Communists with the right-wing Socialists and the Republican Parties * * *; (3) the decline of Communist influence and its later resurgence in the cabinet formed on April 4, 1938. * * * When Franco troops approached Madrid early in November 1936, a new and decisive foreign influence appeared on the scene. Russian aid had arrived—not only airplanes and tanks, but also advisers, technicians and the forces of the International Brigade, in many instances recruited by Communist agencies. Thanks in great part to Soviet influence, the Spanish revolution was not destined—as has so often been the case in history—to pass from the hands of moderates to those of extremists. Instead, the Communists cast their weight against radical trends; they proclaimed that the purpose of the war was not to advance social revolution, but to defend a legal and democratic government.

The Spanish Communists must be credited with significant achievements. They led in transforming the militia into a disciplined army, and encouraged a unified command. They worked to unify and strengthen the central government as against the local committees. They put a check on wholesale socialization of industry and collectivization of agriculture. They sought to substitute discipline under centralized authority for the spontaneous and disorderly enthusiasm of the masses. They demanded that the social revolution be definitely subordinated to the task of winning the war.

The Communists, whose numbers had not exceeded 50,000 prior to the revolt, derived power to enforce these policies from various factors. First, of course, was aid from the Soviet Union. A second factor was superior organizing ability, shown by their success in marshaling support both within the army and behind the lines. The Communists won the allegiance of General Miaja and many other officers, largely controlled the commissar system and the censorship, and were particularly strong in the Madrid forces and in the aviation corps. In the third place, the Communists skillfully exploited a policy of moderation toward socialization of industry and agriculture, which gained the support of numerous middle-class elements, notably small business men and the richer peasants. In consequence their numbers showed a marked increase, being estimated at 220,000 in January 1937, and 400,000 in September of the same year.

This report is in complete contradiction to the statements of numerous anti-Franco authorities to the atrocities and disruption committed by the Communists under their Russian commissars in the Spanish Civil War.

According to Mr. Carlton J. H. Hayes, former American Ambassador to Spain, in his book, *Wartime Mission to Spain*, Mr. Thomson was responsible for the appointment of Abel Plenn as cultural attaché in Spain. Mr. Plenn's ideology can be determined from his recent book, *Wind in the Olive Trees*, which is severely critical of every phase of American policy in Spain during the war. His pro-Communist bias is evident throughout the book which has been enthusiastically promoted by the Communist press and Communist book shops.

According to the *Daily Worker* of July 4, 1946, page 11, Mr. Thomson entered into hearty cooperation with Tom Brandon, producer and distributor of pro-Communist films. This is enough to show where Mr. Thomson stands.

It will be remembered that the personnel of the Cultural Division is in large measure a legacy from Communist permeated OWI, and the regime of Archibald McLeish. How does it happen, for example, that Mr. Armand D. Willis, cultural attaché in Moscow, suddenly burst into the press attacking American Embassy officers as Russian haters? Is this appointment an accident or is it typical of the Cultural Department in general?

Who was responsible for the selection of Mr. Lau Shaw, who made a tour of the United States as a guest of the State Department? Later Mr. Shaw wrote an article on Hollywood Films in China for the pro-Communist magazine, *Screen Writer*. In this article he assailed American movies as having "no educational and no cultural attitude and intention."

Who was responsible for sending as a delegate to the Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization of the United States Prof. Harlow Shapley, who, in spite of his scientific attainments, has an enormous record of affiliations with Communist-front organizations and defense of Communist causes?

Who was responsible for the appointment of Robert T. Miller, Chief in Charge of Publications, who has since been forced to resign and whose record is one of dubious loyalty to the United States?

Who was responsible for the appointment of Charles A. Page, former cultural attaché in Paris, whose membership in the Communist Party and the Young Communist League is testified to by verifiable Government files?

Who is responsible for the appointment of Stefan Arski, alias Arthur Salman, alias Kalimovski, contributor to the Communist Polish publication, *Novy Put'*? Arski's Communist record was previously exposed by Congressman Joseph P. Ryter. I do not know what his citizenship status is, but today he is public-relations officer of the Polish Embassy. How does Mr. Benton account for this transition?

Who was responsible for the fact that Jo Davidson, active in numerous Communist-front organizations, has been engaged by the State Department to

make numerous busts of Latin-American ex-Presidents at a handsome remuneration?

Who was responsible for the invitation to visit the United States issued to two writers and two engineers from Communist-ruled Kalgan, expenses to be paid by the American Government? These men were Chow Yang, vice president of Kalgan's North China Union University; Oyang Shan-chun, playwright; Nih Chun-jung and Li Su, engineers.

Dr. Esther C. Brunauer was selected by the State Department as United States representative to UNESCO with the rank of minister. Speaking over NBC on May 31, 1946, at 6 p. m., she declared:

There are many barriers to the concept [of peoples speaking to peoples]; there are the barriers * * * of monopolistic practices to be overcome.

What did Dr. Brunauer mean by this? What country was she criticizing? Was she aware of the fact that she was echoing Soviet propaganda against the United States? Has this lady ever taken a critical attitude toward conditions in the Soviet Union? Evidently, again under fire of recent criticism, she has been shifted to the Office of Public Liaison in the State Department.

Now let us take a glance at the activities of this coterie. Much is made of the Russian broadcast. I am all for effective broadcasts to the Soviet Union. The voice of free America would be welcome if it could reach the Russian people, but there are certain difficulties of which Mr. Benton has not adequately informed the American people. In fact, he has misled them to believe that there is free and easy access for American broadcasts to the Soviet Union. He has not told you that all receivers must be registered at the nearest post office in Russia. What reason have we to believe that a dictatorship like the Soviet Government, with concentration camps, terror, and firing squads would freely admit a broadcast from a foreign democracy? Why should Stalin set up an iron curtain against the press and suddenly withdraw that curtain at the request of Mr. Benton? As Mr. William Philip Simms, the noted columnist, said in the *Scripps-Howard* press of December 21, 1945:

Mr. Benton's department can no more speak to people of the Soviet Union than it can speak to the people of Mars. And the same can be said of the steadily expanding areas under Soviet control.

Mr. Benton boasts of having received letters from recipients of messages from America. How does he know that these people are not stooges who have sent their letters with Government knowledge and approval?

According to John Crosby in the *Washington Post* of April 27, 1947, the State Department broadcast not only the views of Henry Wallace, who was attacking the State Department, but even those of the *Daily Worker*, which called the Truman doctrine "a national shame."

Of what use is it to the United States to broadcast a talk on the Juilliard School, the description of Louisiana, the function and organization of the Supreme Court, and surgical refrigeration is-

sues? What guarantee has Mr. Benton that anybody is really listening to these things?

According to a dispatch from Moscow in the *Washington Evening Star* of February 18, 1947, only a comparatively few Russians heard the United States State Department's first Russian language broadcast. The Star's dispatch says:

The United States has an elaborate pictorial magazine, but schedules and wave lengths dealing with the State Department programs have not been published in it.

On April 14, 1947, the State Department broadcast a supinely apologetic statement by David Lawrence in which he pleaded with the Russians as follows:

Let us confess that we each have made mistakes and that we, for instance, may misunderstand even now what you are doing in the Balkans, in Greece and Turkey, in Korea. * * * We are not without sin. You mentioned the Negro question. Be patient with us.

Is that the tone which a self-respecting nation should adopt toward a ruthless, expansionist power? Following this broadcast, Mr. Lawrence was duly assailed by Ilya Ehrenburg, Soviet spokesman, whereupon he issued the following abject apology:

If it will help matters, let me present my humblest apologies and regrets for anything that I may have ever written derogatory to Russia and may we all let bygones be bygones with respect to everybody's past writings on other sides.

How the Russian power politicians must have laughed at this spectacle.

Miss Elizabeth Egan, Acting Chief of the Office of International Information and Cultural Affairs in Moscow for 2½ years, has herself admitted the limitations of broadcasts to the Soviet Union. In the *Washington Post* of January 16, 1947, she is quoted as saying that there are few short-wave sets in the Soviet Union—the average family having a plate which is turned to the local station only.

Mr. Benton has made a great to-do of the publication of the magazine *Amerika*. George Moorad, a Moscow correspondent and author of *Behind the Iron Curtain*, has described the American project as follows:

The American effort was not serious enough to warrant unusual curbs. Since we were printing in New York, the text had to be translated into Russian, cabled to Moscow for censorship and correction, cabled back to New York, and finally printed in Russian. Then came the matter of shipping some thousands of copies into Moscow, when transport was available, and the result was only two issues during the 7 months I was there. Our own American difficulties were so staggering, it was hardly necessary for Soviet bureaucrats to devise others.

Mr. David Sentner, writing in the *Los Angeles Examiner* on January 15, 1946, has described the steps in publishing *Amerika* as follows:

The proofs are first sent to Moscow for Soviet approval. The Russian Government censors the contents and sends back the approved portions. * * * No copy of the magazine has ever been seen on a newsstand in the Soviet Union. * * * Why do we permit the Soviet Union to censor an American Government publication when the Union

of Soviet Socialist Republics issues through the Soviet Embassy a weekly bulletin of information which is uncensored Communist propaganda and in violation of the Foreign Agents Registration Act?

Indicative of what is going on inside of Mr. Benton's Department is the following quotation in the pro-Communist publication *In Fact* for January 21, 1947. It evidently followed numerous leaks in the Department. I quote:

Unless the State Department sets up a United States Gestapo to intimidate its employees into silence, the secret and confidential directives will continue to reach the light.

This was an open invitation to the employees of the Department to divulge confidential information to Communist channels. One would think that as a result of this statement which reached Mr. Benton that he would act decisively, determine the sources of the leaks, and re-organize his Department in the most drastic manner. Again we have to rely upon *In Fact*, which apparently is well informed as to what is going on in Mr. Benton's Department. In the issue of April 8, 1946, appeared the following:

Sixteen days after *In Fact* exclusively published the pattern of State Department propaganda operations and printed authentic propaganda directives issued by the State Department to implement its objectives, an official order by Assistant Secretary William Benton to his propaganda staff, marked "confidential," declared that after February 6 the use of the term "directive" would no longer be used and that henceforth all such propaganda directions will be referred to as guides. It can now be revealed that within 24 hours after the *In Fact* publication of the propaganda-directive exposé, top State Department officials met in closed session to plan their strategy.

In other words, Mr. Benton made a full retreat in the face of the pro-Communist gang in his Department.

Another point: I would like to know who was responsible for the invitation the United States tendered to Anthoon Koejemans, editor of the Dutch Communist paper *De Waarheid*. The Communist Workers of February 3, 1946, stated that the gentleman "is now in the United States on a six-man delegation of Dutch newspapermen, sponsored by the State Department's Office of International Information."

I should also like to know who was responsible for the display of the film entitled "Now the Peace," produced by *World in Action* on August 1, 1946, before State Department employees. This picture was severely critical of the American system of free enterprise and was thoroughly Communist in tone.

Characteristic of the chaos in Mr. Benton's Department is the incident described in the New York Times of March 30, 1947, in which Mr. Benton announced that "the relay transmitters at Munich, which beam the daily short-wave program of the State Department to Russia, were sabotaged recently and the broadcasts were turned away to South America." A subsequent investigation resulted in a complete whitewash of the incident, although a later report admitted

that a German Communist had been employed in the broadcasting station.

The *Daily Worker* of April 30, 1947, in the column conducted by Barnard Rubin, publishes in detail a summary of a State Department directive to its international broadcasting division. Has Mr. Benton ever made an inquiry as to how the *Daily Worker* secured this directive?

Mr. Benton has himself shown a certain apologetic attitude toward the Soviet Union. In the *New York Times* of March 4, 1947, speaking at Atlantic City, he is quoted as saying that the Soviet Union spends three times as much for education as does this country. I seriously doubt the authenticity of this estimate.

The *Motion Picture Herald* of July 6, 1946, has reported a number of film enterprises undertaken by the State Department. One is entitled "Banjo Picking Boy," produced by Irving Lerner, who has a long list of Communist affiliations.

The criticisms made of the activities of the Cultural Division are too numerous to cite here. Let me repeat, however, the statement made by Congressman TABER that this branch is "loaded with people whose loyalties are not with the United States." Let me mention the titles of some of the films distributed by the State Department to enhance the status of this Government: *Grasshoppers*, *Tennis Rhythm*, *Reproduction Among Mammals*, *The Farmer's Wife*, *Willie and the Mouse*, *Music for Tiny Tots*, *Chicken Little*, *Unit Cast Partial Dentures*.

Congressman STEFAN on April 11, 1946, declared that State Department programs channeled to the Caribbean area, with a population of 31,000,000, reach only 45,000 families, the number with usable receiving sets. Moreover, he said the programs are broadcast in English, which is understood by only a small part of the population.

You are all familiar with a recent broadcast of a book review of the biography of Henry Wallace and his family at the very moment when he was criticizing the policy of the State Department and being applauded for it by Communist audiences throughout the world.

Mr. Benton, who appears before you with a request for \$31,000,000, does not explain how he proposes to tackle the difficulty which he confronted in Belgrade, when the doors of the American reading room and library were shut down. Indicative of the loss in prestige which we have suffered during the period of Mr. Benton's promotion of our stock is the fact that the French Government did not hesitate to shut down our radio station in Algiers as a result of Russian pressure.

Our Ambassador to Argentina has clearly outlined the ineffectiveness of Mr. Benton's outfit in Latin America. He declared that communism had made great strides in the southern hemisphere. He pointed out that Communist organizations in Latin America had received large funds from Moscow and were doing over-all propaganda against economic and political imperialism with the United States as the chief target. This report has been corroborated by W. H. Law-

rence in the *New York Times* of January 1, 1946, when he declared:

A propaganda effort helpful only to the Soviet Union and harmful to the United States is under way throughout Latin America through formal channels of the Communist Party, including its newspapers and radio stations.

Mr. William H. Newton, well known Scripps-Howard staff writer in China, has made the following report of State Department incompetence in the *Washington Daily News* of January 6, 1947:

The United States Information Service here is under orders from Washington to confine its activities to publishing official documents, innocuous Government releases, and press dispatches. Both the Information Service and American consular employees are aware of the beating the United States is taking on the propaganda front, but no one is permitted to do much about it. * * * The steady day-by-day impact of the Communist propaganda is having its effect here, particularly since our Government's principal response is stories about the TVA and photographs of the little red schoolhouse in Georgia.

Another sample of sheer waste in the Cultural Division of the State Department is the appropriation for the publication of an elaborate Who's Who of personages in Latin-American countries. God knows how much good that will do.

Let me mention in passing also that in the Baltic states—grabbed early in the war by Stalin—all short-wave radios have been confiscated and domestic radios are forcibly tuned to Kremlin broadcasts.

Let me ask of what earthly use is it to us to broadcast Benny Goodman's jazz, Turkey in the Straw, Night and Day, cowboy tunes, and a description of infrared photography while the Russians are lambasting us as power-hungry imperialists.

Charles Coulter, who just returned from a year in Europe, testified to the ineffectiveness of State Department broadcasts in the *Washington Post* on April 14, 1947. He said:

In something like a year spent in Europe recently, I tried again and again and again to listen in to the American broadcast. I could not pick up the broadcast. On the other hand, I could and did receive Russian, English, Swedish, Danish, and other European broadcasts, and even numerous programs from Africa, from Cairo to the Cape.

Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, distinguished editor of the magazine *The Americas*, has testified, according to the *New York Times* of January 5, 1947, to the inexcusable inefficiency of the State Department's program in Latin America:

One reason for the formidable Marxist infiltration throughout Latin America is the singularly inept and sadly ineffective nature of the State Department's Division of International Information and Cultural Affairs.

* * * Dr. Thorning called for "intelligent use of the taxpayer's money at a time when the shadow of Red fascism hangs over the entire world and is exploiting every conceivable issue, false and true, in order to undermine the good-neighbor policy in the Western Hemisphere." * * * What is required is not a great appropriation by Congress but rather some measure of imaginative

resourcefulness, artistic presentation of the abundant material we have, and an alertness in meeting and overcoming the totalitarian propagandists."

The eminent observer Constantine Brown, has described the effect of State Department cultural activities in Paris in the Evening Star of February 21, 1947, as follows:

The United States has spent many hundreds of millions of dollars in assisting France since her liberation, but few in France realize or appreciate this fact * * * the great majority of French people are firmly convinced that the Germans were defeated by the valiant bravery of the Red Armies. * * * They (Mr. Benton and his assistants) aim to inform foreign countries about the United States, but are reluctant to do anything which might be interpreted as propaganda.

Perhaps the greatest hoax put over on the American people has been UNESCO, over which that great poet and fellow traveler, Archibald MacLeish, is the chief architect. Mr. MacLeish has been associated with numerous Communist-front organizations and has written poetry which has drawn the acclaim of the Communist press. Mr. MacLeish is sharply critical of things American. Speaking before a meeting of the American Civil Liberties Union in New York on February 22, 1947, he said residents of foreign countries distrusted America's vast communication powers, the radio programs produced by advertising agencies in New York and the mass-produced day dreams of this country's motion-picture industry. They are afraid we will destroy the richness and variety of the several cultures of the world. He said the United States had undergone an extraordinary deterioration of the will to peace.

Mr. Benton has paid tribute to Mr. MacLeish, declaring that "There is no American—nor anyone in the world for that matter—who has contributed so much to the formation of UNESCO and to the writing of its charter."

According to the New York Herald Tribune of April 14, 1946, the UNESCO constitution calls for "the wide diffusion of culture and the education of humanity for justice and liberty and peace."

Kenneth Lindsay, of Oxford, a leading educator who represents English universities, has ridiculed this conception in the New York Times of November 23, 1946. He is quoted as follows:

I see danger of trying to produce, instead of concrete specific proposals, a whole world of philosophy. If UNESCO is going to try in a Europe, which has got Roman Catholics and Communists and other distinctive creeds, to produce another creed, I foretell that it will be doomed.

In spite of UNESCO's announced cultural and educational aims, it is significant to note that no public- or private-school teacher has been invited to serve as a delegate to this Organization.

It will be remembered that the Soviet bloc in the United Nations has consistently fought for the severance of relations with Franco-Spain. We understand, of course, the exigencies of Soviet power politics involved. It is interesting to note that UNESCO invited representatives of the Spanish Republic to its meetings in conformance with the Communist line supported by the entire Soviet

bloc, and in contradiction to the procedure laid down by the United Nations.

The placing of control over information and culture in the hands of a centralized agency like the State Department or UNESCO on an international scale is fraught with serious dangers. According to the New York Times on September 27, 1946, UNESCO proposes the revision of textbooks and other teaching materials used in schools and colleges throughout the world. Who will determine the nature of this revision? Will it be the left-wing ideologists in the State Department and the UNESCO?

Robert McLean, president of the Associated Press and publisher of the Philadelphia Bulletin, in a speech delivered in Philadelphia on January 17, 1947, denounced the plan for a Government merger of all communications beyond its shores and the establishment of short-wave radio broadcast, charging that the Government had arrogated "to itself in fact a power of censorship—for the power to determine what shall be sent out connotes the power to determine what shall not be sent out."

The Motion Picture Association, according to the Washington Post of January 11, 1947, accused Assistant Secretary of State Benton of trying to bend the movies to fit "a synthetic Government propaganda."

A statement issued by Joyce O'Hara, assistant to President Eric Johnston of the association, said:

What the American people fear is the type of culture which Mr. Benton proposes to spread abroad. Mr. Benton would do far better if he followed the traditional policy of his own State Department in opening up world channels of news and information instead of trying to remake the patterns of American culture.

We are being asked to provide \$31,000,-000 for State Department information services while it is being steadily excluded from country after country. World Report of October 15, 1946, lists the following exclusions of this kind:

Shut-down of Belgrade library of the United States Information Service; Bulgarian censorship of United States Information Service material; Polish restrictions on the scope of United States information; censorship in Hungary; etc.

Mr. Speaker, again I repeat that I believe cultural and information activities are essential for the security of the United States. We are now experiencing a propaganda offensive directed against us in all parts of the world. To defend ourselves we should first of all make a thorough house cleaning and liquidation of the present monstrosity in the State Department, and then set up an efficient machinery which insists and obtains complete reciprocity with the various countries with which we have treaty relations, and which will provide the Congress from time to time with concrete and adequate information based upon facts and check up as to the effective operation of this machinery.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last five words.

PRICE PROPAGANDA VERSUS COMMON SENSE

Mr. Chairman, the potato surplus problem of the United States admittedly

is not our most important problem, but it furnishes an example of the hundreds of problems which we must solve if our people and the people of the world are going to attain maximum prosperity and good living in the coming years. For this reason, I want to discuss the potato surplus problem again today.

To millions of Americans who know very little about potatoes except that they like to eat them, it may not seem worth while to worry about the potato surplus problem, particularly in view of the larger problems that confront us. However, we in the Congress know that all of the little problems piled up make a very big problem, just as a lot of little potatoes piled up make a mighty big surplus. This year that surplus is 100,-000,000 bushels, a large part of which went to waste.

The potato problem impinges on other problems facing us as legislators today. What we do, or fail to do, in formulating a program to do away with the potato surplus will affect, to some degree, the tax rate in the years to come. It will affect our Government's operations. It will affect the prices consumers must pay for potatoes, and the kind of potatoes the housewife can buy at the corner grocery store. It will even affect the price of the wheat that goes into the bread which most Americans eat every day, as I shall prove a little later.

Mr. Chairman, the potato surplus problem even has an important bearing on our overseas relief policy and on our export program of commodities generally. Just last Friday, May 9, the Department of Agriculture put out a release stating that nearly 10,000,000 bushels of potatoes from the 1946 potato crop have been shipped abroad under the Department's export program. In the course of the release, the Department noted:

Potatoes were made available for export as soon as they were harvested, but foreign countries at that time had sufficient quantities for immediate use and preferred to purchase grain. In early spring, however, it was possible to arrange for appreciable exports in spite of the difficulties involved in the handling and shipping of fresh potatoes.

It is significant to note these words, for they bear out a contention I have made before. Other nations are in our wheat market here, buying huge quantities of grain for use as flour. Many times these governments purchase flour. Our own Government purchases wheat in our relief program. This forces up the price of wheat and other grains in this country. If potatoes were processed into potato flour, the flour could be shipped instead of the wheat flour and the other nations would be glad to get it. Fifty thousand carloads of flour could have been produced from this year's surplus potatoes, most of which were destroyed.

Yes, Mr. Chairman; what we in this Congress do about the potato surplus in the long run will even help determine the prices consumers have to pay for many items which they purchase for use on the farm or in the home.

For these reasons, every American and every Member of Congress ought to learn a little more about the potato-surplus problem that seems to grow worse with

each passing year. A study of the problem gives us more insight to solve not only this problem but a multitude of others now before Congress and eventually to come before Congress.

It is true that several groups of Americans already are studying the potato-surplus problem and that the Department of Agriculture is offering every co-operation to me and to others that are seeking better means of disposing of the potato surplus. But it is also true that there is too much apathy on the subject and that the average individual must be made to understand that he will benefit materially if Congress goes into action on the potato-surplus problem.

The potato-surplus problem is important to several distinct groups in America. As we will see, none of these groups is small. As a matter of fact, every one of us is a member of one group or another that is affected by the potato problem.

First. The problem is important to the potato farmer. Right now, the average potato farmer is getting a good price for his product, but he knows—as we all know—that when the price of his product depends on artificial factors, that is, Federal price supports, sooner or later the problem will get out of hand with disastrous results to the potato grower himself.

Second. The problem is important to the thousands of independent bakers throughout the Nation. They are now paying an abnormally high price for flour. They lately have seen the price of flour go higher and higher, while at the same time they have held off putting into effect all the price increases at the retail level they should have put into effect to get their usual mark-up.

Wiser bakers have been chagrined to see their own Government working to make prices higher, while at the same time President Truman has been waging a fictitious war on high prices.

Take the present high wheat prices, for example, and consider these in the light of the potato surplus. If the Government, instead of spending \$80,000,000 this year to support potato prices, would have built several plants for processing potatoes into potato flour, roughly 50,000 carloads of potato flour could have been shipped overseas in this crop year. Think of it. This flour could have been shipped instead of a comparable amount of wheat flour which, because it was sent overseas, actually helped boost American prices for flour. In other words, such activity by the Government as I have suggested actually would have helped keep prices down in the United States—and eventually reduced them down to the housewife's table.

As every economist knows, the supply of any product, or a substitute that is as good or better than the product, has a great bearing on the price the product demands. The present administration continues to think in terms of price ceilings, or allocations, or controls, in relation to prices, while at the same time overlooking the supply factor. This supply factor is in reality our biggest worry, at least for the time being, and the President could do more about

bringing prices down by following policies that will increase production, or byproducts, that by making pretty speeches about the Newburyport plan, or any other similar plan based purely on publicity.

If we had had the foresight to process our surplus potatoes last year into potato flour, the people of Europe would gladly have taken it as a substitute for the wheat flour we had to ship abroad. It is just as good and just as nutritious and just as flavorful as wheat flour. They could have used it to make bread, to make potato soup, or to make potato gravy. Or, had they chosen, they could have used it in a variety of other ways. The flour not used for human consumption could have been fed to cattle or poultry and its food value ultimately realized by human beings. As it was, we dumped millions of bushels and shipped a comparatively little of our surplus to Europe, with the likelihood being that many of the potatoes were not worth consuming by man or beast by the time they arrived there. This can conveniently go on year after year with millions of people in need of food. Lives can be saved if action is taken now.

By so constructing and operating these potato-processing plants to prove the usefulness and profitableness of making potato flour, our Government actually would have added to our assets as a nation. Furthermore it would have been taking a big stride forward toward a solution to the pressing potato surplus problem which hangs heavy over our heads year after year. Private industry could lease or buy these plants from the Government, and by promoting consumption of potato flour in America, actually could do away with the potato-surplus problem.

The thoughtful bakers of this Nation already are recognizing the usefulness of adding a potato culture to their regular wheat-flour mix in baking bread. More than 300 bakers already use potato culture in their operations and others are turning to it each day. They, in effect, are helping already to solve the potato-surplus problem, while at the same time actually increasing the consumption of wheat. The ratio of wheat even in bread with potato culture is very great, and an increase in consumption of potato bread means an increase in consumption of wheat in the long future.

Third. The problem of the potato surplus is important to consumers in America. As we have seen, because the Government has failed to attack forcefully and logically the problems presented by the potato surplus, more wheat flour has been shipped abroad, thus forcing up its price at home. In addition, the American housewife has had to take a poorer grade of potatoes at the corner market than she should have had to take. If the Government converted surplus potatoes into flour, the culs and the lower grades could be used, thus leaving only the best, or United States Standard, grades of potatoes for purchase by housewives to serve in their homes.

Fourth. The problem of the potato surplus is important to taxpayers. Mr. Speaker, I will now give startling figures of interest to every man, woman, and

child in America, as well as everybody all over the world. This year we are spending \$80,000,000 on potato support prices because of a 100,000,000-bushel potato surplus. Now, \$80,000,000 may seem like chicken feed in these days of billions for loans, grants, and gifts to other nations, but it is still a very imposing sum to most Americans, and if we could cut out this expense without hurting the potato farmer, we would be doing the Nation a great service. This \$80,000,000 represents virtually a net loss to the United States Treasury. We Republicans have promised economy in government and this potato-surplus price is one of the best ways we can start practicing economy, yet not upset the prices which potato farmers are getting and deserve to get.

If, instead of spending the \$80,000,000 on support prices, the Government had invested a few million dollars in potato-processing plants to turn surplus potatoes into flour, there would have been none of the dumping of potatoes we have all read about and most of us have deplored. There would have been no eventual loss to the Government, the taxpayer or the consumer. There would have been a net gain, in actuality. All of the potato surplus can be converted into flour and stored for 3 years, or more. It can be shipped over seas and used to obviate the need of sending that much wheat flour abroad. Or it can be used at home in the baking of bread, cake and many other products. There is no rhyme or reason ever in destroying an agricultural surplus as long as our scientists retain their ingenuity in finding new uses, our industrialists retain their will to distribute and their "know-how" to produce, and as long as our people will accept new, flexible policies that will add to our national wealth.

Henry Wallace, who currently is in disfavor because of his Russian stand, was never more wrong in his life than at the very beginning of his career in the New Deal government when he sponsored and put into practice his "plow-'em-under" ideas. We all lived to see the disastrous results of that policy in the long run. Yet, the Department of Agriculture still is following a "plow-'em-under" policy on potatoes. The only difference is that today the potatoes are dumped after having been grown and harvested and shipped at great loss of time and effort.

I know that my colleagues will agree with me that men who are public-spirited and do things in the public interest should be praised on the floor of Congress, whether they are in government, business, or take part in other legitimate endeavors. That is why I have no hesitancy again in praising Jack Schafer, the president of Peter Pan Bakeries in Detroit, Mich., who has put forward a plan to solve this potato surplus and to restore a normal economic price to potatoes in the United States.

Jack Schafer, who is no relative of mine, also is president of Schafer-Varney, Inc., which company serves other bakers throughout the Nation with potato culture, made from potato flour and other products. As an active businessman, he travels into all parts of the Nation and contacts independent bakers, large and small. He tells me that they

are very worried about the price of flour and the results of such prices in their operations. He says that the whole baking industry sees the need for new thinking and that bakers are turning to the use of potato culture in increasing numbers to add flavor and goodness to their product and to overcome buyer resistance which continues to develop as wheat prices climb.

I mention him because I want to pay tribute to his initiative and to his stick-to-itiveness. He has studied potatoes as an active grower, as a salesman, as a marketer, and now as the manufacturer of a potato culture, and he deserves the thanks of all Americans for the time and thought he has given to the potato-surplus problem and possible solutions to it.

He and hundreds of other bakers have endorsed the House resolution which I have introduced. This resolution provides for a study of this whole potato-surplus problem by the Committee on Agriculture and for the formulation of a plan of action that will bring relief to the American taxpayer, the American consumer, the American baker, and will help both the potato farmer and the wheat farmer in the long future. I again urge support for this study among all Members of the House of Representatives and from bakers and other citizens throughout the Nation.

My mail indicates that there is a widespread demand for such a study and for positive action on the potato-surplus problem. We cannot afford to let it run on and on. The problem is a perennial one now and it will get worse and worse if we do not take constructive steps. I submit that a plan such as I contemplate and as I have outlined is the logical next step for the Congress and for the Department of Agriculture to take. This plan has been endorsed by bakers, consumers and nutritionists—in fact, by every informed person who has taken the trouble to learn the details of the potato-surplus problem.

In conclusion, why talk about price reduction when we waste 100,000,000 bushels of potatoes, pay out \$80,000,000 in subsidies, ship out 500,000,000 bushels of grain, causing our own flour and bread prices to go up? If all surplus potatoes were processed into potato flour there would be no surpluses, no \$80,000,000 tax, no abnormally high-priced flour or bread and millions of people here and abroad would be better fed. And please remember, this problem will face us again and again year after year, unless we do something about it. I urge the Rules Committee to bring out my resolution providing for a thorough study of the potato-surplus problem.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries and expenses: For salaries and expenses, regular boundary activities, including examinations, preliminary surveys, and investigations, \$950,000.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the balance of the State Department appropriation language be considered as read and that amendments may be in order to any part thereof.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

**TITLE III—DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY**

Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses of the Office of the Secretary of Commerce (hereafter in this title referred to as the Secretary) including personal services in the District of Columbia; services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (Public Law 600), at rates for individuals not to exceed \$50 per diem; teletype news service (not exceeding \$1,000); purchase of one passenger motor vehicle (not exceeding \$3,000); \$800,000.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROONEY: On page 41, line 19, strike out "\$800,000" and insert "\$1,335,000."

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, the majority members of the Committee on Appropriations have recommended a cut of 40 percent in the budget of the Office of the Secretary in the Department of Commerce.

I want the House to consider this recommendation from the practical standpoint of efficiency.

I am confident that every Member of the House wants more efficiency in government. We all know that making adequate provisions for efficient administration is the only economical way to get any job done. Years of experience in both business and Government show that we can get efficiency only by providing for effective management. That is a simple principle that every successful business and every effective Government agency follows.

But despite charging the Office of the Secretary with at least three new management burdens, the majority members of this committee have recommended a drastic 40-percent slash in the appropriation for his office.

Let us look at the new responsibilities the committee demands that the Secretary's office fulfill with a 60-percent budget.

First. It wants the office to put more effort on the study of current business and industrial needs and to provide more suggestions about the types of legislation that will meet those needs.

Second. The committee wants more screening of the Department's publications and more coordination and consolidation in the publications program.

Third. The committee wants more time and effort spent on getting coordination between the Department of Commerce and other departments of the Government.

I subscribe to all of these suggestions. But these very important responsibilities can be carried out only in the Secretary's Office. Each one of them imposes an additional management burden on his staff. I want to point out that the recommended slash of 40 percent in the funds for the Secretary's Office would make it impossible for him to fulfill the

responsibilities the committee has assigned him. Gentlemen, let us be realistic. Even the most able craftsmen need tools. I think an ordinary sense of fairness must bring us to the conclusion that it is ridiculous to impose these additional responsibilities on the Secretary's Office and at the same time reduce his staff.

The committee has made another recommendation with respect to the Secretary's Office that is grossly inconsistent with our interest in efficient management. I think the suggestion that the Department's Central Services Pool be abolished and the work parcelled out to the various bureaus and offices would tend to defeat the Committee's avowed interest in economy. This central office which now handles personnel, printing, accounting and general office services for many offices of the Department was set up for the very purpose of avoiding duplication and confusion. It has resulted in considerable savings and in the very types of coordination that create the efficiencies and economies the Committee says it wants. To scatter this management function out among various bureaus and offices would require the employment of more people and encourage the confusion we all want to avoid. It would require the Department to spend more money on less efficient management.

The appropriations request of the Secretary, who is an experienced business man and administrator, has included less than one-half of 1 percent of his total budget for the management and supervisory services that are the very basis of efficiency and economy. To cripple the managing office of a department to which every business in the United States looks for efficient service would be penny wise and pound foolish. I urgently recommend that we give this able administrator the funds he needs to do the big job he has so ably started.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York would increase the amount for the office of the Secretary of Commerce from \$800,000, as recommended by this committee, to \$1,335,000. The committee has gone into this matter very carefully and after a very, very serious study we feel that we have perhaps been a little more liberal than we should have been in reaching the amount of \$800,000.

This office in 1938 had \$478,000. In 1939 they had \$484,000. In 1940 they had \$617,000. In 1941 they went back to \$460,000. In 1942 they had \$557,000. In 1943 they had \$586,000. In 1945 they had \$689,000. In 1946 they had \$570,000, and after Mr. Wallace went into office and reorganized it, to \$925,000. Now, they are asking for \$1,335,000.

Let me tell you what they have in that office since Mr. Wallace went in there. They have a secretary, an under secretary, and an assistant secretary. They have an assistant to the secretary, and an executive assistant to the secretary. They have an executive assistant to the

under secretary, and an executive assistant to the assistant secretary. They have a secretary to the secretary and a secretary of public relations, and they have secretaries all over the place.

I think the committee has given them an ample amount of money to carry on the Department of Commerce in an orderly and effective way.

I suggest that the Committee vote this amendment down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Technical and scientific services: For necessary expenses in the performance of activities and services relating to technological development as an aid to business in the development of foreign and domestic commerce, including all the objects for which the appropriation "Salaries and expenses, office of the Secretary," is available (not to exceed \$25,000), for services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (Public Law 600), and not to exceed \$60,000 for printing and binding, \$1,700,000, of which not to exceed \$500,000 may be transferred to the National Bureau of Standards for testing and other scientific studies.

Mr. AREND'S. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. I made a point of order against the language on lines 3 to 14, inclusive, on page 42 that it is legislation on an appropriation bill and not authorized by law.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, we concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is conceded, and the Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

Current census statistics: For expenses necessary for collecting, compiling, and publishing current census statistics provided for by law; temporary employees at rates to be fixed by the Director of the Census without regard to the Classification Act; the cost of obtaining State, municipal, and other records; preparation of monographs on census subjects and other work of specialized character by contract; purchase and rental of office furniture and equipment including mechanical and electrical tabulating equipment and other labor-saving devices; tabulating cards and continuous form tabulating paper; \$5,000,000: *Provided*, That on and after October 1, 1947, all functions necessary to the compilation of foreign trade statistics shall be performed in New York, N. Y., and of the foregoing amount \$1,200,000 shall be available exclusively for this purpose.

Mr. BEALL. I make a point of order against the language on page 43, line 18, beginning with the word "provided" and going through line 22 on the same page, that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order and I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is conceded. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STEFAN: On page 43, line 18, after the amount "\$5,000,000" and before the period, insert a comma and the words "of which amount not to exceed \$3,800,000 may be expended at the seat of government."

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

The Chairman. The gentleman from Nebraska is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Nebraska yield?

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

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I am thoroughly in accord with the provisions of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN]. We had anticipated that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BEALL] would make the point of order with regard to the language in the paragraph we inserted on page 43 with reference to moving the Office of Foreign Trade Statistics to New York. The question of economy, which is paramount in the minds of all of us, plays an important part in this item.

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

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. TABER. This is the place where it is very desirable from the standpoint of economy that the Bureau of the Census be not permitted to have 700 employees doing the work that 50 employees used to do in New York. I think the statement of the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] is correct and proper.

Mr. ROONEY. However, I want to make myself perfectly clear that I am not in accord with the reduction made by the committee from \$11,500,000 to \$5,000,000 in the over-all figure for the collection of current census statistics. I was thoroughly in accord with the language on page 43 to which the point of order has been made by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BEALL]. The funds there concern the collection of foreign-trade statistics, the office which does most of the work having been located in New York for a great many years. The committee held extensive hearings with regard to the situation and the New York office, and found that a saving of more than \$200,000 could be made by locating the entire outfit in New York.

Mr. STEFAN. It is \$250,000 that we are saving by this amendment. The gentleman might also add that we had investigators look into this matter several times and it was on the recommendation of these investigators that we have taken this action.

Mr. ROONEY. If I may conclude on the gentleman's time, the minority members of the subcommittee are in thorough accord with regard to the amendment now offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN]. I trust it will be adopted and the work of collecting foreign-trade statistics carried on in New York.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] wish to make the point of order?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I reserve the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Chairman, this is an extremely important matter and one with which I believe the Members of the House are not familiar.

The facts are that at the present time there are approximately 300 employees in

Washington in this Foreign Trade Section of the Census Bureau and approximately 90 in New York. Now that the point or order to the removal proviso has been conceded this amendment is offered which in reality is a back-door attempt to move this Section to New York.

The Foreign Trade Section is but one minor department of the Census Bureau. In the Census Bureau there is the population census, the housing census, the manufacturing census, the employment census, the agricultural census not duplicated by the Agricultural Department, local and State governments census (relating to tax information of over 150,000 political units), and numerous others.

The pending bill reduced the current expenditure from \$10,000,000 to \$5,000,000. Of that \$5,000,000 this amendment would earmark nearly \$1,200,000, or allot approximately one-quarter of the total appropriation to the Foreign Trade Section alone and locate in New York against the judgment and wishes of the Commerce Department. The other phases of the work which I have mentioned would have to be administered with less than three-quarters of the appropriation but require about 10 times as many employees.

This Foreign Trade Section gets information from ships at ports all over the United States. Such information is sent by mail to Washington. New York is the only port in which they attempt to tabulate and publish the information themselves. Baltimore, ports on the Gulf and Pacific coasts, and other ports on the Atlantic coast send their information to Washington where it is tabulated and accessible.

The important thing in a census is not getting these reports from the ships, for the reports can be mailed in, as they are from every port except New York; the important phases of a census is the tabulating and dissemination, the publication of the information. At the bureau it is available to Congressmen, to other Government departments, to other branches of industry.

If this amendment prevails it will not only throw the allocation way out of balance, giving about one quarter of the total appropriation, to Foreign Trade Section, but in addition to that it will move the office which tabulates, disseminates and publishes the information to New York. Suppose this were permitted at every port and someone wanted to get information on the subject? Anyone desiring information regarding foreign trade port would have to get information about all the ports throughout the United States would have to contact each individual port. At the Census Bureau it is accessible. There it is tabulated and published.

My distinguished colleague, the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, and the Chairman [Mr. TABER], naturally are for this amendment because they are both from New York.

It has not been called to the attention of the House that the Director of the Census and the Commerce Department are opposed to this removal. This matter has come up from time to time. A year ago the Bureau of the Budget was called upon to make a study of this

subject and prepared a report for the Appropriations Committee.

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

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Chairman, a year ago when a study was made by the Bureau of the Budget for report to the Appropriations Committee, after extensive study they advised against it. They said:

The foreign trade statistics program cannot be merely a routine tabulation of the data contained in export and import documents. Its usefulness depends upon its adaptability to changing situations and needs. The program is not isolated, but closely related to working programs and responsibilities of many Government agencies.

The Section of Customs Statistics should be located in Washington from the standpoint of administration. If the offices were in Washington many problems could be adjusted from time to time before assuming large proportions requiring investigations. The location of the section in Washington would permit of a greater and more expeditious use of the basic data.

As it now stands, there are 300 employees here tabulating and disseminating and publishing information and if this amendment prevails they will be moved to New York where all that need be done is to take the data from the ships as is done in other ports by mail.

In addition to that, if I may repeat it again, it throws the appropriation way out of balance and earmarks over \$1,000,000 for this activity. If it is left here we will have the benefit of all the information.

These 300 families who would have to move to New York would not only have to give up their homes here, but would have difficulty in finding homes in that already overcrowded city. I hope the amendment will not prevail.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maryland has expired. Does the gentleman from Virginia press his point of order?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ROONEY and Mr. SASSCER) there were—ayes 71, noes 32.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BUCHANAN: On page 43, line 18, strike out "\$5,000,000" and insert "\$11,500,000."

USE OF CENSUS FIGURES IN MAINTAINING STABLE ECONOMY

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I am certain there is one thing on which every Member of this House will agree. I think we would all agree that the chief responsibility of business, industry, and government today is to work together to insure a stable, high-level

economy for this Nation. If we were to be plunged again into a deep, morale-shattering depression, there are very real reasons to doubt that our form of government could survive as it now is, and as we want it to continue. There are some who are just lying in wait for that to happen.

We must do everything humanly possible to assist business and industry maintain high levels of employment and production. The people in my district and the people everywhere want to attain higher living standards and a greater measure of security that comes from full employment and a stable economy. With that in mind, I want to discuss what to me is one of the most shortsighted and uneconomic proposals I have ever seen. That is the proposal of the Appropriations Committee, in its recommendations on the budget of the Commerce Department, to cut the funds of the Bureau of the Census for current statistics from \$11,500,000 to \$5,000,000.

At this time in the Nation's history when it is imperative for all of us to make wise economic decisions, the Appropriations Committee proposes to reduce the main Government agency which provides Congress, business, industry, and agriculture with the facts and statistics upon which sound judgment and action can be based.

Full employment depends on high production and it takes shrewd, hard-headed managers, of large and small business alike, to maintain high production. They must know the right thing to do at the right time. Can this be expected of management unless up-to-date and accurate facts are available to them?

This need of business managers for facts, facts and more facts, is not something I have pulled out of a hat like a magician's rabbit. The urgent need of businessmen for information to guide them in intelligent management decisions is attested to by the strong position taken by the United States Chamber of Commerce and other business organizations in support of the fact-gathering work of the Bureau of the Census.

Business representatives point out that they must have these facts for intelligent planning. They want to have the most recent information available on current production and distribution, both retail and wholesale; they want to know the size of their markets, the size of the labor force, and latest figures on unemployment. These facts help them plan plant-expansion programs, how to schedule their purchases, their production, and their sales activities.

I said the information they need must be recent because in these days of rapid shifts information goes quickly out of date. It is therefore absolutely necessary that information be kept current, that old figures be replaced by new ones, so that decisions can keep pace with changes that are taking place.

Unless the funds we vote for the Census Bureau are adequate for its operation we will find that we here in Congress, businessmen, and farmers throughout the country will not have the basic facts and figures on which to operate their enterprises. This is a time when everyone is wondering whether a recession or a

depression is inevitable, and it is exactly the time when everyone should be well informed on all aspects of our Nation's economy.

I want to say again that it is our duty to maintain a stable economy. Our own welfare and that of the world depends on the steps we take in Congress to do this.

I believe that a reduction in the funds available to the Bureau of the Census is a step in the wrong direction. I ask the Members of the House to restore the funds to the \$11,500,000 which the Bureau requested. I think this is a step in the right direction and that it is one of the best investments this Congress can make in the welfare and prosperity of the Nation and the world.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment would seek to increase the amount of \$5,000,000 allowed by committee for current census statistics to \$11,000,000. I wish to call the attention of the Committee to the fact that the Bureau of Census has taken unto itself unusually broad authority to take whatever census seems to come to their minds. Much of this, in our opinion, is not authorized or never was expected to be authorized by the Congress of the United States. I wish to call your attention to the fact that we have money in this bill for the decennial census—that is, to start the decennial census—which comes in 2 years, at which time practically all of this will be taken over again. We have information from various parts of the country indicating that the Census Bureau is now setting up field offices all over the United States, similar to the field offices of the Foreign and Domestic Commerce. A majority of the committee are of opinion that the amount that we allowed in this bill, \$5,000,000, is ample to carry on the current statistical work. We have allowed \$4,000,000 in this bill for the current census of manufactures. We see no reason, in view of the fact that the people want us to economize, why we should not reduce this sum to the amount we suggest, \$5,000,000. I call your attention to the fact, too, that in 1943 the amount for current census was \$1,242,000; in 1945, \$4,300,000; and in 1946, \$5,318,000. They are asking now \$11,500,000. I urge the members of the Committee for the sake of economy to vote down this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUCHANAN].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

CIVIL AERONAUTICS ADMINISTRATION

Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses of the Civil Aeronautics Administration in carrying out the provisions of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended (49 U. S. C. 401), incident to the enforcement of safety regulations; maintenance and operation of air-navigation facilities and air-traffic control; furnishing advisory service to States and other public and private agencies in connection with the construction or improvement of airports and landing areas; including personal services in the District of Columbia; the operation and maintenance of 226 aircraft; contract stenographic

reporting services; fees and mileage of expert and other witnesses; purchase of 325 and hire of passenger motor vehicles; purchase and repair of skis and snowshoes; and salaries and traveling expenses of employees detailed to attend courses of training conducted by the Government or other agencies serving aviation; \$66,133,000, and the War and Navy Departments are authorized to transfer to the Civil Aeronautics Administration without charge aircraft, aircraft engines, parts, flight equipment, and hangar, line, and shop equipment surplus to the needs of such Departments: *Provided*, That none of the funds hereby appropriated shall be used for the employment of personnel for the operation of air-traffic control towers: *Provided further*, That there may be credited to this appropriation, funds received from States, counties, municipalities, and other public authorities for expenses incurred in the maintenance and operation of airport-traffic control towers.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROONEY: On page 45, line 18, strike out "\$66,133,000" and insert "\$70,982,000"; and on page 45, line 23, strike out the proviso beginning with the word "That" and ending with the colon in line 1 on page 46.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, this is the item in which I know a great many of us are vitally interested. This is the paragraph in the bill wherein the entire amount of moneys requested by the Civil Aeronautics Administration for airport traffic-control towers is eliminated. The majority members of this subcommittee and the majority members of the full Committee on Appropriations in their judgment cut out the amount \$4,849,000 for these very, very necessary airport traffic-control towers. My amendment would put the airport traffic-control tower program back in circulation. It would increase the amount on line 18, page 45, from \$66,133,000 to \$70,982,000, and also strike out the proviso beginning on line 23 on page 45 wherein the committee would like to have us say that none of the funds appropriated in the paragraph shall be used for the employment of personnel for the operation of air-traffic control towers.

I feel that I do not need to say very much with regard to this item because the temper of the House was expressed yesterday. I inserted at page 5196 of yesterday's RECORD a list of the airport traffic-control towers, numbering 148, showing the locations where those towers were intended to be. This is just another instance of penny-wise, pound-foolish economy on the part of the majority. They eliminate 148 of these traffic-control towers with the expectation, the hope, and the prayer that somebody else will pay for them, when the fact of the matter is they are thereby jeopardizing safety on our entire system of national airways.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. What was the expenditure for this service last year?

Mr. ROONEY. I do not have that figure readily available.

Mr. STEFAN. If the gentleman will yield, we had an amount last year for 130

towers. They are asking for 18 more this year. It was about \$3,000,000 last year.

Mr. ROONEY. I trust you will support the amendment I have offered, which would, as I said before, put back into circulation our airport tower control program.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

This committee eliminated \$4,849,000 for the air-traffic-control towers because the membership is convinced now, more than ever, that these towers should be operated by the cities and municipalities in which the airports are located and who derived the benefit from the traffic of the airports. The commercial air lines, the nonscheduled air lines, and private fliers should participate in this cost. Last year, the funds for these towers were restored on the floor of the House for the same arguments being presented today. I supported the amendment last year, feeling that we should take care of the most important towers temporarily as a stopgap. Before the war, the control-tower operators were paid for by the municipalities. Many of them used CAA operators. The Army then took over the operations of the air-control towers, and when the war was over, the Army stated they no longer needed the towers for the prosecution of the war and they returned them to the municipalities. It was thought at that time that it would be well to continue operating some of the most important towers under Government expense for about a year, in order to give the municipalities, the air lines, and the CAA an opportunity to arrange for a method of paying for these operators out of private funds. The committee felt that, as long as the Government is constructing most of the airports furnishing most of the equipment and safety aids, it should not be called upon to pay for the salaries of the operators of the air-control towers any more than it should be called upon to pay for the railroad operators and train dispatchers in the railroad depots. A majority of the committee feels that with a transfer of the costs of operating these towers the safety factor is in no way affected. The towers would be continued to be operated by CAA personnel under CAA standards and the cities and municipalities would merely be reimbursed \$25,000 or \$35,000 each annually for the operation of the towers. The actual maintenance of these towers, that is, installing equipment and keeping it in first-class condition, would continue to be a responsibility of the CAA and funds are provided in this bill for that purpose.

It is my sincere belief that if something is not done, or started very soon, this item will eventually cost the taxpayers more than \$150,000,000 a year and the present amount will be increased every year, or as rapidly as the real pressure can be placed on the CAA by the hundreds of cities which want the government to pay for this service and which they are paying for themselves without complaint. These municipalities and their officers tell me, "We are paying for the operators in our towers ourselves and we are willing to do that if the rest of the cities in

the United States are given the same treatment; but if you are going to pay for the operators in the control towers of 130 cities, we want the same advantage and do not want to be discriminated against." So the committee felt that in view of this hodge-podge program which now has gotten into the category of "pork barrel" we should call it to the attention of Congress by eliminating the item, so far as the payment of salaries to the operators is concerned, and leave in all of the safety factors.

I know how difficult it is for Members of Congress to make their decision on this amendment, because every Member who has a control tower in his town and district being paid for by the Federal Government has a score of telegrams in his possession demanding that he work to restore this money into this bill. Also, a large number of Members who have air control towers in their towns or districts, being paid for by municipalities, have telegrams and letters in their possession from the mayors and other officials demanding to get in on the band wagon.

Those of you who believe in economy and recognize the financial condition of the Federal Treasury should hesitate before you cast your vote in favor of this amendment. The amendment should be defeated in order to give the Interstate Commerce Committee notice that we want some legislation in order to safeguard our Treasury and bring about a badly needed review of the entire financial conditions of the Civil Aeronautics Administration and its relationship to the American taxpayer and the aviation industry generally.

I want to repeat what I told the members of the committee yesterday in my general statement regarding my concern over the matter of cost, and the predictions which are made every day connected with the air industry. This refers to the great increases in the number of airplanes and personnel and the air industry generally that affect the future. I might point out that the number of domestic civil aircraft produced in 1941 was a little over 8,000. It is estimated 50,000 will be produced in 1948. The total registered aircraft in 1941 was 22,500, and it is estimated 171,000 will be produced in 1948. The total revenue passenger-miles in 1938 was 1,300,000,000, and it is estimated that in 1948 the total revenue passenger-miles will be 7,500,000,000. It seems obvious that the Federal Government cannot afford to continue to increase appropriations to the CAA in proportion to the increased air activity.

It would be very well for Members of Congress to inform themselves what it cost the taxpayer every time a commercial airplane leaves an airport with a load of passengers and freight. It is time to review this entire matter of cost.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? Does the committee understand that we have 4,700 airports now in the United States?

Mr. STEFAN. We have 4,728 airports in the United States.

Mr. DONDERO. That means we have 100 airports for every State in the Union.

Mr. STEFAN. Besides that, the Army and Navy turned over to us by way of surplus more than 400 surplus airports which were built for war purposes. They told us in committee they will have in addition to that many more surplus Army and Navy airports for which they will have no further use.

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

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. SABATH. Is not the gentleman and the committee aware that this air transportation is increasing by leaps and bounds and that it would be manifestly unfair to unload the cost of maintaining these towers on the local governments?

Mr. STEFAN. I am aware of that more than you are because I have lived with this thing for more than 15 years. I know about it. Certainly I am aware of it. I am just as interested in the safety factor as you or anybody else. That is what I am going to talk about. We cannot discriminate on safety. If one airport gets the service, why should not other airports get the service?

Mr. SABATH. But the elimination of this appropriation will not help for the safety for our air travelers.

Mr. STEFAN. I will get into that and explain it.

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

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. HORAN. Is it not true that we are at the place where we have to make a decision? Either we have to cut out the control towers or we have to furnish control towers and operate them for every airport.

Mr. STEFAN. Absolutely. Somewhere along the line you have got to make a start, and here it is.

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

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Do not the fares which are charged passengers for traveling in these planes cover a substantial gross cost so that the air lines can pay for some of these improvements?

Mr. STEFAN. The argument will be made that they do not and that the commercial lines are not making money now.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute amendment offered by Mr. MILLER of Connecticut for the Rooney amendment: On page 45, line 18, strike out "66,133" and insert "\$70,983."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut is recognized for 8 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, this matter was pretty well

discussed on yesterday. I want to explain the difference between the substitute amendment and the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The gentleman from New York suggests that we strike out the proviso at the end of the section which permits the CAA to receive reimbursements from States, counties, and municipalities. I believe that should be left in the bill.

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

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. That is not it at all.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Did not the gentleman ask that that proviso be stricken out?

Mr. ROONEY. The only proviso that I asked be stricken out was the proviso which stated that none of the funds hereby appropriated shall be used for the employment of personnel for the operation of air traffic control towers.

The gentleman's amendment does not even include that. So while the gentleman asks for the same amount as I do, except an additional thousand dollars, more or less, he does not provide that the airport traffic control towers may be maintained.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I beg the gentleman's pardon and the pardon of the Committee. I had the wrong proviso in mind. The proviso I had in mind was at the top of page 46.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the substitute amendment and that I may be recognized on the Rooney amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut is recognized.

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

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Briefly.

Mr. BROOKS. I assume from what the gentleman said that he is very much in favor of increasing the appropriations.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I am absolutely in agreement with the gentleman from New York in restoring the full amount.

Mr. BROOKS. I am very glad to learn that and I assure the gentleman that I think he is right.

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

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield.

Mr. RIVERS. Our distinguished friend from Nebraska made the statement that the only reason we favored this was because we got telegrams from mayors and so forth. Is that the reason the gentleman favors it?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I have not received a single telegram from any mayor in my district. There are only two control towers in my district. To me this is a matter of making our airways safe and nothing more.

I usually agree with the gentleman from Nebraska. As I said on yesterday, I agree with the gentleman from Nebraska in the ultimate plan of eventually turning the cost of these control-tower operations back to the States. I believe, however, that should be done only after the Congress has considered legislation

whereby we can set up a plan and determine who is going to pay for a lot of this airway equipment. I think the day will soon be here when the air lines should pay a greater share of the cost of the air-line equipment; but I do think it is the responsibility of the Federal Government to provide the equipment to operate what we usually refer to as our Federal airways system.

The gentleman from Nebraska stated that there were 4,000 or more airports in the United States. Nobody is even asking that we put a federally-operated control tower at every one of those airports.

This expensive CAA program has grown considerably in the past few years and it is going to grow in the future, but so have the revenues. I want to refer to a paragraph of the testimony presented to the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee this morning bearing on this subject of revenues from air lines and air-line operations. Mr. Carlton Putnam, president, Chicago & Southern Air Lines, Inc., testified:

Under an estimate made for Congress by the Board of Investigation and Research, the domestic air lines thus far have received in the way of mail subsidy about \$110,000,000. This appears to have been pretty well paid back, since the direct expenditure from appropriations in the domestic air-mail service by the Post Office Department, including both the payments to carriers and all the other direct costs of maintaining the service, but not indirect allocations, was \$361,436,839 through 1946, whereas the postal revenue was \$484,071,259, leaving a credit in the air lines' favor on this basis of \$122,634,420. This exceeds by more than \$32,000,000 the \$90,000,000 estimated by the Civil Aeronautics Board to be the air lines' share of the costs of airways and airports. So we have a total of perhaps \$200,000,000 (the \$110,000,000 plus the \$90,000,000) so far advanced by the Government, in the form of support, with accruals back to the Government of all of this, plus the Post Office's direct allocations, plus \$32,000,000.

A great deal of this maintenance cost for airways is coming back to the Treasury through the Post Office Department.

Mr. Wright, of the CAA, testified when this matter was under consideration by the subcommittee, as follows:

Mr. WRIGHT. We feel that the airport traffic-control towers are a vital and integral part of the Federal airways system, and it would be absolutely inappropriate. With the increasing traffic that there is it would possibly be disastrous to have those operated by local communities.

Again he said:

Mr. WRIGHT. If you are talking of the reimbursement to the Government of one part of the expense, such as we are talking about under this general Federal airways program, that would be a possibility, if you could get all the cities to do it, but if one refused to do it, it seems to me you would be left without one link in your whole Federal airways system, and you simply could not fly airplanes into that airport under instrument weather conditions.

Mr. Chairman, there is the best authority I know of on the operation of the American airways.

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

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. JENNINGS. How much does the gentleman's amendment increase this

appropriation for the maintenance of these airways?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. A little less than \$5,000,000.

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

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment for the Rooney amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute amendment offered by Mr. HINSHAW for the amendment offered by Mr. ROONEY: On page 45, line 18, strike out "\$66,133,000" and insert "\$70,848,500", and strike out the proviso beginning on line 23, page 45, and ending on line 1, page 46.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, the difference between the Rooney amendment and my amendment is the deduction of \$133,500 which I find upon reading the hearings and the committee report was allocated and assigned to the Washington National Airport and included in the Washington National Airport appropriation for the purpose of maintaining the control-tower operation here in Washington. Consequently, it is not needed as a part of this over-all appropriation, and I have deducted it from the total amount.

In respect to control tower operation, I think that I am as well qualified to speak on this subject as nearly any Member of the House, having been a member of the investigating committee of which the gentleman from Oklahoma, Mr. Nichols, was chairman, and which included the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the gentleman from Texas, Mr. Kleberg, and the gentleman from Tennessee, Mr. Pearson. The first time that we came to the full conclusion that control towers definitely should be operated by the Federal Government was upon the investigation of the accident that occurred at Atlanta, Ga., wherein our former colleague, Bill Byron, was killed, and Eddie Rickenbacker was seriously injured. We came to the conclusion then and there that to trust the municipality for the quality of operators, with the salary scales offered by some municipalities and with the patronage system involved, was a wholly unsatisfactory way to operate such an important part of our airway system. If you will examine the accident statistics over the years you will find that a very high proportion—the exact proportion is not in my mind at the moment, but it is in my mind as 80 percent—of all accidents to aircraft, both civil, military, and commercial, occur on or in the immediate vicinity of airports when the airplanes are under control of the local control zone operator or the airport control-tower operator. Consequently, it is of the very highest importance that these control-tower operators be just top notch.

Now, to say that you are going to turn this function back to the municipalities on June 30 next and expect them to support the operation of control towers is, in my humble opinion, perfectly ridiculous. The local communities are not in a position to take over these control towers on the 30th of next June, and if they were, there are many of them that

would not be able to afford to do it, because while they might be an important airport for either air line flying or private flying or military flying, they might be small municipalities, and hence be unable to support a control tower. My committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, having the subject of air safety under investigation and study since the 15th of January of this year, is now giving very careful thought to many matters relating to aviation, and this is one of them. Whether or not we will be able to resolve an equitable solution to this problem any different than the one now being used, is a question which we cannot answer as yet. It is entirely too complicated.

There are airports which are used principally by Army and Navy fliers. There are airports which are principally used by the private fliers flying small airplanes. There are airports such as LaGuardia and Washington National that are used very largely and almost exclusively by commercial operators. Landing fees are charged to commercial operators, of course, but there is only one airport in the United States that is even breaking even today—I guess Washington National is coming close to it—but LaGuardia Airport, I understand, shows a small profit. No other airport in the United States is able to show a profit on its operations as yet. However, the business is growing, and it may be that in the not too distant future some will be able to show a profit on their airports. However, they are not presently able to support the quality of control-tower operators and the number of control-tower operators that are required to bring safety to aviation.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Was it not brought out before our committee that if this GCA equipment is operated, as they hope to by the control-tower operators, that it will make them even a more essential part of the control-tower operation?

Mr. HINSHAW. That is right. A console with two radar scopes can be used very handily by the control-tower operators themselves, and much to my surprise, in the Washington National Airport budget, they put in \$69,000 for additional personnel to operate the radar scope.

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

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. There is no need whatever, as I see it, to supply additional operators at control towers for the operation of these radar scopes. I understand however, that very large sums of money were suggested by the CAA for that purpose.

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

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

Mr. ROONEY. The gentleman stated at the outset that his substitute amendment was similar to mine except for the amount of \$133,500 for the Washington National Airport. Does the gentleman realize that on page 47 of the bill under "Maintenance and operation, Washington National Airport," the amount of \$133,500 to which he refers is included?

Mr. HINSHAW. That is exactly why I deducted it from the over-all item, because it is included in the Washington National Airport item according to your committee report and hence is not needed as a part of the over-all amount.

Mr. ROONEY. The gentleman is utterly incorrect. I am sure the chairman of the subcommittee on his side will explain it to him.

Mr. HINSHAW. May I ask the chairman of the committee if I am not correct in that statement?

Mr. STEFAN. The item was deducted in the committee.

Mr. HINSHAW. Deducted from what?

Mr. STEFAN. It has been deducted from the amount we allowed. If the gentleman will read the third paragraph on page 27 of the committee report, he will find that we deducted this \$133,500 for the maintenance and operation of air control tower, Washington Airport, from the item the gentleman seeks to decrease on page 45, line 18, namely, \$66,133 00.

Mr. HINSHAW. The gentleman means that the amount of \$4,890,000, or whatever it is, was originally \$133,500 higher than that?

Mr. STEFAN. That is correct.

Mr. HINSHAW. Then I am wrong, but the bill and the committee report are quite indefinite on that point. Under the circumstances, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my substitute amendment, with the hope that the Rooney amendment will be adopted.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time in order to read to the House two telegrams which I have received from officials of the city and county of San Francisco. The first is from Hon. Roger Lapham, mayor of San Francisco. I quote:

Am advised House Appropriations Committee has eliminated from Commerce Department appropriation bill funds for operation of San Francisco airport air-traffic-control tower. While we naturally protest imposition of this financial burden on our local government, we are more principally concerned because of firm feeling that all traffic-control-tower men should be hired and controlled by one agency, necessarily Federal, in the interest of uniform control in all airports and resulting standardization of safety for benefit of all pilots as well as passengers. It is unthinkable that national and international air commerce and lives of countless thousands of passengers should be jeopardized.

I personally oppose centralization of government in Federal hands as a matter of

broad principle, but feel that air commerce, which knows no State boundaries and few international ones, is type of operation so fast moving and broad that centralization in Federal agency of safety control and supervision is only answer in this particular case.

San Francisco now spending \$20,000,000 to make our airport one of world's finest. Many other cities also modernizing airports for safety and convenience. All this would be undermined if uniform safety standards of air-traffic-control-tower men are sidetracked by Federal Government.

ROGER D. LAPHAM,
Mayor.

And now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to quote a telegram which I have received from Mr. Mike Doolin, manager of the San Francisco Airport, who is in attendance at the convention of the American Association of Airport Executives in Chicago. I quote:

The American Association of Airport Executives in annual convention at Chicago and as a special first order of business request that you present to the Congress immediately its unanimous and urgent protest against the elimination from CAA appropriations of funds for the operation of air traffic control towers. This association, composed of airport managers and executives of wide experience in aviation, and from localities with the heaviest volume of air traffic, are amazed at the elimination of funds for this key agency on which is dependent the safety of air commerce and the life of every pilot and air passenger on air line or any other aircraft.

Congress must reinstate funds for the Federal operations of air traffic control towers or take the responsibility for the complete break-down of a system of flight control which has been proven the safest in the world.

MIKE DOOLIN,
Manager, San Francisco Airport.

Mr. BAKEWELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute amendment offered by Mr. BAKEWELL for the Rooney amendment.

Page 45, line 18, strike out "\$66,133,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$71,045,734."

On page 45, line 23, strike out beginning with the word "That", down to and including the word "towers", on page 46, line 1, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That \$4,877,734 of the funds hereby appropriated shall be available for the employment of personnel for the operation of air-traffic control towers."

Mr. BAKEWELL. Mr. Chairman, the objective of this amendment is substantially the same as the objective of the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from New York. However, it goes a little bit further than his.

His amendment eliminates lines 23, 24, and 25, which provide that these funds should not be used for the personnel handling air-control towers. My amendment goes further and affirmatively states that these funds, if they should be reinstated, shall specifically be used for this purpose. My amendment likewise increases the amount from \$4,849,000 to \$4,877,000, in order to include within this program an airport which was approved and recognized by the CAA after it had submitted its figures to the Committee on Appropriations.

As we all know, the primary responsibility for the safety of the airways is lodged in the Civil Aeronautics Authority. To attempt to return that function to the communities, would in my judgment be inviting confusion, lack of uniformity, and possibly disaster. The CAA has very high standards and qualifications for its personnel. It has an established and uniform system throughout the country. It means a great deal to every Army, Navy, commercial, and private pilot who comes into an airport if he is accustomed to the system of communications which is in operation there. There is now perfect cooperation between land and air which must be maintained, particularly when we consider the split-second decisions which frequently must be made in bringing a plane in for landing at a crowded airport or controlling traffic for take-off.

What is the cost of this program? I believe in economy. This program is less than \$5,000,000. Yet, if you have one disaster involving a DC-6 you will have lost almost a million dollars right there. Of course, we would not attempt to evaluate in dollars and cents the human lives, and on these large passenger ships there can be 40, 50, or 60 people.

The committee recommends that the CAA personnel still operate these airports, but that the city should reimburse them.

With due deference to this recommendation of the committee, I do not think that it is realistic. There will be a division of responsibility. You will have these flight-control tower operators in the impossible position of trying to serve two masters; that is, the CAA, by whose regulations they must abide, and the municipalities, who are paying their salaries.

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

Mr. BAKEWELL. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. PLOESER. I would like to say to my colleague from Missouri that I support wholeheartedly the idea that this should be under Federal supervision, and I will support not only his substitute but I would support the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY]. However, I do believe that with the tremendous growth of this cost to the Federal Government, an immediate plan should be brought about whereby we will have local reimbursement. I do not believe we should go on and on and let these costs mount when in the main they are to the credit and the additional service of the air lines and the municipalities. I support it in the hope that this Congress can bring a program which will reimburse the Federal Government for the management of airport controls.

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

Mr. BAKEWELL. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. Will the gentleman please advise the amount that he inserted in line 18 in lieu of \$66,130,000?

Mr. BAKEWELL. \$71,045,734.

Mr. ROONEY. May I inquire of the gentleman how he arrived at that figure?

Mr. BAKEWELL. This figure includes the \$4,849,000 which was cut by the Appropriations Committee together with the sum of \$63,734 submitted by the CAA as the cost of devices and personnel required for the operation of an airport which was recently approved by it, that is, after the CAA had submitted its original estimates to the Appropriations Committee. In that regard I should like to defer to my colleague the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COLE], in whose district this recently approved airport is situated.

Mr. ROONEY. I think there are a number of gentlemen who have local airports they would like to have included.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BAKEWELL] has expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be given two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. I wonder if the gentleman would advise me as to how he arrived at that amount.

Mr. BAKEWELL. I defer to my colleague the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COLE], in whose district this particular airport is located.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. If the gentleman will yield, I hope to get time after the gentleman has yielded the floor. However, I will say that the CAA furnished me the figure of \$63,734 for the operation of the control tower and the replacing of equipment there at St. Joseph, Mo.

Mr. ROONEY. I believe the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] also has an airport down in New Orleans that the CAA gave him some figures with regard to a new project. Does the gentleman from Missouri realize that these items have not been presented by the Bureau of the Budget; that they have not been examined by this committee and by the able chairman the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN], and the majority members of the committee, and that the figure which he suggests is one that is more or less taken out of thin air?

Mr. BAKEWELL. I yielded to the gentleman for a question, and now if I may answer him: In the first place I do not think that the CAA merely takes its figures out of thin air. As far as I am concerned, I think every airport that is under the supervision of the CAA should have this same type of operation. I would have gladly acceded to the request of any Member of this Congress in whose district an airport might recently have been approved but for which funds were not allocated in this bill. And now to include the airport for which the request is made by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COLE], is just extending my theory that you must have uniformity in every airport throughout the country.

We witnessed a series of air casualties last winter. The Congress initiated an investigation. Suppose we deny the CAA these funds, and some crashes occur as a result. Suppose, further, that the Congress undertakes an investiga-

tion, and comes to the conclusion that the crashes were due to untrained and inexperienced flight-control operators. Then the Congress will stand self-accused and self-convicted before the entire country.

I appeal to you, my colleagues, to restore these funds. Aviation is peculiarly interstate and national in scope, more so than any other medium of travel. To turn this responsibility back to the local communities would definitely be a step backward in the development and progress of aviation. There must be uniformity in the operation of air-control towers. To deny these funds to the CAA is tinkering with safety and toying with human life which we cannot afford to do when we consider the comparatively minor sum involved.

Mr. Chairman, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a copy of a letter received from Gen. Milton W. Arnold, vice president, in charge of operations and engineering of the Air Transportation Association of America, and also a copy of a telegram received from Mr. David L. Behncke, president, Air Line Pilots Association:

AIR TRANSPORT ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA,
Washington, D. C., May 9, 1947.

The Honorable CLAUDE I. BAKEWELL,
Congressman from Missouri,
House of Representatives,

Washington, D. C.

My DEAR CONGRESSMAN BAKEWELL: I thought you might be interested in the thoughts of the Air Transport Association concerning the proposal of the House Appropriations Committee to eliminate Civil Aeronautics Administration operation of airport control towers.

The scheduled air-line industry is greatly concerned respecting the possible decrease in safety that would occur should the important function of airport traffic control, with the accompanying responsibility of approach control under instrument approach conditions, be assigned to air traffic controllers who were employees either directly or indirectly of any agency or organization other than the Civil Aeronautics Administration.

It has been agreed by all Government agencies concerned with the operation of aircraft, as well as representatives of all segments of civil aircraft operations, that airport and airway traffic control are no longer separate and distinct functions and must, in the interests of safe and reliable aircraft operations, function completely under the supervision and the control of one agency.

As you are aware, the Civil Aeronautics Administration has adopted a policy of approving approach control only at those airports where airport traffic control is under its jurisdiction and the tower operators in its employ. The air lines concur wholeheartedly with this stand.

There have been several cases in the past where approach control has not functioned to the best interest of safe aircraft operations where control tower operators were employed by the municipalities. I believe outstanding examples that can be cited are LaGuardia Field and the Detroit city airport, the towers at both of which have subsequently been placed under the Civil Aeronautics Administration.

With an ever-increasing utilization of airway and airport facilities, and the installation of improved navigational aids at airports, designed to permit speedier and more reliable instrument approaches, it seems more important than ever that everything be

done that will provide the maximum amount of safety in all aspects of air traffic control.

The committee has recommended that the airport control tower operators be retained in the employ of the Civil Aeronautics Administration and the individual cities reimburse the Civil Aeronautics Administration for salaries which supposedly would allow standardization. There is no law nor requirement to force the cities to take such action. Furthermore, if a number of key cities fail to accept this responsibility the entire system of traffic control is broken and safety is greatly jeopardized. This type of arrangement will necessarily require airport traffic controllers to serve two agencies; namely, the individual cities and the Federal Government which will not be conducive to efficient and safe operations.

For your information, we are attaching a condensation of the reasons that the air-line industry feels that the Civil Aeronautics Administration should operate airport traffic control towers. This material has been supplied to the Bureau of the Budget and the agencies interested in the matter, which have requested that the Air Transport Association provide this data for their guidance in considering this question.

Sincerely yours,

MILTON W. ARNOLD,
Vice President, Operations and Engineering.

REASONS FOR CAA OPERATION OF CONTROL TOWERS

1. Standardization of training of controllers has been reached through CAA training courses.

2. Procedures and phraseologies have been standardized.

3. Technical advances in equipment design more readily possible.

4. Purchase of equipment incorporating latest design features possible under Federal operation of control towers because of greater resources and purchasing power of the CAA at a saving to the taxpayer.

5. Approach control, a necessity to more reliable and safe clearance of aircraft into and out of airports under restricted conditions of ceiling and visibility, can only function when both airport tower personnel and airway traffic personnel are responsible to the same central authority.

6. Maintenance of tower-operating equipment such as radio transmitters and receivers, voice recorders, interphone circuits, etc., more economically and efficiently accomplished by technical specialists employed by the CAA.

7. Competent tower-operating personnel essential to the safety of air commerce more readily accessible to the CAA than through municipal sources because of CAA ability to reach by means of Federal civil service all corners of the country. Opportunities for advancement will be greater because under the CAA particularly competent personnel may be promoted to better positions at other towers.

8. Air traffic now using, and which will continue to use, the airways consist of Army and Navy aircraft, air-carrier planes, miscellaneous aircraft, privately owned aircraft, and planes of foreign registry. Owing to the widespread diversification of interest of operators of the various types of aircraft it is essential to orderly and safe operational procedures that airport-traffic control be exercised by an authoritative Federal agency.

9. The practice of permitting airport-tower personnel to make official visibility observations under conditions of variable visibility for transmission to pilots of aircraft approaching the airport for landings is only authorized for tower operators employed by the CAA. This service is of great importance in that the pilot receives instantly any visibility information that may affect the safety of his approach procedure.

10. A large proportion of airport traffic is interstate or international rather than local and the responsibility of controlling this traffic should not be placed upon the municipality.

CHICAGO, ILL., May 10, 1947.
Hon. CLAUDE I. BAKEWELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C..

Word has reached me that there is language in H. R. 3311, page 45, and elsewhere in this measure, that strike out \$4,849,000 which will have the effect of discontinuing all present Federal air traffic control tower operators. Under this plan replacements can come only from local municipalities improperly trained, ill-equipped political appointees. The Nation's air line pilots object most strenuously to this deletion of funds from H. R. 3311 on the grounds that it will have the effect of causing the harmful disintegration of the present Nation-wide uniform air traffic control operation procedure which is marked advance in air traffic control methods. The presently employed air traffic controllers, methods, and procedures are the results of years of trial and error, careful selection, and expert training. To destroy all this and throw it into the hands of local municipalities where these jobs will become political footballs and will be used for local patronage purposes dependent on who happens to have the upper hand politically at the time and changing with each changing political regime, will result in a disastrous backward step in the development of our air line network so important to our air commerce and to national defense. Air line traffic and air traffic control from one end to the other still has a long way to go to reach perfection but if the parts of it that have reached reasonably safe and practical development are destroyed by foolish economy then we are turning our backs upon what is right and proper and inviting an epidemic of air crashes and marching backwards to the dark ages of air line traffic control. I am sure that the Congress of the United States would not want to do this and upon knowing the facts will wisely restore the money that they have struck from H. R. 3311 for the payment of the presently employed highly experienced and efficient air traffic control tower operators in preference to the hodge podge of political appointees to control our air traffic. The air line pilots of our Nation will deeply appreciate a reconsideration of this action by the Congress of the United States, many of whose Members they fly as passengers to and from their districts. To not restore these funds would be calamitous to the best interests of our country's air lines and to the defense of our Nation.

DAVID L. BEHNCKE,
President, Air Line Pilots Association.

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

Mr. STEFAN. 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. CURTIS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 3311, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEFAUVER asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. SHORT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include two editorials.

Mr. HERTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. WEICHEL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix on two subjects and to include two resolutions.

Mr. BAKEWELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole this afternoon and to include therein a letter and a telegram.

Mr. KING (at the request of Mr. MILLER of California) asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a speech.

Mr. DURHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. BELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an address given by the Vice President of the Philippines at the Press Club on yesterday.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR THE BALANCE OF THE WEEK

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, we will meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow and take up first the conference report on the Greek-Turkish aid bill.

We will then continue the consideration of the State, Commerce, Justice bill, which I trust can be disposed of expeditiously.

The bill from the Committee on Banking and Currency will then be considered and if it is disposed of, and barring some unforeseen development, we expect to adjourn over from tomorrow afternoon until Monday.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to be excused for tomorrow on account of personal and important reasons.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] is recognized for 30 minutes.

SECURITY PROBLEMS IN THE ATOMIC AGE

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, with the recent passage of the Greek-Turkish loan, the United States is embarked on a far-reaching and radically different foreign policy.

Many of the people who are fairly well-informed about the atomic-energy development, look with great concern on the steadily deteriorating relations with Russia. Many of us who are neither pro-Russian nor pro-isolationist reserve the right to be pro-American in the best sense of the term without becoming anti-humanitarian.

It is because of my deep interest in conveying to the people of my district and the Nation some very pertinent thinking on the implications of the atomic-energy discovery—that I have asked for this time to read into the RECORD a startling, brilliant, and challenging address which was recently given by one of our brilliant young scientists, Mr. Cord Meyer, Jr.

Mr. Meyer, in the latter part of his address makes an analysis of the Baruch plan and makes certain conclusions with which I am not wholly in accord. However, his arguments are strong and worthy of serious consideration. I confess that I am not able to completely refute them with the knowledge I now have. With his suggestion that we approach control of the atom by strengthening the United Nations in the direction of world government on the security plane, I am in complete accord.

Mr. Meyer's address follows:

I hardly need to remind you here who are close to events in the National Capital of the crisis in foreign relations which our Government now faces. It is impossible to exaggerate the fatal significance of the decisions that America cannot avoid making in the immediate future. Whether our fate is to be peace or an atomic-biological war is the issue. I do not overstate the case when I say that the lives of more than one-third of humanity and the survival of what we have chosen to call civilization are at stake. Let me describe briefly the three basic alternatives before us.

The first alternative is to attempt to insure our national security by remaining the strongest military power in the world. Although there is no effective defense against an atomic attack once it is launched, we can try to prevent a would-be aggressor from ever beginning such an attack by the obvious size and efficiency of our preparations for a counteroffensive. By building up our capacity to retaliate even though our cities lie in ruins and half our people are killed, we can hope to instill such fear into other governments that they will never dare to risk war with us. This is the policy of peace through intimidation into which our Government is rapidly drifting.

If we adopt this alternative, other nations have no choice but to do likewise. When superior military power is the sole guaranty of national security, each government is forced to compete for that superiority. Every increase in our armed strength will provoke a corresponding increase in the power of others. A mounting competition for arms, allies, strategic bases, and raw materials is the inevitable result. Our only possible competitor in this struggle is the Soviet Union, which alone has the potential strength to challenge our lead. Quite

apart from ideological considerations, the United States and the Soviet Union are doomed to be the two central contestants, because in the search for national security each is the only real threat to the other.

Before we are finally and irrevocably committed to this meaningless struggle there is still time to consider the consequences. We cannot insure our ability to strike back after the holocaust of a modern assault merely by building more atomic bombs, biological weapons, bombers, and rockets than our possible opponent. That nation which is able to protect from atomic bombing vital sections of its industry and population by subterranean dispersal will enjoy a decisive advantage in any future war. If we seek protection in our ability to retaliate, we have no time whatever to lose in building secret and self-sufficient underground production centers. Our present concentration of men and machines in a few congested cities makes us the most vulnerable target in the world. There is also need for a large professional standing army equipped with the most effective modern weapons, widely dispersed, and kept in instant readiness to launch the counteroffensive. As far as possible our urban population must be protected by underground shelters. The concentration of the entire directing personnel of the Government in Washington can no longer be tolerated.

This is the minimum price of modern preparedness. It can only be paid by profound changes in our political and economic system. The necessary dispersion of industry can only be accomplished by autocratic planning and Government edict. Labor will have to be conscripted to work in the underground factories. As the stock piles of weapons grow our living standards will decline. Antisabotage and antiespionage precautions will restrict and finally eliminate our civil liberties. In foreign policy, the search for allies will lead us into backing any regime, no matter how corrupt and tyrannical, so long as it opposes Russia. In attempting to defend the independence of our country by military power in this new age, we will have to give up all that has made it worth defending in the past. When the last measure of preparedness has been completed and the state has become one vast military machine poised for instantaneous retaliation, we will be a driven and degraded people and life for the individual will be a drawn-out agony of oppression and suspense.

Will these sacrifices accomplish their purpose? Can war be prevented by fear of our armed power? I do not believe so. As the nations accumulate the weapons with which they can annihilate each other's cities suspicions will grow monstrous. Already as the struggle for power increases between the United States and Russia each Government protests that its own preparations are purely defensive, but each suspects that the other plots aggression. Now that the only defense is a counter offensive, there is no longer any way of distinguishing between defensive and aggressive preparations, until the last moment when the attack is launched. Sooner or later fear will provoke war, and one nation or the other will strike first in order to deny the advantage of the initiative to its opponent. Peace cannot be built on mutual terror. In the war that will inevitably result from competing programs of preparedness industrial society will be totally destroyed.

The second alternative is the preventive war. The difficulties and dangers of a prolonged competition for military supremacy with Russia have led some to the conclusion that we should attack now while we have the atomic bomb and they don't. Life magazine has recently condensed for mass consumption James Burnham's vision of an American empire established and maintained by nuclear fission. There are demands in

the Congress for an immediate show-down with Russia. Because the body of opinion that believes in the preventive war is growing with remarkable speed the argument is worth refuting. Morally, preventive war is a nice name for aggression. The unsubstantial suspicion that our victim planned to attack at some future date could not mitigate our guilt. Preventive war is the act for which we hung the Nazi leaders at Nuremberg. Practically, the preventive war is not as easy as it has been made to appear by its supporters. It would not end with the atomization of Moscow and Leningrad. The Red Army would march into western Europe, the Middle East, and China. They would have many allies, as our attack would alienate even our own friends. The resulting land campaign would be long and incredibly costly. England and Europe would be ruined beyond repair. If the Russians do not yet have atomic bombs it is quite probable that they are already armed with the means of biological warfare. Should we attack them they would be justified in striking back with incurable epidemics that might eliminate whole sections of our population. Eventually we might be able to win a shadow victory. We would then be forced to establish an iron tyranny over the entire earth in order to prevent the defeated from constructing modern weapons for revenge. Nor can the spread of communism be stopped by killing large numbers of those who believe in it. Past attempts to crush militant faiths by the sword have been singularly unsuccessful.

Who would fight this preventive war for those who seek to provoke it? I believe that there are many who fought bravely and well in the last war to defend their country who would prefer jail to the role of aggressors. Preventive war is a nightmare that we must reject.

There is a third alternative: It is the policy of attempting to find with the Soviet Union and the other nations a cooperative solution of the security problem. Good-will gestures of unilateral disarmament are futile and dangerous. But we must offer to join with others in transforming an impotent United Nations into a reliable system of international security while preserving our national armed strength until general agreement to the new system is obtained. Once it is recognized that no amount of sacrifice for armaments can delay war for long or protect the country when war comes, it is clear that we have a right and a duty to demand that the first objective of the United States Government be the establishment of an effective international organization for our protection.

What has the United States Government done to date in order to strengthen the United Nations and to halt the suicidal arms race that has already begun? It has proposed the Baruch plan, and many think that in doing so we have fulfilled our obligation as the first country to develop and use atomic weapons. The feeling is general that we have done all within our power to assure peace. Now, it is argued, the other nations, and particularly Russia, must accept the Baruch plan or, by refusing it, convict themselves of intent to commit aggression. Whether this view is accurate can only be shown by a critical analysis of the Baruch plan itself.

As you know, the plan calls for an abolition of atomic weapons. Inspection and an international monopoly on the potentially dangerous peacetime uses of atomic energy are to insure that bombs cannot be secretly constructed by any government. Only by expropriating the plants of the international authority would a nation be able to manufacture bombs, and this seizure would be immediately evident to the world. All other nations acting through the Security Council are then to join forces against the violator, which would not retain its veto to prevent

collective action. In other words, if and when the Baruch plan is put into effect, the danger of sudden and surprise attack with atom bombs will be eliminated, since no nation will have them. Any attempt to make bombs is to be discovered by an international intelligence service, and all governments can then seize the atomic plants in their respective territories and join in the race to make the first bombs for the resulting atomic war. All weapons except atomic explosives are to remain uncontrolled and each nation is to retain its army, navy, and air force. How practical is this plan and what chance is there of its general acceptance?

It has been claimed that by eliminating the veto the Baruch plan would insure effective enforcement action against a government violating the atomic agreement. I cannot agree. Here in new guise is the old fallacy that separate armed nations can find security by formally undertaking to use their respective armies jointly against any one of their number that commits aggression. It is an attempt to revive the impractical principles of the League of Nations and to graft them on to a veto-ridden United Nations. A mere change of voting rules in the Security Council can have no effect on the actions of the United States and Russia. If either chose to defy the international inspectors and seize the plants of the Authority, the result would be World War III, with the two giants and their satellites ranged against each other. No majority vote in the Security Council could disguise that reality or provide protection. It is even unlikely that such a vote could ever be taken. The seizure of atomic plants would be such a clear indication of aggressive designs that it would only be attempted in coordination with a general assault launched with rockets, blockbusters, bacteria, and mechanized armies. The victims of the attack would be more interested in defending themselves than in voting. Changes in the structure of the United Nations more fundamental than a juggling of voting rules in the Security Council are necessary, if the swift, certain, and sure system of punishment which Mr. Baruch called for is to be achieved.

Under the Baruch plan, veto or no veto, war would result from interference with the inspection system. The plan recognizes this fact by calling for a strategic balance of atomic plants among the nations. The number of plants and the amount of nuclear fuel within the borders of each nation will be an essential factor in its national security. If one nation seizes its plants to produce bombs, the others will be forced to seize theirs, and the side that has the largest atomic industry will have a considerable advantage in the resulting war. Agreement to a scheme determining the allocation of atomic industry is a prerequisite to the acceptance of the plan and such agreements extremely unlikely.

For instance, if the Soviet Government believed that the United States and the British Commonwealth would be allied against it in the event of another war, it could hardly agree to an equal division of atomic facilities among the three. Nor can I imagine either the United States or Britain consenting to a balance which would give the Russians as large an atomic industry as they owned together. Similarly, the number of atomic plants the United States might allow France for peaceful use would depend entirely upon the direction of French foreign policy. A victory at the polls for the French Communists would swing France into the Russian orbit. The United States would then be compelled to demand a revision of the balance or accept military inferiority when and if aggression occurred.

Agreement to a distribution scheme is further complicated by the impossibility of

equalizing the factors that condition the speed with which the various nations can convert to bomb production. The high level of industrialization, the technological skill, and the special experience of the United States with atomic energy combine to place this country for a long time at a distinct advantage in any sudden attempt to construct bombs. The Soviet Union might well hesitate to agree to a plan which upon the first violation would commit it to an atomic armament race which it would have little hope of winning against the technological superiority of the United States. Russia may prefer to continue unrestricted and secret competition for atomic weapons in the belief that an inferior supply of bombs is more protection than no bombs at all, if a potential enemy can construct them with greater speed than its own industrial efficiency permits. Even if accepted, the Baruch plan would only replace competition for bombs by an intense rivalry between the nations for the personnel and methods with which to produce bombs in the shortest possible time. Peace based on a balance of power has proved to be a brief truce between wars. Peace based on a nice balance of atomic power is not likely to be any more stable or enduring, whether that power exists as bombs ready for use or as plants capable of conversion within 3 months to bomb manufacture.

Another serious obstacle to the acceptance of the plan is the fact that under its provisions the nations are to remain free to compete for every weapon except bombs. With proper concern for American security, the Senate would be justified in refusing to destroy our atomic weapons except in conjunction with the demobilization of the Red Army and in return for material proof that Russia was not preparing for other types of specialized warfare. The Senate leaders have repeatedly demanded a fool-proof system of security in return for any surrender of atomic secrets. The Baruch plan is far from fool-proof. Each nation would retain as many millions of soldiers, as many mechanized divisions and biological weapons as it wished. Against a large nation armed with these forces, an attempt to punish a violation of the atomic agreement would result in a long and indecisive conflict. By agreeing to the Baruch plan, the United States would be giving up its one decisive weapon in return for the privilege of competing for other weapons where it has no advantage.

I hope this analysis of the plan will indicate why many of us in UWF believe that a more comprehensive and effective scheme is necessary, if there is to be any chance of acceptance by either the Russians or the United States Senate. The fatal defect of Mr. Baruch's proposal is the false assumption that atomic bombs can be prohibited while aggression in all its other forms remains possible. Security is indivisible and cannot be realized by attempting to ban one particular type of weapon. The first and only step toward the prevention of atomic warfare is the creation of an international organization powerful enough to prevent all war between nations. By specific amendments, the United Nations must be strengthened to the point where national preparation for war is not only unnecessary but impossible. The indispensable changes are briefly these:

First, the United Nations must be given the power to administer world laws binding the individual citizens of each country as their first duty. This constitutional authority must be strictly limited to those matters found essential to the preservation of peace. For example, the United Nations must be able to prohibit by binding enactment the manufacture or ownership by any national government of the means of organized warfare. It must be able to prohibit the use of force in the settlement of international disputes, and

it must be able to control and regulate the dangerous aspects of atomic development.

Secondly, the United Nations must have the power to arrest and try in world courts those who violate the basic security law. We need a procedure through which a Nuremberg trial can be held according to an established law before rather than after war has begun.

Thirdly, the United Nations must have the power to conduct an international system of inspection with free access into every country. It would be the task of the inspectors to discover any illegal attempt to produce the prohibited armament.

Fourthly, the United Nations must have not only the right to prohibit international war but the police power to enforce its authority. A world police force must be recruited from the individuals of each nation. It must be responsible only to the United Nations, armed with a monopoly on modern weapons, and strategically distributed. Until national governments are willing to give a world organization preponderant military power to keep the peace, they will be condemned to compete for arms among themselves.

These significant additions to the authority of the United Nations will necessitate certain changes in its internal structure. Particularly, the Security Council will cease to be legislator, prosecutor, judge, and jury. It will become an executive cabinet operating to administer the laws every nation has accepted as essential to the common security.

This would be world government, if you want to use the word. But it would be government only in a very limited area. Each nation would remain free to conduct its domestic affairs and foreign trade without restriction. The nations in agreeing to these amendments would be giving up only the right and means of annihilating each other.

There is but one way in which these changes can be made realities. As the Nation which first developed, employed and continues to manufacture atomic weapons, the United States has the responsibility for taking the initiative in proposing the formation of a strong United Nations. Our unilateral action in Greece and Turkey has been explained on the ground that the United Nations is not yet capable of assuming such a burden. But the United Nations cannot strengthen itself. It is a league of sovereign states and will remain impotent unless its members agree to give it the strength it needs. Through every available instrument of public information, the American people must be reached with the knowledge that they must choose between a suicidal war or a strong United Nations. An insistent and informed public demand must be brought to bear on the Government here in Washington.

But what of Russia? There are many who claim that the Soviet regime would reject any radical amendment of the United Nations and that the offer is not worth making. I am not so pessimistic. They have as much to lose as we do in a mutually devastating war. Faced with a choice between a desperate arms race ending in war and an effective system of security protecting them and us alike, the Kremlin leaders may well choose security. At least, until the Russians are given a fair opportunity to make the choice, we cannot tell whether the purpose of their present policy is aggression or defense. An American offer to erect an enforceable world law would be the only real test of Russian intentions. If they turned that down, we would be justified in assuming the worst. But let me repeat that I believe there is a good chance that they would accept.

I recognize that the changes necessary in traditional institutions are great and the time short. A shooting war may not be imminent but we are rapidly approaching a critical point when in preparation for conflict policies will have been adopted that

make war inescapable. Soon preparedness and propaganda will have swept both governments past all chance of turning back. While there is still time and room for hope, let us present to the people of this country the real choice, the destruction of civilized society or some measure of world government. When they understand that choice, I have confidence in their decision. Men are sufficiently rational to acquiesce in their own survival.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the House, pursuant to its previous order, adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 15, 1947, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

678. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a report of proposed transfer to the State of Texas of U. S. S. *Texas* for maintenance by the State for historical purposes as a part of the San Jacinto battleground; to the Committee on Armed Services.

679. A letter from the Under Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill providing for participation by the United States in the Inter-American Commission of Women, and authorizing an appropriation therefor; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

680. A letter from the Architect of the Capitol, transmitting a report with regard to the remodeling of the Senate and House caucus rooms and restaurants; to the Committee on Public Works.

681. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on audit of Export-Import Bank of Washington for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 248); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed.

682. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on audit of Export-Import Bank of Washington for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1946 (H. Doc. No. 249); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed.

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. DONDERO: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 310. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to permit the delivery of water from the District of Columbia and Arlington County water systems to the Falls Church or other water systems in the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia in Virginia; without amendment (Rept. No. 378). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DONDERO: Committee on Public Works. House Joint Resolution 193. Joint resolution to grant authority for the erection of a permanent building for the American National Red Cross, District of Columbia Chapter, Washington, D. C.; with amendments (Rept. No. 379). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LECOMpte: Committee on House Administration. House Joint Resolution 144. Joint resolution providing for the comprehen-

sive observance of the bicentennial of John Paul Jones; without amendment (Rept. No. 380). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. LECOMpte: Committee on House Administration. House Joint Resolution 188. Joint resolution authorizing the erection on public grounds in the city of Washington, D. C., of a memorial to the dead of the First Infantry Division, United States Forces, World War II; without amendment (Rept. No. 381). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. LECOMpte: Committee on House Administration. House Joint Resolution 190. Joint resolution authorizing the printing and binding of a revised edition of Cannon's Procedure in the House of Representatives and providing that the same shall be subject to copyright by the author; without amendment (Rept. No. 382). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. CORBETT: Committee on House Administration. House Joint Resolution 170. Joint resolution authorizing the erection in the District of Columbia of a memorial to Andrew W. Mellon; without amendment (Rept. No. 383). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HOPE: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 195. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell certain lands in Alaska to the city of Sitka, Alaska; without amendment (Rept. No. 384). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOPE: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 1826. A bill making it a petty offense to enter any national-forest land while it is closed to the public; without amendment (Rept. No. 385). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 1341. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to construct a postgraduate school at Monterey, Calif.; with amendments (Rept. No. 386). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 3215. A bill to revise the Medical Department of the Army and the Medical Department of the Navy, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 387). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BENNETT of Michigan:

H. R. 3457. A bill to extend the benefits of title II of the Social Security Act to employees of States, political subdivisions thereof, and instrumentalities of States or political subdivisions, and to self-employed individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3458. A bill to reduce the retirement age and to increase benefits under the old-age and survivors insurance system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 3459. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide disability insurance benefits and to reduce the age requirement for old-age and survivors insurance benefits from 65 to 60 in the case of men and from 65 to 55 in the case of women; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3460. A bill to extend the benefits of title II of the Social Security Act to employees of certain nonprofit organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOFFMAN (by request):

H. R. 3461. A bill to establish a procedure for facilitating the payment of certain Government checks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 3462. A bill to incorporate the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAND:

H. R. 3463. A bill to authorize the construction of a chapel at the Coast Guard Academy, and to authorize the acceptance of private contributions to assist in defraying the cost of construction thereof; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 3464. A bill to provide for the mobilization of the scientific resources and knowledge of the United States for the purpose of seeking the causes and cure of cancer, heart disease, infantile paralysis, and other diseases of mankind; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HILL:

H. R. 3465. A bill to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina:

H. R. 3466. A bill to clarify and amend section 2 of the act of Congress of February 11, 1929, with respect to the granting of relief by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia in cases in which certain special assessments have been paid and later held to be void or erroneous; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 3467. A bill for the relief of the city of Needles, Calif.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 3468. A bill to amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 so as to grant certain personnel equitable treatment in the matter of leave; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 3469. A bill to promote the national security by providing for the coordination of all elements of national security, and for the reorganization of the military structure of the Nation to conform to the requirements of modern warfare; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL:

H. R. 3470. A bill to provide for pilgrimages of gold-star mothers, sisters, and wives to the graves of their sons, brothers, and husbands who died in the service of the armed forces of the United States during World War II and who are buried in foreign lands; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SHAFER:

H. R. 3471. A bill to authorize leases of real or personal property by the War and Navy Departments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. R. 3472. A bill to provide disability benefits for persons who performed uncompensated services in the administration of the Selective Training and Service System and the emergency price control and rationing program; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEONARD W. HALL:

H. R. 3473. A bill to provide for nonrecognition of gain or loss in the case of anticipatory replacement of property condemned for public use; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.:

H. R. 3474. A bill to amend the Bankruptcy Act to permit compensation or reimbursement in certain cases to persons acting in a representative or fiduciary capacity; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. Res. 211. A resolution authorizing and directing the Committee on Public Works to conduct surveys of certain works of improvement; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GEARHART:

H. R. 3475. A bill for the relief of Milo Jurisevic, Mrs. Jelena Jurisevic, Svetozar Jurisevic, and Radmila Jurisevic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GWINN of New York:

H. R. 3476. A bill for the relief of James J. O'Loughlin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H. R. 3477. A bill for the relief of Mattia Racine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 3478. A bill for the relief of the California-Pacific Utilities Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, FTC.

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

511. By Mr. KING: Petition signed by 64 residents of Inglewood, Calif., urging the passage of S. 265, which would prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

512. By Mr. KUNKEL: Petition relative to the Capper bill, S. 265, which penalizes interstate transmission, by mail or otherwise, of newspapers, periodicals, news reels, photographic films, or records advertising alcoholic beverages or soliciting orders therefor, advertising by radio being also prohibited, as well as the sending of circulars, letters, and so forth, into States which bar liquor advertisements; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

513. By Mr. LECOMPTTE: Petition of Mrs. Daisy McConnell and other members of the Methodist Church of Chariton, Iowa, in the interest of S. 265, S. 623, H. R. 142, and H. R. 2408; to the Committee on Armed Services.

514. By Mr. MICHENER: Petition forwarded by Mrs. A. J. Abing, route 3, Blissfield, Mich., and signed by 14 other residents of the community, urging favorable action on the Capper bill, S. 265, to prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of advertisements of alcoholic beverages; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

515. By Mr. MILLER of Maryland: Petition of residents of Snow Hill, Md., urging passage of S. 265, a bill to prohibit transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising and broadcasting alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

516. By Mrs. NORTON: Petition of Lt. Robert P. Grover Post, No. 377, Jewish War Veterans of the United States, Jersey City, N. J., opposing the enactment of H. R. 318, a bill to require certain persons within the United States to carry identification cards and be fingerprinted, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MAY 15, 1947

(*Legislative day of Monday, April 21, 1947*)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., Chaplain of the House of Representatives, offered the following prayer:

Thou who art our merciful Heavenly Father upon earth, hear us as we tarry at the altar of prayer. We art Thine,

and Thou wilt surely hear us when we call and answer us when we pray.

"Made in His image" is the blessed word in the front door of the immortal Book. O direct us that we may never violate our sacred inheritance. Give us to understand that rich character is the offspring of unbiased meditation inspired by honest purpose. Grant that all decisions of this august body may be couched in wisdom; O keep us this day without sin and abide with all in the measure of a great peace.

In our dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHITE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, May 14, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on today, May 15, 1947, the President had approved and signed the following act and joint resolution:

S. 874. An act to authorize the President to appoint Lt. Comdr. Paul A. Smith as Alternate Representative of the United States to the Interim Council of the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization or its successor, and as representative of the United States to the Air Navigation Committee of the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization, without affecting his status and perquisites as an officer of the Coast and Geodetic Survey; and

S. J. Res. 86. Joint resolution to authorize Herschel V. Johnson, Deputy Representative of the United States to the Security Council of the United Nations, to be reappointed to the Foreign Service.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 938) to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following joint resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. J. Res. 170. Joint resolution authorizing the erection in the District of Columbia of a memorial to Andrew W. Mellon;

H. J. Res. 188. Joint resolution authorizing the erection on public grounds in the city of Washington, D. C., of a memorial to the dead of the First Infantry Division, United States Forces, World War II; and

H. J. Res. 190. Joint resolution authorizing the printing and binding of a revised edition of Cannon's Procedure in the House of Representatives and providing that the same shall be subject to copyright by the author.

REPORT ON OPERATIONS OF UNRRA (H. DOC. NO. 254)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.