

the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOBBS:

H. R. 3690. A bill to amend the Federal Tort Claims Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOMENGEAUX:

H. R. 3691. A bill providing for the continuance of compensation or pension payments and a subsistence allowance for certain children of deceased veterans of World War I or II during education or training; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LEA:

H. R. 3692. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, with respect to ownership or stock interest in freight forwarders; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma:

H. J. Res. 211. Joint resolution consenting to an interstate oil compact to conserve oil and gas; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to pass, at the earliest possible moment, S. 126 or H. R. 1180, or any similar bill relating to the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the Wisconsin centennial celebration; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to an appropriation for insect control in national forests; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to appropriate the funds authorized by the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (Public Law 733, 79th Cong.), for agricultural marketing and research, at the earliest possible date; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the creation of an additional national cemetery in the Los Angeles area and the enlargement of existing national cemeteries in California; to the Committee on Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to take appropriate measures to assist in the restoration and preservation of the city of St. Augustine, Fla., and other historic missions, forts, and landmarks of the State of Florida; to the Committee on Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to pass legislation enabling the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize the city and county of Honolulu to issue sewer bonds; to the Committee on Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Delaware, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the terms of office of the President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact Senate bill 637, amending the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas, memorializing the President

and the Congress of the United States to enact H. R. 881 and H. R. 1199, granting tax exemptions to those held prisoners by the Japanese; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. R. 3693. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Sarah Alfandary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUFFETT:

H. R. 3694. A bill for the relief of Eric Sedon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

H. R. 3695. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Bessie Jordan White; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

H. R. 3696. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Daniel Broken Leg; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. DOUGHTON:

H. R. 3697. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Zelma Inez Cheek; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H. R. 3698. A bill for the relief of the estate of Julius Zaffareni; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LODGE:

H. R. 3699. A bill for the relief of William S. Meany; 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:

591. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Petition of Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators, and Paperhangers of America, Union No. 108, of Racine, Wis., expressing opposition to the Hartley and Taft labor bills; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

592. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Massachusetts Catholic Order of Foresters, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to opposition to communism; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

593. Also, petition of the members of the Clearwater Valley Light and Power Association, Inc., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to appropriation of funds to Rural Electrification Administration; to the Committee on Appropriations.

594. Also, petition of the board of managers of the Pennsylvania Society of Sons of the Revolution, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to opposition to communism; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

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

SENATE

TUESDAY, JUNE 3, 1947

(Legislative day of Monday, April 21, 1947)

The Senate met, in executive session, at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

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

We pray, O God, that Thou wilt fill this sacred minute with meaning, and make it an oasis for the refreshment of

our souls, a window cleaning for our vision, and a recharging of the batteries of our spirits. Let us have less talking and more thinking, less work and more worship, less pressure and more prayer. For if we are too busy to pray, we are far busier than we have any right to be.

Speak to us, O Lord, and make us listen to Thy broadcasting station that never goes off the air.

Through Thy Holy Spirit, who is waiting to lead us into all truth. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHITE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the legislative proceedings of Monday, June 2, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bill and joint resolution of the Senate, each with an amendment in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 640. An act to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell certain property occupied by the Weather Bureau at East Lansing, Mich., and to obtain other quarters for the said Bureau in the State of Michigan; and

S. J. Res. 115. Joint resolution authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to continue and establish offices in the territory of the Republic of the Philippines.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 174. An act to amend section 26, title I, chapter 1, of the act entitled "An act making further provision for a civil government for Alaska, and for other purposes," approved June 6, 1900 (31 Stat. 321), as amended by the act of May 31, 1938 (52 Stat. 588);

H. R. 195. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell certain lands in Alaska to the city of Sitka, Alaska;

H. R. 310. An act 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;

H. R. 325. An act to transfer Blair County, Pa., from the middle judicial district of Pennsylvania to the western judicial district of Pennsylvania;

H. R. 468. An act to amend section 115 of the Internal Revenue Code in respect to distributions by personal holding companies;

H. R. 577. An act to preserve historic graveyards in abandoned military posts;

H. R. 673. An act to repeal certain provisions authorizing the establishing of priorities in transportation by merchant vessels;

H. R. 981. An act to amend section 2 of the act of January 29, 1942 (56 Stat. 21), relating to the refund of taxes illegally paid by Indian citizens;

H. R. 1054. An act to make permanent the judgeship provided for by the act entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the eastern and western districts of Missouri," approved December 24, 1942;

H. R. 1379. An act to establish the United States Naval Postgraduate School, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1556. An act to provide basic authority for the performance of certain functions and activities of the Bureau of Reclamation;

H. R. 1628. An act relinquishing to the State of Illinois certain right, title, or interest of the United States of America, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1714. An act to exclude certain interns, student nurses, and other student-employees of hospitals of the Federal Government from the Classification Act and other laws relating to compensation and benefits of Federal employees, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1882. An act for expenditure of funds for cooperating with the public-school board at Walker, Minn., for the extension of public-school facilities to be available to all Indian children in the district;

H. R. 2005. An act to amend the act of April 21, 1932 (47 Stat. 88), entitled "An act to provide for the leasing of the segregated coal and asphalt deposits of the Choctaw and Chickasaw Indian Nations, in Oklahoma, and for an extension of time within which purchasers of such deposits may complete payments";

H. R. 2097. An act to declare the ownership of the timber on the allotments on the Northern Cheyenne Indian Reservation, and to authorize the sale thereof;

H. R. 2207. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands within the Shiloh National Military Park, Tenn., and for other purposes;

H. R. 2229. An act to amend the act of June 25, 1938, relating to the appointment of postmasters under civil service;

H. R. 2276. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to pay certain expenses incident to training, attendance, and participation of personnel of the Army of the United States in the Seventh Winter Sports Olympic Games and the Fourteenth Olympic Games and for future Olympic games;

H. R. 2411. An act to authorize patenting of certain lands to Public Hospital District No. 2, Clallam County, Wash., for hospital purposes;

H. R. 2545. An act to provide funds for cooperation with the school board of the Moclips-Aloha district for the construction and equipment of a new school building in the town of Moclips, Grays Harbor County, Wash., to be available to both Indian and non-Indian children;

H. R. 2655. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to grant to the Mayor and City Council of Baltimore, State of Maryland, a permanent easement for the purpose of installing, maintaining, and servicing two subterranean water mains in, on, and across the land of Fort McHenry National Monument and Historic Shrine, Md.;

H. R. 2693. An act for the relief of Public Utility District No. 1, of Cowlitz County, Wash.;

H. R. 2798. An act to amend section 5, Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2799. An act to amend the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, title IV of the National Housing Act, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2800. An act to amend section 5 of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2852. An act to provide for the addition of certain surplus Government lands to the Otter Creek recreational demonstration area, in the State of Kentucky;

H. R. 2857. An act to extend second-class mailing privileges to bulletins issued by State conservation and fish and game agencies or departments;

H. R. 2872. An act to amend further section 4 of the Public Debt Act of 1941, as amended, and clarify its application, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3001. An act to provide further safeguards with respect to the issuance of passports by or under the authority of the Secretary of State, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3124. An act to authorize the attendance of the Marine Band at the Eighty-first National Encampment of the Grand

Army of the Republic to be held in Cleveland, Ohio, August 10 to 14, 1947;

H. R. 3143. An act to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Paoia Federal reclamation project, Colorado;

H. R. 3151. An act to grant a certain water right and a certain parcel of land in Clark County, Nev., to the city of Las Vegas, Nev.;

H. R. 3197. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to contract with the Mancos Water Conservancy District increasing the reimbursable construction cost obligation of the district to the United States for construction of the Mancos project and extending the repayment period;

H. R. 3215. An act to revise the Medical Department of the Army and the Medical Department of the Navy, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3448. An act to amend the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3587. An act to establish a National Aviation Council for the purpose of unifying and clarifying national policies relating to aviation, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3629. An act to authorize the transfer to the Panama Canal of property which is surplus to the needs of the War Department or Navy Department; and

H. J. Res. 167. Joint resolution to recognize uncompensated services rendered the Nation under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, and for other purposes.

TRANSACTION OF LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, as in legislative session, 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:

MEMBERSHIP OF UNITED STATES IN CARIBBEAN COMMISSION

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation providing for membership and participation by the United States in the Caribbean Commission and authorizing an appropriation therefor (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

TRANSFER BY NAVY DEPARTMENT OF A MOTOR LAUNCH TO THE JUNIOR NAVAL MILITIA, INC.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, reporting, pursuant to law, that the Junior Naval Militia, Inc., had requested the Navy Department to transfer a motor launch for use by that organization in training boys and young men; to the Committee on Armed Services.

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

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

REIMBURSEMENT OF EMPLOYEES OF DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE FOR ENTERTAINING FOREIGN REPRESENTATIVES

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to reimburse employees of the Department for the expense of entertainment of representatives of other countries, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

ELECTION FRAUDS IN KANSAS CITY, MO.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, a few minutes ago the following telegram from David B. Childs, of Kansas City, Mo., who is chairman of the Jackson County Re-

publican Committee, was delivered to me:

Kansas City is again chagrined by the exposed election frauds. Although your office is not one of law enforcement in aroused citizenry, irrespective of politics, demands that you do everything within your power to see that the guilty are properly punished. As Governor Hadley once said, "Crooks are neither Republicans nor Democrats."

DAVID B. CHILDS
Chairman, Jackson County
Republican Committee.

The President of the United States has recently addressed a joint session of the Congress on the importance of maintaining free institutions in various remote parts of the world. He asked for a way of life distinguished by free elections as against a way of life that relies on terror and oppression. The Congress may well ask today: What is the President of the United States now doing toward enforcing the conspiracy laws of the United States in order to guarantee free elections in the very heart of America?

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the General Assembly of the State of California; ordered to lie on the table:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 46

"Joint resolution relative to memorializing Congress to enact Senate bill 637, amending the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930

"Whereas there is now pending before the Senate of the United States, Senate bill 637, providing for certain amendments to the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, relative to retirement annuities; and

"Whereas said bill was reported from committee to the Senate on April 25, 1947, with the recommendation that it be passed: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California (jointly). That the Congress of the United States is memorialized and urged to cause the said bill to be enacted into law at the earliest possible date in order that postal employees may be provided enough income with which to live upon retirement; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"Senate Joint Resolution 34

"Joint resolution requesting the Congress of the United States of America to enact legislation appropriating sufficient funds to reimburse the several counties of the Territory of Hawaii for the cost of restoring the pavement of streets, roads, and highways (subjected to war damage) to their prewar condition

"Whereas the streets, roads, and highways of the several counties of the Territory of Hawaii were, throughout the war, subjected to severe and heavy traffic by the vehicles of the armed forces and their contractors; and "Whereas, such severe and heavy traffic resulted in substantial damage to the pavements of the streets, roads and highways of the several counties; and

"Whereas restoration of all streets, roads, and highways of the several counties to their

prewar condition would impose too great a financial burden on the several counties; and

"Whereas under Public Law 694, Seventy-ninth Congress, there is provided funds in the amount of \$4,000,000 to cover an estimate of the minimum damage to Territorial and county highways; and

"Whereas this sum appears insufficient to take care of the cost of repair of all war damage to highways: Now, therefore

"Be it enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii:

"SECTION 1. That the Congress of the United States of America be and it is hereby requested, through the delegate to Congress from the Territory of Hawaii, to enact legislation which will appropriate sufficient funds to the several counties of the Territory of Hawaii to reimburse them for the cost of restoring the pavements of their streets, roads, and highways to prewar condition.

"SEC. 2. That the Honorable JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON, Delegate to Congress from Hawaii, be and he is hereby requested to afford every assistance and aid possible in seeking passage of such legislation.

"SEC. 3. This resolution shall take effect upon its approval.

"Approved this 22d day of May A. D. 1947.

"INGRAM M. STAINBACK,

"Governor of the Territory of Hawaii."

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Public Lands:

"Senate Joint Resolution 22

"Joint resolution requesting Congress of the United States of America to pass legislation enabling the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize the city and county of Honolulu to issue sewer bonds

"Whereas the city and county of Honolulu is prepared to initiate a program of public improvement, interrupted and delayed by the war; and

"Whereas it is the desire of the Territory of Hawaii to aid, assist and cooperate with the city and county in its program of public improvement; and

"Whereas the city and county has expended a sizable sum for the planning of a complete sewerage system including a sewage treatment and disposal plant as part of its program of public improvement; and

"Whereas the limitation on bonded indebtedness as set in the Hawaiian Organic Act and the Revised Laws of Hawaii 1945 limits the city and county in the issuance of bonds to finance such public improvement; and

"Whereas it is to the loss of the city and county to cause a further delay in the commencement of such a program by the city and county: Now, therefore

"Be it enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii:

"SECTION 1. That the Congress of the United States of America be, and it hereby is, requested, through the Delegate to Congress from the Territory of Hawaii to enact legislation which will enable the Territory of Hawaii, any provision of the Hawaiian Organic Act or of any act of this Congress to the contrary notwithstanding, to authorize the board of supervisors of the city and county of Honolulu to issue general obligation bonds in the sum of \$5,000,000 for construction, maintenance and repair of a sewerage system in the city of Honolulu and to that end the Congress of the United States of America is hereby requested and urged, through said Delegate to Congress, to adopt a bill in substantially the following form, to wit:

"An act to enable the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize the city and county of Honolulu, a municipal corporation, to issue sewer bonds

"Be it enacted, etc., That the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, any provision of the Hawaiian Organic Act or of any act

of this Congress to the contrary notwithstanding, may authorize the city and county of Honolulu, a municipal corporation of the Territory of Hawaii, to issue general obligation bonds in the sum of \$5,000,000 for the purpose of enabling it to construct, maintain and repair a sewerage system in the city of Honolulu.

"SEC. 2. The bonds issued under authority of this act may be either term or serial bonds, maturing, in the case of term bonds, not later than 30 years from the date of issue thereof, and, in the case of serial bonds, payable in substantially equal annual installments, the first installment to mature not later than 5 years and the last installment to mature not later than 30 years from the date of such issue. Such bonds may be issued without the approval of the President of the United States.

"SEC. 3. Act — of the Session Laws of Hawaii 1947, pertaining to the issuance of sewerage system bonds, as authorized by this act, is hereby ratified and confirmed subject to the provisions of this act: *Provided, however,* That nothing herein contained shall be deemed to prohibit the amendment of such Territorial legislation by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii from time to time to provide for changes in the improvements authorized by such legislation and for the disposition of unexpended moneys realized from the sale of said bonds.

"Approved:

"SEC. 2. This resolution shall take effect upon its approval.

"Approved this 20th day of May A. D. 1947.

"INGRAM M. STAINBACK,

"Governor of the Territory of Hawaii."

"House Joint Resolution 38

"Joint resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to amend sections 207, 209, 213, 215, 216, 220, 222, and 225 of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, as amended

"Be it enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii:

"SECTION 1. The Congress of the United States is hereby requested to amend sections 207, 209, 213, 215, 216, 220, 222, and 225 of title 2 of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, as amended, substantially as set forth in the following form of bill:

"A bill to amend sections 207, 209, 213, 215, 216, 220, 222, and 225, of title 2 of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, as amended

"Be it enacted, etc.—

"SECTION 1. That section 207 (a) of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, as amended, is hereby further amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 207. Leases to Hawaiians, licenses. (a) The Commission is authorized to lease to native Hawaiians the right to the use and occupancy of a tract or tracts of Hawaiian home lands within the following acreage limits per each lessee: (1) Not less than 1 or more than 40 acres of agricultural lands; or (2) not less than 100 nor more than 700 acres of first-class pastoral lands; or (3) not less than 250 nor more than 1,000 acres of second-class pastoral lands; or (4) not more than 1 acre of any class of land to be used as a residence lot: *Provided, however,* That, in the case of any existing lease of a farm lot in the Kalaniana'ole settlement on Molokai, a residence lot may exceed 1 acre but shall not exceed 4 acres in area, the location of such area to be selected by the lessee concerned: *Provided, further,* That a lease granted to any lessee may include two detached farm lots located on the same island and within a reasonable distance of each other, one of which, to be designated by the Commission, shall be occupied by the lessee as his home, the gross acreage of both lots not to exceed the maximum acreage of an agricultural or pastoral

lot, as the case may be, as provided in this section."

"SEC. 2. Section 207 (c) of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, as amended, is hereby further amended to read as follows:

"(c) (1) The Commission is authorized to grant licenses for terms of not to exceed 21 years in each case, to public-utility companies or corporations as easements for railroads, telephone lines, electric power and light lines, gas mains, and the like. The Commission is also authorized to grant licenses for lots within a district in which lands are leased under the provisions of this section, to—

"(A) Churches, hospitals, and public schools;

"(B) Theaters, garages, service stations, markets, stores, and other mercantile establishments (all of which shall be owned by lessees of the Commission or by organizations formed and controlled by said lessees).

"(2) The Commission is also authorized, with the approval of the Governor, to grant licenses to the United States for terms not to exceed 5 years, for reservations, roads, and other rights-of-way, water storage and distribution facilities, and practice target ranges: *Provided,* That any such license may be extended from time to time by the Commission, with the approval of the Governor, for additional terms of 3 years: *Provided further,* That any such license shall not restrict the areas required by the Commission in carrying on its duties, nor interfere in any way with the Commission's operation or maintenance activities."

"SEC. 3. Section 213 of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, as amended, is hereby further amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 213. Hawaiian home-loan fund; Hawaiian home-development fund; Hawaiian home-operating fund; Hawaiian home-administration account. (a) There are hereby established in the treasury of the Territory two revolving funds to be known as the Hawaiian home-loan fund and the Hawaiian home-operating fund, and two special funds to be known as the Hawaiian home-development fund and the Hawaiian home-administration account.

"(b) Hawaiian home-loan fund. Thirty percent of the Territorial receipts derived from the leasing of cultivated sugarcane lands under any other provisions of law, or from water licenses, shall be deposited into the Hawaiian home-loan fund until the aggregate amount of the fund (including in said amount the principal of all outstanding loans and advances, and all transfers which have been made from this fund to other funds for which this fund has not been or need not be reimbursed) shall equal \$2,000,000. In addition to these moneys there shall be covered into the loan fund the installments of principal paid by lessees upon loans made to them as provided in paragraph 2 of section 215, or as payments representing reimbursements on account of advances made pursuant to section 209 (1), but not including interest on such loans or advances. The moneys in said fund shall be available only for loans to lessees as provided for in this act, and for the payments provided for in section 209 (1), and shall not be expended for any other purpose whatsoever, except as provided in paragraphs (c) and (d) of this section.

"(c) Hawaiian home-development fund. Twenty-five percent of the amount of moneys covered into the Hawaiian home-loan fund annually shall be transferred into the Hawaiian home-development fund until the aggregate amount of such annual transfers shall equal \$400,000. The moneys in said development fund shall be available, with the prior written approval of the Governor, for the construction of sanitary sewerage facilities, for the construction of roads through and over Hawaiian home lands, and for other non-revenue-producing improvements.

"(d) Hawaiian home-operating fund: All moneys received by the Commission from any other source, except moneys received for the Hawaiian home-administration account, shall be deposited in a revolving fund to be known as the Hawaiian home-operating fund. The moneys in said fund shall be available (1) for construction and reconstruction of revenue-producing improvements, including acquisition thereof of real property and interests therein, such as water rights or other interests; (2) for payment into the treasury of the Territory of such amounts as are necessary to meet the following charges for Territorial bonds issued for such revenue-producing improvements, to wit, the interest on such bonds, and the principal of such serial bonds maturing the following year; (3) for operation and maintenance of such improvements, heretofore or hereafter constructed from said fund or other funds; and (4) for the purchase of water or other utilities, goods, commodities, supplies, or equipment and for services, to be resold, rented, or furnished on a charge basis to occupants of Hawaiian home lands. The moneys in said fund may be supplemented by other funds available for, or appropriated by the legislature for, the same purposes. In addition to such moneys, said fund, with the approval of the Governor, may be supplemented by transfers made on a loan basis from the home-loan fund. The amounts of all such transfers shall be repaid into the home-loan fund in not exceeding 10 annual installments, and the aggregate amount of such transfers outstanding at any one time shall not exceed \$500,000. No projects or activities shall be undertaken hereunder except as authorized by sections 220 and 221 or the other provisions of this act.

"(e) Match moneys: The Commission is authorized and empowered to use moneys in the development and operating funds, with the prior written approval of the Governor, to match Federal, Territorial, or county funds available for the same purposes and to that end is authorized to enter into such undertaking, agree to such conditions, transfer funds therein available for such expenditure and do and perform such other acts and things, as may be necessary or required, as a condition to securing match funds for such projects or works.

"(f) Hawaiian home-administration account: The entire receipts derived from any leasing of the available lands defined in section 204 shall be deposited into the Hawaiian home-administration account. The moneys in said account shall be expended by the Commission for salaries and all other administration expenses of the Commission, not including structures and other permanent improvements, subject, however, to the following conditions and requirements:

"(1) The Commission shall, at such time as the Governor may prescribe, but not later than November 15 preceding each biennial session of the legislature, submit to the Territorial director of the bureau of the budget its budget estimates of expenditures for the next ensuing biennium in the manner and form and as required by Territorial law of Territorial departments and establishments.

"(2) The Commission's budget, if it meets with the approval of the Governor, shall be included in the Governor's budget report and shall be transmitted to the legislature for its approval.

"(3) Upon approval by the legislature of the Commission's budget estimate of expenditures for the ensuing biennium, the amount thereof shall be available to the Commission for said biennium and shall be expendable by the Commission for the expenses hereinabove provided, or, if no action on the budget is taken by the legislature prior to adjournment, the amount submitted to the legislature, but not in excess of \$200,000,

shall be available for such expenditures; any amount of money in said account in excess of the amount approved by the legislature for the biennium or so made available shall be transferred to the general fund of the treasury of the Territory, such transfer to be made immediately after the amount of moneys deposited in said administration account shall equal the amount approved by the legislature or so made available.

"(4) The money in said administration account shall be expended by the Commission in accordance with Territorial laws, rules and regulations, and practices."

"Sec. 4. Section 215 (1) of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, as last amended by the act of November 26, 1941, 55 Statutes at Large, page 785, is hereby further amended by deleting from the first sentence the figures "\$3,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$5,000", and by deleting from the first sentence the figures "\$1,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$3,000", so as to cause the portion of the first sentence following the colon and preceding the proviso to read as follows:

"The amount of loans at any one time to any lessee, or successor or successors in interest, of a tract of agricultural or pastoral land shall not exceed \$5,000 and to any lessee or successor or successors in interest, of a residence lot shall not exceed \$3,000."

"Sec. 5. Section 215 (2) of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act 1920, as amended, is hereby further amended to read as follows:

"(2) The loans shall be repaid in periodic installments, such installments to be monthly, quarterly, semiannual, or annual as may be determined by the Commission in each case. The term of the loan shall not exceed 30 years, provided that payments in any sum in addition to the required installments, or payment of the entire amount of the loan, may be made at any time within the term of the loan. All unpaid balances of principal shall bear interest at the rate of 3 percent per annum, payable periodically or upon demand by the Commission, as the Commission may determine. The payment of any installment due shall, with the concurrence therein of at least three of the five members of the Commission, be postponed in whole or in part by the Commission for such reasons as it deems good and sufficient and until such later date as it deems advisable. Such postponed payments shall continue to bear interest at the rate of 3 percent per annum on the unpaid principal."

"Sec. 6. Section 216 of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, as amended, is hereby further amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 216. Insurance by borrowers; acceleration of loans; lien, and enforcement thereof. The Commission may require the borrower to insure, in such amount as the Commission may by regulation prescribe, all livestock and dwellings and other permanent improvement upon his tract, purchased or constructed out of any moneys loaned from the fund; or in lieu thereof the Commission may directly take out such insurance and add the cost thereof to the amount of principal payable under the loan. Whenever the Commission has reason to believe that the borrower has violated any condition enumerated in paragraphs (2), (4), (5), or (6) of section 215 of this title, the Commission shall give due notice and afford opportunity for a hearing to the borrower or the successor or successors to his interest in the tract as the case demands. If upon such hearing the Commission finds that the borrower has violated the condition the Commission may declare all principal and interest of the loan immediately due and payable, notwithstanding any provision in the contract of loan to the contrary. The Commission shall have a first lien upon the borrower's or lessee's interest in his tract, growing crops, either on the tract or in any collective contract or program, dwellings, or other per-

manent improvements thereon, and his livestock, to the amount of all principal and interest due and unpaid and of all taxes and insurance upon such tract and improvements paid by the Commission, and of all indebtedness of the lessee, the payment of which has been assured by the Commission. Such lien shall have priority over any other obligation for which the tract, said growing crops, dwellings, other improvements, or livestock may be security.

"The Commission may, at such times as it deems advisable, enforce any such lien by declaring the borrower's interest in his tract, or his successor's interest therein, as the case may be, together with the said growing crops, dwellings, and other permanent improvements thereon, and the livestock, to be forfeited, the lease in respect to such tract canceled, and shall thereupon order the tract to be vacated and the livestock surrendered within a reasonable time. The right to the use and occupancy of the Hawaiian home lands contained in such tract shall thereupon revert in the Commission, and the Commission may take possession of the tract and the improvements and growing crops thereon; provided that the Commission shall pay to the borrower any difference which may be due him after the appraisal provided for in paragraph (1) of section 209 of this title has been made."

"Sec. 7. Section 220 of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, as amended, is hereby further amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 220. Development projects; appropriations by territorial legislature; bonds issued by legislature. The commission is authorized directly to undertake and carry on general water and other development projects in respect to Hawaiian home lands and to undertake other activities having to do with the economic and social welfare of the homesteaders, including the authority to derive revenue from the sale, to others than homesteaders, of water and other products of such projects or activities, or from the enjoyment thereof by others than homesteaders, where such sale of products or enjoyment of projects or activities by others does not interfere with the proper performance of the duties of the commission; *Provided, however,* That roads through or over Hawaiian home lands, other than Federal-aid highways and roads, shall be maintained by the county or city and county in which said particular road or roads to be maintained are located. The legislature of the Territory is authorized to appropriate out of the treasury of the Territory such sums as it deems necessary to augment the Hawaiian home-loan fund, the Hawaiian home-development fund, the Hawaiian home-operating fund, and the Hawaiian home-administration account, and to provide the commission with funds sufficient to execute and carry on such projects and activities. The legislature is further authorized to issue bonds to the extent required to yield the amount of any sums so appropriated for the payment of which, if issued for revenue producing improvements, the commission shall provide, as set forth in section 213 (d)."

"Sec. 8. Section 222 of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, as last amended by the act of November 26, 1941, 55 Statutes at Large, page 787, is hereby further amended by amending the second sentence thereof to read as follows:

"All expenditures of the commission, as herein provided out of the Hawaiian home-administration account, the Hawaiian home-development fund, or the Hawaiian home-operating fund, and all moneys necessary for loans made by the commission, in accordance with the provisions of this chapter, from the Hawaiian home-loan fund, shall be allowed and paid upon the presentation of itemized vouchers therefor, approved by the chairman of the commission."

"Sec. 9. Section 225 of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, as amended, is hereby further amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 225. Investment of loan funds; disposition. The commission shall have the power and authority to invest and reinvest any of the moneys in the loan fund, not otherwise immediately needed for the purposes of the fund, in such bonds and securities as authorized by territorial law for the investment of territorial sinking fund moneys. Any interest or other earnings arising out of such investments shall be credited to and deposited in the Hawaiian home-operating fund and shall be considered a deposit therein from the other sources mentioned in section 213 (d)."

"Sec. 10. This act shall take effect on and after the date of its approval."

"Sec. 2. This joint resolution, upon its approval, shall be forwarded to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States and to the Delegate to Congress from the Territory of Hawaii.

"Sec. 3. This joint resolution shall take effect upon its approval.

"Approved this 22d day of May A. D. 1947.

"INGRAM M. STAINBACK,

"Governor of the Territory of Hawaii."

The petition of the Municipal Assembly of the City of Mayaguez, P. R., praying for an amendment to the Organic Act of Puerto Rico providing for the election of a governor by the citizens of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A telegram in the nature of a petition from Lucille Ward, of Dallas, Tex., praying for the enactment of legislation to end rent control by June 30, 1947; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. CONNALLY:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Texas; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 47

"Concurrent resolution relative to memorializing Congress to enact House Resolution 881 and House Resolution 1199, granting tax exemptions to those held prisoners by the Japanese

"Whereas many citizens of the State of Texas, civilians and members of our armed forces, were taken and held in Japanese prisons, and suffered untold hardships; and

"Whereas it is fitting and proper that the former prisoners of war receive the benefits granted by two bills now pending before the Congress of the United States, H. Res. 881 and H. Res. 1199, which bills give them certain tax benefits under section 251 of the Internal Revenue Code of the United States; Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Texas (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of Texas respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States to enact H. Res. 881 and H. Res. 1199; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President, the President pro tempore of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from Texas in the Congress of the United States."

(The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Texas, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.)

PROHIBITION AGAINST LIQUOR ADVERTISING

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and to have printed in the RECORD a letter I have received from

the Northern New York Conference of the Methodist Church, advising me of the action taken at their conference in Utica, N. Y., this month on my bill, S. 265, which would prohibit the advertising of alcoholic beverages.

There being no objection, the letter was received, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NORTHERN NEW YORK CONFERENCE
OF THE METHODIST CHURCH,
Mohawk, N. Y., May 26, 1947.

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: At the request of the Northern New York Conference of the Methodist Church, which convened in Utica, N. Y., May 14-18, 1947, I am sending you a copy of the following action, which was unanimously adopted by the members present:

"We, as ministers and laymen of the Northern New York Conference of the Methodist Church, representing 30,000 voters of New York State, urge the adoption of the Capper bill (S. 265) to prohibit the advertising, and interstate commerce in the advertising, of all alcoholic beverages."

Respectfully yours,

W. A. WILBUR.

RATES OF NATURAL-GAS UTILITIES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Council of the City of Portland, Oreg., relating to House bill 2185, which proposes to prevent the use of the prudent-investment theory in fixing rates of natural-gas utilities.

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

Resolution 23239

Whereas a bill has been introduced into the Congress of the United States, numbered H. R. 2185, to amend the Natural Gas Act; and

Whereas this bill proposes to eliminate the prudent-investment theory of utility rate fixing with regard to natural gas; and

Whereas the city of Portland, Oreg., is not now served by any natural-gas utility but a legislative ban on rate fixing upon the prudent-investment theory in regard to natural-gas utilities would affect regulation of other utilities; and

Whereas the Pacific coast area and the city of Portland are vitally interested in consumer costs for utility services which now, or in the future, may exist in this area: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Council of the City of Portland, That the proposed bill, H. R. 2185, is contrary to the interests of the consumer public in that it probably will have an adverse effect on the prudent-investment theory for rate-fixing determinations, and that such bill, if passed, will tend to affect adversely the consumers of all public-utility products and services; and be it further

Resolved, That an abolition of the prudent-investment theory of rate regulation will materially increase the cost of regulation and cause delay in obtaining for consumers any rate reduction, to the greater expense of the public consumer and taxpayer; and be it further

Resolved, That the bill numbered H. R. 2185 should not be passed; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution duly certified be sent to Mr. Herman C. Wil-

son, president of the National Institute of Municipal Law Officers, for presentation to the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, and that copies be sent to Senators GUY CORDON and WAYNE MORSE and to the Honorable HOMER D. ANGELL.

PROTESTS AGAINST REDUCTION IN BUDGETS FOR INTERIOR AND AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and to have printed in the RECORD, two statements issued by the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, Washington, D. C., relating to the reduction in the budgets of the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture.

There being no objection, the statements were received, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE REDUCTION OF THE BUDGET OF THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

The cut in the budget of the Department of the Interior is made at a time when projects under way have already involved the Government in vast expenditures of money. To fail to finish work started is wasteful of money already spent. Furthermore, many of these projects would be productive of income when finished.

The Congress has recommended a cut of \$138,881,907 in the budget request of the Department of the Interior, which is nearly half of the budget request of this Department. If the Senate approves of this cut this will mean hampering the work of irrigation, electric-power development for many purposes, fire protection for some of our regions, surveying and discovering mineral resources, caring for our Indian wards, and other vital services to the American people.

Study of the proposed use of the money requested makes the proposed cut seem extremely wasteful of our natural resources and of the work already done on unfinished projects. It is the opposite of economy from every viewpoint.

THE WOMEN'S INTERNATIONAL LEAGUE
FOR PEACE AND FREEDOM,
WASHINGTON, D. C.

IS IT ECONOMY?—A STATEMENT ON THE PROPOSED CUT IN BUDGET OF THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Value of farm products (figures obtained by subtracting from gross farm income the amount of Government payments):

1939	\$9,121,000,000
1940	9,575,000,000
1941	12,556,000,000
1942	17,000,000,000
1943	21,358,000,000
1944	22,269,000,000
1945	22,924,000,000
1946	26,404,000,000
Appropriations to Agriculture Department:	
1939	\$1,548,000,000
1940	1,649,000,000
1941	1,549,000,000
1942	1,610,000,000
1943	1,127,000,000
1944	1,185,000,000
1945	1,169,000,000
1946	1,254,000,000
1947	1,274,000,000
1948 (budget request)	1,188,000,000

The above figures show the increase of dollar value in agricultural products from 1935 to 1946. Estimates show that the present year will probably be as good a year as 1946. Thus we see that the value of our agricultural production has increased from \$9,121,000,000 to \$26,404,000,000, while the

budget of the Agriculture Department has decreased during the same period. Inflation has, of course, had much to do with the increase of value, but the same inflation has affected the value of the money appropriated to the Department of Agriculture.

In terms of amount of products coming from the farm, the increase has been about one-third. Therefore, we must recognize that under the guidance of the Department of Agriculture, our farmers have increased the productivity of the farms by one-third during the period when manpower was short, and that this has been done without an increase (but with a decrease) in money spent for the Department of Agriculture. It is also significant that this increase has come principally through an increase of productivity per acre rather than through use of new land.

It may be said that the farmers would have been able to increase production without the aid of the Department of Agriculture. Whatever may be true in this regard, it is difficult to believe that they would have done so with the degree of scientific care of the land which has prevailed in this period. We must not forget the Dust Bowl experiences of the past.

Economies in administration may be possible and desirable, but in view of the food needs of the world and the burden which they place on American agriculture, we must ask ourselves whether it is, in reality, an economy at all to cut the appropriations of the Department of Agriculture in such a way as to handicap their program.

WOMEN'S INTERNATIONAL LEAGUE.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

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

S. 358. A bill to provide for settling certain indebtedness connected with Pershing Hall, a memorial in Paris, France; with an amendment (Rept. No. 223);

S. 1032. A bill for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Foreign Service of the United States; with an amendment (Rept. No. 224);

H. R. 620. A bill for the relief of Blanche E. Broad; without amendment (Rept. No. 225);

H. R. 723. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Hunter A. Hoagland, a minor; without amendment (Rept. No. 226);

H. R. 811. A bill for the relief of J. F. Powers; with an amendment (Rept. No. 229);

H. R. 1065. A bill for the relief of the estate of Thomas Gambacorto; without amendment (Rept. No. 227); and

H. R. 2257. A bill for the relief of South-eastern Sand & Gravel Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 228).

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

S. 924. A bill to credit active service in the military or naval forces of the United States in determining eligibility for and the amount of benefits from the policemen and firemen's relief fund, District of Columbia; with an amendment (Rept. No. 217);

S. 966. A bill to authorize the establishment of the District Educational Agency for Surplus Property in the municipal government of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 218);

S. 1124. A bill to amend the Boiler Inspection Act of the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 219);

S. 1191. A bill to authorize the Methodist Home of the District of Columbia to make certain changes in its certificate of incorporation with respect to stated objects; without amendment (Rept. No. 220);

H. R. 1624. A bill to authorize payment of allowances to three inspectors of the Metro-

politan Police force for the use of their privately owned motor vehicles, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 221); and

H. R. 1997. A bill to provide seniority benefits for certain officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia who are veterans of World War II and lost opportunity for promotion by reason of their service in the armed forces of the United States; with an amendment (Rept. No. 222).

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

S. 394. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Raymond Wesley Doyle; with an amendment (Rept. No. 230);

S. 395. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Richard Jay Doyle; with amendments (Rept. No. 235);

S. 396. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Thurlow Grey Doyle; with an amendment (Rept. No. 231);

S. 397. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Lawrence Stanley Doyle; with an amendment (Rept. No. 232);

S. 398. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Spencer Burgess Doyle; with an amendment (Rept. No. 233); and

S. 399. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Gladys May Doyle; with an amendment (Rept. No. 234).

By Mr. BROOKS, from the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. J. Res. 112. Joint resolution to establish a commission to formulate plans for the erection, in Grant Park, Chicago, Ill., of a Marine Corps memorial; without amendment.

S. J. Res. 113. Joint resolution authorizing the erection in the District of Columbia of a memorial to the Marine Corps dead of all wars; without amendment; and

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; without amendment.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 1373. A bill to amend section 26, title I, chapter 1, of the act entitled "An act making further provision for a civil government for Alaska, and for other purposes," approved June 6, 1900 (31 Stat. 321), as amended by the act of May 31, 1938 (52 Stat. 588); to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BALL:

S. 1374. A bill for expenditure of funds for cooperating with the public-school board at Walker, Minn., for the extension of public-school facilities to be available to all Indian children in the district; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BALDWIN:

S. 1375. A bill to incorporate the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PROPOSED RULE REGARDING PRINTING OF MATTERS IN THE RECORD

Mr. JENNER, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 121), which was ordered to be placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That hereafter no written or printed matter shall be offered or received for printing in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as part of the remarks of any Senator unless such matter (1) shall have been read orally by such Senator on the floor of the Senate, or (2) is offered and received for printing in such manner as will indicate clearly that the contents thereof were not

read orally by such Senator on the floor of the Senate. No request shall be entertained by the presiding officer to suspend by unanimous consent the requirements of this resolution.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED OR PLACED ON CALENDAR

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

H. R. 174. An act to amend section 26, title I, chapter 1, of the act entitled "An act making further provision for a civil government for Alaska, and for other purposes," approved June 6, 1900 (31 Stat. 321), as amended by the act of May 31, 1938 (52 Stat. 588);

H. R. 577. An act to preserve historic graveyards in abandoned military posts;

H. R. 981. An act to amend section 2 of the act of January 29, 1942 (56 Stat. 21), relating to the refund of taxes illegally paid by Indian citizens;

H. R. 1556. An act to provide basic authority for the performance of certain functions and activities of the Bureau of Reclamation;

H. R. 1628. An act relinquishing to the State of Illinois certain right, title, or interest of the United States of America and for other purposes;

H. R. 1882. An act for expenditure of funds for cooperating with the public-school board at Walker, Minn., for the extension of public-school facilities to be available to all Indian children in the district;

H. R. 2005. An act to amend the act of April 21, 1932 (47 Stat. 88), entitled "An act to provide for the leasing of the segregated coal and asphalt deposits of the Choctaw and Chickasaw Indian Nations, in Oklahoma, and for an extension of time within which purchasers of such deposits may complete payments";

H. R. 2097. An act to declare the ownership of the timber on the allotments on the Northern Cheyenne Indian Reservation, and to authorize the sale thereof;

H. R. 2207. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands within the Shiloh National Military Park, Tenn., and for other purposes;

H. R. 2411. An act to authorize patenting of certain lands to Public Hospital District No. 2, Clallam County, Wash., for hospital purposes;

H. R. 2655. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to grant to the mayor and City Council of Baltimore, State of Maryland, a permanent easement for the purpose of installing, maintaining, and servicing two subterranean water mains in, on, and across the land of Fort McHenry National Monument and Historic Shrine, Md.;

H. R. 2852. An act to provide for the addition of certain surplus Government lands to the Otter Creek Recreational Demonstration Area, in the State of Kentucky;

H. R. 3143. An act to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Paonia Federal reclamation project, Colorado;

H. R. 3151. An act to grant a certain water right and a certain parcel of land in Clark County, Nev., to the city of Las Vegas, Nev.; and

H. R. 3197. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to contract with the Mancos Water Conservancy District increasing the reimbursable construction cost obligation of the district to the United States for construction of the Mancos project and extending the repayment period; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 195. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell certain lands in Alaska to the city of Sitka, Alaska; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

H. R. 310. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to permit the delivery of water from the District of Columbia and Arling-

ton County water systems to the Falls Church or other water systems in the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia in Virginia; and

H. R. 2545. An act to provide funds for co-operation with the school board of the Moclips-Aloha district for the construction and equipment of a new school building in the town of Moclips, Grays Harbor County, Wash., to be available to both Indian and non-Indian children; ordered to be placed on the calendar.

H. R. 325. An act to transfer Blair County, Pa., from the middle judicial district of Pennsylvania to the western judicial district of Pennsylvania;

H. R. 1054. An act to make permanent the judgeship provided for by the act entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the eastern and western districts of Missouri," approved December 24, 1942; and

H. R. 2693. An act for the relief of public-utility district No. 1, of Cowlitz County, Wash.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 468. An act to amend section 115 of the Internal Revenue Code in respect to distributions by personal holding companies; and

H. R. 2872. An act to amend further section 4 of the Public Debt Act of 1941, as amended, and clarify its application, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

H. R. 673. An act to repeal certain provisions authorizing the establishing of priorities in transportation by merchant vessels; and

H. R. 3587. An act to establish a National Aviation Council for the purpose of unifying and clarifying national policies relating to aviation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 1379. An act to establish the United States Naval Postgraduate School, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2276. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to pay certain expenses incident to training, attendance, and participation of personnel of the Army of the United States in the seventh winter sports Olympic games and the fourteenth Olympic games and for future Olympic games;

H. R. 3124. An act to authorize the attendance of the Marine Band at the Eighty-first National Encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic to be held in Cleveland, Ohio, August 10 to 14, 1947;

H. R. 3215. An act to revise the Medical Department of the Army and the Medical Department of the Navy, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3629. An act to authorize the transfer to the Panama Canal of property which is surplus to the needs of the War Department or Navy Department; and

H. J. Res. 167. Joint resolution to recognize uncompensated services rendered the Nation under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1714. An act to exclude certain interns, student nurses, and other student-employees of hospitals of the Federal Government from the Classification Act and other laws relating to compensation and benefits of Federal employees, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2229. An act to amend the act of June 25, 1938, relating to the appointment of postmasters under civil service; and

H. R. 2857. An act to extend second-class mailing privileges to bulletins issued by State conservation and fish and game agencies or departments; to the Committee on Civil Service.

H. R. 2798. An act to amend section 5, Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2799. An act to amend the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, title IV of the National Housing Act, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2800. An act to amend section 5 of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2448. An act to amend the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency; and

H. R. 3001. An act to provide further safeguards with respect to the issuance of passports by or under the authority of the Secretary of State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the subcommittee of the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program may hold sessions during today and tomorrow while the Senate is in session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THYE in the chair). Without objection, permission is granted.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION—ADDRESS BY SENATOR HILL

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address on the subject Should There Be Federal Aid to Education? delivered by him on April 21, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY REV. BERNARD W. DEMPSEY, S. J., BEFORE MORTGAGE BANKERS' ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA

[Mr. KEM asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Rev. Bernard W. Dempsey, S. J., regent of the School of Commerce and Finance, St. Louis University, before members of the Mortgage Bankers' Association of America at Kansas City, Mo., on May 8, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY—ARTICLE FROM THE DENVER POST

[Mr. AIKEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "St. Lawrence Seaway Again in Public Eye," published in the Denver Post for May 25, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

TREATY OF PEACE WITH ITALY

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of Executive F (80th Cong., 1st sess.), the treaty of peace with Italy, signed at Paris on February 10, 1947.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Aiken	Hatch	Moore
Baldwin	Hawkes	Morse
Ball	Hayden	Murray
Barkley	Hickenlooper	O'Daniel
Brewster	Hill	Revercomb
Bricker	Hoey	Robertson, Wyo.
Brooks	Holland	Russell
Buck	Ives	Saltonstall
Bushfield	Jenner	Smith
Cain	Johnson, Colo.	Sparkman
Capehart	Johnston, S. C.	Stewart
Capper	Kem	Taft
Chavez	Kilgore	Taylor
Connally	Knowland	Thomas, Okla.
Cooper	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Cordon	Lodge	Thye
Downey	Lucas	Tobey
Dworshak	McCarran	Tydings
Eastland	McCarthy	Vandenberg
Eaton	McClellan	Watkins
Ellender	McFarland	Wherry
Ferguson	McGrath	White
Flanders	McKellar	Wiley
Fulbright	McMahon	Williams
George	Magnuson	Wilson
Green	Malone	Young
Gurney	Millikin	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] are absent by leave of the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONNOR], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. UMSTEAD] are detained on public business.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. IVES in the chair). Eighty Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, the Senate must now exercise its constitutional function of passing upon the treaties which have been written by 21 Allies to terminate formally World War II with Italy, Hungary, Rumania, and Bulgaria.

The Senate must decide whether we shall initiate the healing processes of peace insofar as lies within our power. In meeting this obligation, the Senate is a free agent. It can base its decision upon whatever considerations it may wish to consult, and a wide variety of advice is available.

I presume every Senator's desire in the first instance will be to give due weight to the urgent Executive recommendations of our constitutional partners in treaty making, who have the primary constitutional responsibility and prerogative in this area of action. I emphasize again that this executive responsibility is primary only. The Senate is a free agent, but the Senate cannot ignore the bases upon which the Executive makes his recommendations to us in this utterly vital area of action at this utterly critical moment in the history of the world.

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

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. Have there been recommendations from the executive department since the Hungarian coup?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I will reach that point in a few moments, if the Senator will permit me to proceed.

Therefore, as a basis for my presentation of the subject, I first give the Senate the judgment of the President of the United States uttered as recently as May 5, 1947. He should have more intimate and accurate and dependable facilities for gaging this problem, and the effects of what we do, than any other man in America. He said:

These treaties are the result of months of effort by outstanding leaders of both parties in this Government and of other

governments to work out a common peace in this important area of the world. Nothing has occurred to render their efforts unsound or unwise. It is more than ever important that the Government of the United States should appear to the world as a strong and consistent force in international relations. Treaties which have been worked out with the approval of so large a proportion of all the nations convened at the Paris Conference represent the considered judgment of the international community. Moreover, many of the most difficult problems were resolved as the result of American initiative.

I now underscore this final sentence of quotation from the President:

It would be a great misfortune and a heavy blow to our country's leadership in world affairs should we now unilaterally withhold approval of these treaties.

That is the opinion of the President of the United States.

I now quote the former Secretary of State, James F. Byrnes, without whose indomitable purpose to open the treaties to general Allied consultation there would have been no peace conference to mobilize the universal judgment of our partners in the war. He spoke to us as follows on May 6, 1947:

If we now fail to ratify the treaties we have insisted upon for the last 18 months, we will thereby veto the action of the Allied Nations. If we exercise the veto power, the responsibility for the maintenance of the armies of occupation and of chaotic political and economic conditions in these countries will rest upon us.

I now quote Secretary of State George C. Marshall, speaking to the Foreign Relations Committee upon his recent return from Moscow. I interpolate at this point that if there is any doubt in anybody's mind about my attitude toward the Secretary of State, I should like to say that I consider him to be a very great and deeply trusted American and a Secretary of State in the finest American tradition. Secretary Marshall was responding to a specific question as to the relationship between these pending treaties and those which remain to be written with Austria and Germany at the core of Europe's tragedy. I quote Secretary Marshall:

If these treaties are suspended or rejected, I think it would be exceedingly harmful to the prospect for completing a satisfactory treaty with Austria and the development of one with Germany. As a matter of fact, I have decided fears that the situation would so deteriorate that I do not know quite how we would go about the further negotiations. It is already exceedingly difficult, as everyone knows. Now all we would do is to make it more difficult, if not impossible.

To answer specifically at this point the question raised by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], I beg to testify that in a conversation with the Secretary of State this morning he reasserts his position in total and without reservation, and insists that the present situation even more requires our affirmative action.

I respectfully submit, Mr. President, that the Senate cannot lightly dismiss these high admonitions and these high warnings, even though it is a totally free agent in making up its mind and reaching its decision. These admonitions and warnings are entitled at least to a priority of consultation because they come from the constitutional sources upon

which we must continue to rely for the primary creation and administration of our foreign policy, no matter what form our advice and consent, or lack of it, may take. There can be no shadow of a doubt, there can be no suggestion of a reservation, as of today, in connection with the Executive attitude. We are urged to prompt ratification of these treaties, for the sake of the best calculated chance of peace for all concerned. There is the primary responsibility—referring to the executive branch of the Government—theirs is the primary responsibility if we ratify in response to their recommendations. Ours is the exclusive responsibility if we reject the treaties.

Now let us look at other background factors. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee unavoidably faced special obligations in these connections. I hope we discharged them faithfully. We opened the public hearings to every citizen who wished to be heard. The full record is on Senators' desks. We consulted at length, in both public and private, with the State Department. With every possible sympathy, Mr. President, we listened to the completely understandable pleadings of many representatives of our splendid Italian-American citizenship who argued for change or postponement in respect to the Italian treaty. None of us could approve all the detailed engagements set out in these pending treaties. All of us wished that the treaties had been written, or could be rewritten, more completely in keeping with all our American recommendations, and freed of all necessity to find common ground with our wartime Allies, each one of which had an equal right, with us, of consultation. But in the very nature of things our negotiators had no such option. I can testify that we won many an important point for which we contended. I can identify these points—and I intend to do it—and not even the critics of these treaties, at home or abroad, have withheld their expressions of unstinted gratitude, I am proud to say, for what we succeeded in doing. But we could not dictate solely to suit ourselves. This is not a dictated peace, and under the American concept it cannot be a dictated peace.

I repeat, we did not, we could not, enjoy the luxury of that option. Neither did, or could, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. We faced a condition; not a theory. We assessed the realities. No such treaties are ever satisfactory. But we decided that these treaties, representing the consensus of 21 nations, are the best available; that further improvements must await events; that the alternative is greater confusion, greater chaos, greater disintegration; that present ratification, all things considered, emphatically is advisable. With no illusions regarding the hard road ahead for all Europe and for us, regardless of what we may here do, the committee made this decision by a full vote of 13 to nothing. For whatever it is worth, I add this exhibit to the presumptions which recommend ratification to the Senate.

I shall not take the time of the Senate to review the treaty texts in detail. This

has been done many times before. This information is succinctly summarized in the Appendix to the full committee report, which is on the desks of Senators. Therefore I confine myself today largely to an analysis of treaty criticisms. I simply remind Senators again that practically every recommendation made by the Peace Conference of 21 nations by a two-thirds vote is written into these texts. They are the common denominator of the Allied minds. We cannot change them unilaterally even if we would. Senators can imagine, for example, what would happen in the potentially explosive boundary areas between Yugoslavia and Italy—the cockpits of white-hot controversy—if each one of us sought to take unilateral action in the expression of our unilateral wishes. Imagine what would happen if the United States drew one boundary line in this controverted area, and if Soviet Russia drew another; or if we procrastinated and jointly drew none at all. Imagine what would happen if we unilaterally tried to give Trieste to Italy, as was our wish, while Soviet Russia unilaterally tried to give Trieste to Yugoslavia, as was her wish—or if we leave it all in angry flux, instead of establishing this treaty compromise under the agreed authority and protection of the United Nations. Senators can imagine how the prospects, if any, of an Austrian or a German treaty will fade even further into dim intransigence if the Big Four lock horns in this present limited area of agreement and have to return to the weary, painful round of sterile contentions which marked these satellite negotiations throughout most of 1946.

These are grim realities, Mr. President. Our emotional impulses, no matter how nobly mediated, are no match for these realities. I repeat that we face a condition, not a theory. So do these treaties. We must start to rebuild a broken world. The only way to begin is to begin.

There is no large controversy over three of these treaties, those with Rumania, Hungary, and Bulgaria, although the Hungarian situation now becomes highly complicated, and I shall refer to it specifically before I have concluded. Senators will find one strong appeal in the hearings in behalf of Rumania. But the issue clearly is Italy; and it is the Italian treaty which is now pending for the Senate's verdict. It is here that we do or do not cross the Rubicon. It is here that powerful, organized movements in the United States, on one theory or another, have besieged Senators with appeals for rejection or delay. I wish to say again that I deeply sympathize with these ethnic loyalties. I think I understand them. I certainly understand arguments addressed to the thesis that when Italy ceased to be an enemy state with the fall of Mussolini and aggressively joined the Allied cause, she did so under promises that her atonement would count in her favor when the peace was written. Frankly, Mr. President, I think it has—even in the treaty here pending, as I shall undertake to prove. Frankly, I think it will be even more evident in years to come—a theme to which I shall subsequently advert. But I hope and pray, Mr. President, that these

ethnic loyalties will not unwittingly lead our good Italian-American friends into disservice to their own old fatherland, as might too easily be the case if we did not face the facts of life. No one better understands than I that the choice is a hard one, for them and for us. But we must make it with our heads and hearts, and not with our hearts alone.

At this point I wish to read, because of its significant bearing, two or three paragraphs from a letter which came to me under date of May 7 from Dr. Francesco Gasparini, who is an Italian citizen recently arrived in New York as a representative of ANSA, which is the Italian equivalent of the American Associated Press. Dr. Gasparini's letter came to me unsolicited. This is his voluntary observation:

I am well aware that many Italian-Americans have urged you and the United States Senate not to ratify the Italian Peace Treaty, or at least to postpone ratification. But now permit me, as an Italian coming from Italy, to tell you that, on the contrary, the Italian people need ratification, and need it badly; today rather than tomorrow, tomorrow rather than the day after.

We all agree that the treaty is unjust; more than unjust, it is punitive; but, at least, it is a peace treaty, and Italy cannot even hope to start on the road to reconstruction unless the treaty becomes effective.

I am not authorized to speak in the name of the Italian people, but I know for sure that I am interpreting the feeling of all, or almost all Italians who have our country's destiny at heart, and I know how the overwhelming majority of the members of our government and of the Constituent Assembly feel in this matter.

I can well understand the attitude of the Italian-Americans, who are prompted only by their love for the old country, but evidently are not fully aware of the financial and economic plight in Italy; the situation is such, that we cannot possibly wait any longer for a starting point on which to build up our national economy. If we had bread and jobs for everyone in Italy, I, too, would fall in with the Italian-Americans in urging that ratification be at least postponed. But, unfortunately, we have 2,500,000 unemployed in Italy, and too many families are short even of bread. We cannot afford to wait.

Furthermore, we cannot overlook the lowering of morale in the great majority of the 46,000,000 inhabitants of the Italian peninsula; unquestionably even the morale of the Italian people could be improved by such a substantial change in the present situation, as would be brought about by the ending of the state of war between Italy and the United States of America, and by the withdrawal of occupation troops.

I do not pretend, Mr. President, that this letter is anything other than appears upon its face. I have inquired regarding its author and I find him authentic. I submit for what it is worth his testimony from Italy itself in respect to the subject which I now proceed to analyze.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that to reject or to indefinitely postpone the ratification of this Italian treaty, relatively speaking, would be bad for Italy, bad for Europe, bad for us, and bad for peace. It would perpetuate confusion and uncertainty. It would make any sort of planning impossible. It would indefinitely delay desperately important decisions relating to the disposition of Italian colonies. It would hamper sound rehabilitation. It would prolong occupa-

tion by foreign troops. It would create major doubts whether the United States can be depended on to keep its word. It would precipitate new resentments and new frictions on the border.

Let me emphasize that statement, Mr. President. I repeat, we are choosing between alternatives. The rejection or postponement of the ratification of the treaty would precipitate new resentments and new frictions on the border. It would inspire some Allies, disappointed in what they consider to be too soft a peace, to reopen their demands for more reparations and more territory; such, for example, as the Austrian Tyrol. It would postpone Italy's entry into the United Nations, with all the vitally important privileges and prerogatives thus involved. It would postpone Italy's entry into new stabilizing economic arrangements with other powers. It would "trade a bird in the hand for two in the bush"—with no "bush" in sight. In the words of Secretary Marshall, "You would not improve your treaty by delay; but you would have a very great risk to the world." Still other words of Secretary Marshall:

My own view, to state it very frankly, is that the whole situation practically dissolves; that would be my own feeling in my position in approaching any further conferences; the world would lose all confidence in our proposals and our leadership. I do not think we can afford that.

Mr. President, I am unable to make myself believe that any of the hypothetically claimed advantages from rejection or delay can weigh against these bitter considerations; and I say this from the standpoint of both Italy and the United States. I am frank to add that I do not pretend to know what the effect of our action, one way or the other, may be upon the ascendancy of totalitarianism in Italy—a specter of dread menace which I do not minimize. If we ratify, and American and British troops withdraw, it is said that we leave a disarmed Italy at the mercy of armed subversion at home and armed penetration by hostile neighbors. But if we do not ratify, we leave Italy at the mercy of Communist propaganda which can tear to shreds any further concept of American democratic good faith, and we tacitly accept the more or less permanent assignment of keeping our troops in Italy—and very busy troops they may indeed become under the resultant aggravated circumstances.

I cannot concede the relative wisdom of the latter course. I cannot concede that it would have any kinship with our policy in Greece and Turkey, where our overriding aim is to encourage independent autonomy. Neither can I concede that treaty ratification, though accompanied by troop withdrawal, leaves Italian democracy at the helpless mercy of its foes. The major powers which sign these treaties in good faith will confront a continuing obligation to hold others to strict accountability for bad faith, if such there be; and all the other powers, which have helped to write these treaties, will constitute such a mighty force in the United Nations that this organized conscience of the earth inevitably will find a way to make bad faith

too unprofitable to be worth while. In this connection I call the attention of the Senate to a particularly significant statement by former Secretary Byrnes, at page 183 of the committee hearings:

By long and persistent effort we did achieve a settlement by common Allied agreement. If that settlement is not respected by the signatories, we will have a clear right in accordance with the principles of the United Nations to defend Italy.

I should add at this point that the treaty itself leaves Italy far from helpless. It permits an army of 185,000 men, a constabulary of 65,000 men, an air force of 25,000 men, and a navy of 25,000 officers and men. This may be small on the basis of global comparisons, but it is all her impoverished economy could afford, even though there were no such limitations in the bond, and it is far, far from impotence. Furthermore, these limitations are not static. The treaty itself declares that these limitation clauses "shall remain in effect until modified in whole or in part by the Security Council and Italy." In other words, modification is contemplated in the future. This is not a strait-jacket. There is hope ahead. Why not put at least a little emphasis on hope? There are other "hopes" to which I shall subsequently advert. Let us not ignore these encouragements. I think, Mr. President, that some of them are far more tangible than any wishful hopes for a better basic treaty now or in the foreseeable future at the end of another era of uncertainty, subversion, and resultant disintegration.

Nor is this all of the military story. In the Free Territory of Trieste 5,000 American troops and 5,000 British troops will remain so long as the governor considers them necessary to law and order and to peace and security. This is the point of greatest hazard. One may say that such armed forces are as nothing compared with the hordes an aggressor could turn loose upon Italy. I reply that our present armed forces in Italy also are as nothing compared with the hordes an aggressor could turn loose. Each is but a token force. But one token is calculated to be as repressive, in its lengthened shadow, as the other.

Oh, but, it is said, this treaty was written in contemplation of further early treaties with Austria and Germany. It was to be a part of a pattern. This expectation has defaulted, it is said. Therefore, this treaty should default. We should wait, it is argued, for the Austrian and German treaties and fit this treaty into the pattern then disclosed. In my opinion, Mr. President, this is the counsel of despair. We do not know when we shall get the German and Austrian treaties. But we do know, on the authority of Secretary Marshall, that if these treaties on the perimeter are abandoned or indefinitely suspended, it will be necessary to take time out to retrace all the earlier steps, and thus we shall have further postponed the final treaties if, indeed, we shall not have shelved them for keeps. I am unable to see that this serves Italy or Europe or America or peace.

Someday we shall get these other treaties, even if, unhappily, we are forced by circumstance to organize

peace in our own zones alone. If this or any other evolution ultimately invites better advantages for Italy, in respect to peace and security, I have no shadow of a doubt that the General Assembly of the United Nations will take jurisdiction under article XIV of its Charter. That is what, among other things, article XIV is for—"to recommend measures for the peaceful adjustment of any situation, regardless of origin, which it deems likely to impair the general welfare or friendly relations among nations," and so forth.

I specifically asked former Secretary Byrnes for his interpretation of this point in the committee hearings. His reply will be found at page 185. He said the door is not shut to change. On the contrary, he said, there is an invitation to change.

Here again is hope. It may be said that it is nebulous, but everything in life these days is nebulous and relative. I reply that this very positive provision in the United Nations Charter is far less nebulous than it is to lean on the wishful notion that if we postpone ratification of this treaty, we shall somehow start a chain of reaction which will hasten, instead of hamper, German and Austrian treaties; and that this, somehow, by some unknown process, will reflect Italian advantage. We have the categorical advice of Secretary Marshall that this is not so. We have his warning that the exact opposite is so. The facts of life underwrite his warning. So does the experience of all American participants in the actual modern business of making peace.

It is one thing to moralize abstractly upon this subject, Mr. President. It is quite another thing to "face the music"—if anyone may call it music. I spoke feelingly upon this subject to one distinguished witness at our committee hearings. The dialogue will be found at page 98 of the hearings. Dealing with this general contemplation, I said to him:

It is very easy for us to sit here across this table, and you and I can agree in 20 minutes on the kind of treaty we would like to write for Italy. * * * But having sat last year for 213 days across from Mr. Molotov, I can assure you it is quite a different thing from sitting across from you.

Mr. President, this leads me to another observation regarding the pending treaty. There seems to be a prejudicial myth afloat to the effect that the United States engaged in some sort of appeasement in the writing of this treaty. Nothing could be further from the truth. The truth is that the United States firmly stood its ground. The truth is that, as a result, Italy is infinitely the beneficiary, despite the inevitability of incidental compromise in bringing the viewpoints of 21 nations to one, common dotted line.

Let me note a few of these significant considerations. They are important, not by way of apology in any sort of sense, but by way of justification for the Italian treaty. Probably the reparations figures are the most spectacular exhibit. At page 188 of the committee hearings former Secretary Byrnes testified that the total claims actively pressed against Italy amounted to between twenty and twenty-five billion dollars. Mr. President, I said

between twenty and twenty-five billion dollars. Compare that figure with the \$360,000,000 of total reparations in the final treaty figures—between 1 and 2 cents on the dollar, to be paid over 7 years, and not to start for 2 years. Even so, the states receiving reparations in current production must furnish the raw materials. Soviet Russia gets \$100,000,000—in 7 years, after waiting 2 years—1 percent of the physical damage done to her by Italian armies, she asserts. Is that appeasement? Do you think, Mr. President, that Italy could hope to fare better in renegotiation 6 months or 6 years from now?

We properly emphasize Italy's right to special credit because of her magnificent atonement in the last years of the war. It is important to our sense of justice. But, in simple honesty, Mr. President, can we expect our allies to ignore and forget the ghastly destruction they suffered from Fascist Italy during the first years of the war?

For example, can we expect Greece to forget? Greece gets \$105,000,000 of the \$360,000,000 in reparations, plus the return of her conquered Dodecanese Islands. Must we not consider justice for Greece, our brave and consistent ally, even as we seek justice for ex-enemy Italy? Is it justice to Greece to reject or postpone this treaty and thus reject or postpone Greek repossession of her Dodecanese Islands, as demanded by a resolution adopted by the Senate of the United States?

Mr. President, let us be fair about this question. The record eloquently demonstrates that the United States fought for long and dogged months, notwithstanding these considerations, to set total Italian reparations at a still lower figure. But, frankly, I marvel, not that the final reparations figures are so high but, rather, that they are so low. I see no tangible prospect of making them lower. Meanwhile, we insisted upon the significant clause in the treaty which reads:

Deliveries—

For reparations—

shall be scheduled in such a way as to avoid interference with the economic reconstruction of Italy and the imposition of additional liabilities on other Allied or Associated Powers.

And we constitute the Ambassadors of the four big powers at Rome as a court to administer this and other protections.

Mr. President, I shall not tax the Senate's patience by reviewing in detail all the clauses in this treaty which are relatively favorable to Italy, largely as a result of American insistence; but it is important to set the general pattern of this telltale fact. Otherwise, our Italian-American friends—yes, and New Italy herself—may forget these evidences of an American friendship which is calculated to be of inestimable value to New Italy in the trying days and months and years that lie ahead. I wish gratefully to acknowledge again the expressions of gratitude which most of our Italian-American witnesses in the committee hearings expressed upon this score.

Let me list a few of these treaty advantages for Italy which the United States helped to gain. There is the clause which protects Italy against being indiscriminately stripped of her artistic, historical, and archeological values—things dear to the Roman heart. There is the clause requiring that Italian property wrongfully transferred to Germany shall be restored to Italy. There is the clause requiring the restoration of United Nations property on the basis of 66½ percent, instead of 100 percent of value—a percentage which we tried to reduce to 25 percent—and there is the critically important clause permitting these settlements to be made in local currency. There are the clauses protecting the property rights and interests of Italians in Trieste and in ceded territories. There are the clauses requiring conclusive arbitration of disputes arising under the treaty. There are the clauses denying advantages to Italy's creditors not possessed before the war. There are the clauses protecting Italian water rights on the French and Yugoslavian borders. There are the boundaries themselves which the Soviet bloc sought to drive very much farther into Italian soil. There is Trieste itself, which at least is neutral instead of being delivered to the Yugoslavs. I could go on and on. Perhaps most important, there would have been no peace conference at all except for the relentless insistence of the United States—a conference where all nations, including Italy and the other ex-enemy states, had their full, free right of consultation.

Let me add one more significant exhibit bearing upon American attitudes toward New Italy. Not only did we waive all reparation claims, but it is the announced policy of our Government to release Italian property controlled by it, whether blocked or invested. It is contemplated that arrangements will be promptly made for the unblocking and return of such property. These arrangements and relationships are now under way, and approaching a happy climax. This vital matter, from the Italian viewpoint, is covered in detail in the Acheson letter, at page 145 of the committee hearings.

Mr. President, I make no claim that this is an easy peace. Such a thing as an easy peace is impossible in the liquidation of so terrible a war. It was not an easy war, let us not forget, particularly for those European countries which were overrun and devastated by Nazi-Fascist arms. Their scars and wounds, let us not forget, are infinitely deeper than our own. It would not be human nature if their viewpoints were so objective as ours can be. Their right of consultation, however, is just as great as ours. They must ratify these treaties, as well as we. I doubt whether weighted justice is possible in such circumstances. Indeed, I doubt, in all honesty, whether justice can be specifically identified amid such complex and incompatible emotions and experiences. The best we can do is to do the best we can.

But the point I have tried to make is that this treaty is relatively an infinitely easier peace, a more just peace, for New Italy, as a result of the long

and constant intercessions of the Government of the United States. It much more nearly repays Italy, as Italy was promised, for her valiant, sacrificial aid in the latter years of the war. It much more adequately invites New Italy to the rehabilitation which shall restore her stabilities as a useful, self-sufficient, and honored member of international society.

I think it is vitally important, for the sake of New Italy herself, to stress the demonstrated fact that she has the loyal friendship of the United States. We want her to resume her own prosperous and stable independence. We want to help her back upon her own feet. We have already poured more than \$900,000,000 into postwar Italy. We are making additional appropriations this month. We shall sympathetically cooperate in every possible, practicable way in seeking to promote her sound, democratic welfare. We were her friend at London, Paris, and New York. We are her friend today. We wish to be her friend tomorrow. Her effective democratic independence is an aim we deeply cherish. The way to end uncertainty and disintegration is to end uncertainty and disintegration. The way to end war is to write the peace.

Hence, Mr. President, in my humble opinion, we must not make a helpless conundrum of Italy's destiny by rejecting or postponing the ratification of this Italian treaty. We should not fiddle while Rome burns.

I should like at this point to have inserted in the Record, Mr. President, a statement made yesterday by the Secretary of State dealing with this precise problem, and dealing with it in the same friendly, sympathetic, helpful, encouraging way in which I have undertaken to speak.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

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

The American Government naturally wishes every success for Prime Minister de Gasperi and the new Italian Government in the difficult tasks which they must face. There are many bonds between Italy and the United States, and the American people have a deep interest in the Italian welfare.

We are happy to have been of assistance in rebuilding the Italian economy and we shall continue to give aid to the Italian people, who have demonstrated their sincere and abiding faith in democratic processes for the preservation of their individual liberties and basic human rights.

PROBLEMS NOT MINIMIZED

There is no desire in the United States to minimize Italy's problems. But the Italians have already overcome many of their most immediate postwar difficulties and I feel that they may recently have been underestimating their own capacity for reconstruction.

Everyone who comes back from Italy remarks upon the vitality of the people, their will to work and their very real attachment for democracy. The world has watched with admiration and even surprise the progress which the Italians have made thus far in taking up their lives again as a free people.

I have every confidence that they will continue that progress and with the help we shall give them rebuild Italy as a free and prosperous nation.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I am frank to say that I am one of those who would have preferred one over-all European peace settlement if it had been possible. But that is water over the dam. I also am one of those who believe that there must one day be an integrated Europe, economically and politically, if the pattern for tomorrow shall be sound. This still is possible.

I further believe that we cannot wait too much longer for Soviet cooperations and consents in stabilizing western and central Europe, although common consents and cooperations are still infinitely preferable. The rest of us are entitled to just as much voluntary freedom of action on our side of the iron curtain as the Soviets and their satellites have assumed, often coercively, on their side. We cannot wait indefinitely to stabilize relationships among those who substantially think alike, and this includes the control of atomic energy. Patience is still a virtue, but not forever, particularly when time runs against us. All these things are very definitely in my mind. So is the evolution of the United Nations into more effective peace functions prayerfully desired by a vast preponderance of its membership.

But, Mr. President, I am unable to see that we hasten these or any other long-range objectives by postponing or rejecting preliminary agreements already made; by reopening yesterday's uncertainties and adding them to those of today and tomorrow; by putting ourselves and Europe and the world back 2 years in respect to certain fundamental decisions which, short of another war, require total Allied consent; by inviting suspicions regarding our own reliability in respect to peace decisions even when made by a general peace conference which we inspired; and by substituting speculation for reality.

Mr. President, we shall not reach the Hungarian Treaty until after we have concluded our consideration of the pending covenants with Italy, Rumania, and Bulgaria. But inasmuch as the Hungarian situation inevitably intrudes upon our minds and our judgments because of untoward circumstances, I would not want to conclude this discussion without my own frank disclosure to my colleagues of my own reactions to what has happened in Hungary.

The treaty with Hungary has now virtually become, in the last 10 days, a treaty with another Soviet satellite. It potentially classifies itself now with the Bulgarian and Rumanian treaties, which are with Soviet satellites. As in the cases of Bulgaria and Rumania, so also in the case of Hungary, it is necessary to have a treaty with this ex-enemy country in order to end the state of war, regardless of what their internal status may be. In the case of Hungary, there may be additional reasons, to which I shall presently advert. But recent developments in Hungary certainly add nothing but a further sense of outrage to the sensibilities of those Allied Nations which, like America, will and must continue to insist that peace with justice is the goal which we shall continue to pursue.

Nowhere have Communists more openly presented a more cynical illustration of their idea of democracy. It is an ugly travesty upon the word. Nowhere has this violation of the basic freedoms for which we were presumed to have been fighting World War II raised more definite implications of Moscow's influence in these unholy events or required more definite official inquiry to fix the facts. Otherwise, Yalta and Potsdam, to say nothing of the Atlantic Charter and the pledges of the United Nations, are contemptuously flouted and their "scraps of paper" become relics of dishonor.

Ever since the Hungarian people voted by a large majority in favor of the so-called Smallholders Party and set up a coalition government the Communist minority, mustering but 17 percent of the popular vote, has been busy undermining the coalition government, of which they were a nominal but treacherous part. Under what seems to have been the conspiring protection of occupying arms, this minority infiltrated the Government and captured the police. Three months ago they arrested the secretary-general of the Smallholders. They refused to listen to American protests. They evolved a series of subsequent police assaults upon other Smallholders, chosen to rule by the Hungarian electorate. This armed conspiracy now climaxes in the removal of the Smallholders Premier, who bargains in exile for his life. He is succeeded by one who apparently is Moscow's nominee and who will now rule a complacent satellite. The familiar pattern of infiltration and internal sabotage once more appears to have "done its stuff." If the pattern runs true to form Hungary will soon enjoy the further travesty of a rigged election to confirm these triumphs of Communist "democracy."

America cannot deal with Hungary as it deals with Greece. Hungary is an ex-enemy state. Greece is an ever-constant ally. Hungary is under armed occupation by Soviet troops pursuant to her rights under the terms of armistice. Greece is an independent state. Hungary cannot, therefore, ask or receive our aid in the Greek manner. The cases are different, though the underlying causes are much the same. They are parallel tragedies, but they cannot have parallel treatment. Yet this need not mute our voice. We need not be impotent. On the contrary, it should move us swiftly to demand the total facts. We cannot condone, by any sort of silence, what appears to be the treacherous conquest of a brave, exploited people whose independent autonomy appears to have been destroyed within a few short months by those same minorities which were overwhelmingly repudiated at the Hungarian polls. This may become, Mr. President, if the facts justify these presumptions, a clear call to trial in the forum of the United Nations; and, I repeat, if the facts justify these presumptions it will become America's duty to sound that call.

But is this a reason to reject the pending treaty with Hungary, or to have the Hungarian consideration move us toward a rejection of the treaty with Italy?

That Mr. President, is a totally different question. If rejection would help free Hungary, I would not only favor, I would demand rejection, but it seems to me that all the facts argue directly to the contrary.

Ninety days after the ratification of this treaty, all foreign troops—which means all Soviet troops—must be withdrawn from Hungary, except those necessary to protect so-called lines of communication between Russia and Austria. I hasten to say that this exception is an unhappy one, because the Soviets will measure this necessity to suit themselves. On the other hand, there is bound to be some degree of withdrawal, and it has been dependably estimated at a minimum of 50 percent. Whatever withdrawal occurs will represent vital relief for Hungary; will proportionately weaken military dictatorship, and proportionately relieve Hungarian autonomy. Here again we must assess the alternative. If we do not ratify the treaty, the Soviet control continues without any sort of interruption. If anything, the failure to ratify will be calculated to intensify this usurpation. It seems to me that inevitably it will be interpreted to these struggling and harassed Hungarian patriots as some sort of evidence that we are content to leave them at the mercy of this ugly status quo. On the other hand, ratification will restore new Hungary to an independent place, at least in theory, in the society of nations; and even the theory has its powerful, protective implications. It will make offenses against Hungary hereafter not only offenses against Hungary but also offenses against the Great Powers, against all the Allied Powers which joined in the peace conference, and against the United Nations, which Hungary will then be enabled to join. I believe the Hungarians themselves would prefer to take this latter chance.

There is nothing that could have been written into the Hungarian Treaty which would have prevented these events, which I do not hesitate to identify as a conspiracy against Hungarian autonomy. But refusal to ratify the treaty would simply extend the era of conspiracy. It would extend the time in which to complete the uninterrupted subjugation of the forces of free democracy and self-government. Ratification carries with it no presumption or suggestion that we sanction or condone events against which we have vigorously protested. It merely serves, Mr. President, in my opinion, to clarify the situation, to establish the essential preliminaries which must precede a physical peace, and to hasten the day when Hungarian democracies, if such there still be, may yet hope and expect more successfully to appeal to the conscience of the world.

So, Mr. President, I submit the four treaties to the Senate en bloc, with the immediate occasion relating only to the Italian Treaty. And I say in finality, that it would be a very solemn responsibility which the Senate would assume if these treaties should not be ratified. It would be solely our responsibility, because it would be the Senate alone which would veto the recommendations of the Council of Foreign Ministers, Peace Con-

ference, the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. For the time being, we are the court of last resort. I say again that this is no foreclosure on any Senator's complete and total right of independent judgment. But I also respectfully urge again that it should take a solid preponderance of substantial evidence to overcome these favorable presumptions, in a matter of this overwhelming concern to the peace of the world, America and all.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Treaty with Italy is before the Senate and is open to amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I wonder if I may ask the distinguished Senator from Michigan a question or two relative to the treaty.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the senior Senator from Michigan yield for a question or two by the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Oh, yes.

Mr. WHERRY. I am informed by one who has made an analysis and a study of the Italian Treaty that the total reparations which have been agreed upon amount to about \$360,000,000, of which the Soviet Union gets \$100,000,000; Yugoslavia \$125,000,000; Greece, \$105,000,000; Ethiopia, \$25,000,000; and Albania \$5,000,000.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I think that is approximately correct. I do not have the figures before me.

Mr. WHERRY. How is that to be paid in the case of Soviet Russia and Yugoslavia?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Does the Senator mean how is it to be paid to them?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The treaty very specifically indicates divers and sundry methods by which the reparations are to be paid to Russia. They are to be paid out of Italian assets in other countries that have been taken over. They are to be paid by the transfer of scrap war materials. They are to be paid ultimately out of Italian production, hedged about by the rule of conduct to which I referred in detail.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Yes.

Mr. CONNALLY. In the case of current production—

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, to clarify the situation, do I have the floor?

Mr. CONNALLY. I beg the Senator's pardon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair thinks the Senator from Michigan still has the floor, and he yielded at the request of the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yielded the floor.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I was going to supplement what the Senator from Michigan said, and call his attention to the fact that in the case of current production the raw materials must be furnished by Russia or by Yugoslavia.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is what I had in mind when I referred back to the program I described in my main address.

Mr. WHERRY. That is the very point I want to bring to the attention of the distinguished Senator from Michigan, and, of course, to the distinguished Senator from Texas, because it is my understanding that the raw materials are to be furnished by Russia, that they are to be shipped into Italy, and they are to be processed in Italy with Italian labor. Now I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Michigan—

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield for a question?

Mr. WHERRY. Once again, Mr. President, I ask, Do I have the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In order to make the situation clear, the Chair will say that the Senator from Nebraska is recognized as having the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Presiding Officer.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator speaks of Russian raw materials being shipped into Italy and manufactured.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. EASTLAND. I should like to ask the Senator from Nebraska how the raw materials can be manufactured in Italy when we are giving Mr. Tito and France Italy's entire electric-power production? Tito gets 70 percent, France gets 30 percent. And now we are giving Mr. Tito 90 percent of Italian hard coal. If those facts are true, the question is: How can the Italian factories operate unless Communist Tito permits it?

Mr. WHERRY. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Montana to answer the inquiry made by the distinguished Senator from Mississippi, because that was one of the questions I myself was going to ask the Senator.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I disagree with the figures, to begin with. I shall be very glad to produce figures which I think are accurate. I know perfectly well that Italy is not denuded of 100 percent of her electric power. On the contrary, I know that in such instances as on the French border and on the Austrian border particular care was taken to write into the treaty protection of the existing power facilities which would be still available to the Italians on the same basis as they are available to others.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. If the Senator would kindly give me the facts as to the amount of Italian electric-power production that is retained, I should like to have them.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I shall be very glad to ask for a statement on that subject.

Mr. EASTLAND. I have been informed that 30 percent of Italy's electric-power production goes to France, and 70 percent to Mr. Tito.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I disagree completely with those net results, because I know of the instances where we very carefully protected the Italian use of electric power, even though the plants

involved were in territory transferred to other countries.

Mr. EASTLAND. That being true, if there is an agreement by Mr. Tito and Mr. Stalin that Italy can still secure the electric power, I want to know if we can enforce it, and I certainly would like to know if the Senator from Michigan would place any confidence in a promise made by Mr. Tito and Mr. Stalin.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, the Senator from Mississippi can state the case as prejudicially as he wishes. This is a treaty for whose integrity the Government of the United States, the Government of Great Britain, the Government of France, and the governments of 16 other allies, in addition to Mr. Tito and Mr. Stalin, are responsible. So far as I am concerned, Mr. Stalin and Mr. Tito are unavoidably partners to this treaty, and there is not any way that I know of that the distinguished Senator from Mississippi can cut them out of their right of possession unless he is prepared to send the American Army in by way of ouster.

Mr. EASTLAND. The simple question I ask the Senator is: If they get Italy's electric power resources, and if they have promised to transport some of that power back to Italy, how are we going to enforce that promise? Clearly, the promise is worthless.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Now the Senator is referring solely to power. I do not wish him to misunderstand me. He is referring solely to power on the border. I deny that there is such a 100 percent transfer of power or coal.

Mr. EASTLAND. Well, if it is 50 percent.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Very well. I do not know what the percentage is, but I shall find out for the Senator, and he will be authentically advised.

Mr. EASTLAND. What are Mr. Tito's and Mr. Stalin's words worth?

Mr. WHERRY. That is right.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator from Nebraska says, "That is right," and I say, "that is right." I also say that that is the kind of a world we are in, and that this is the best we can do toward starting those physical boundaries and establishing that physical status upon which there must be mutual agreement, unless we are willing to start now to fight it out with them, and that after that basis is established, it remains for the Senator from Mississippi and the Senator from Nebraska and the Senator from Michigan to decide for themselves on their consciences how far they are willing to go to meet a challenge from Mr. Tito or Mr. Stalin. And we do not escape, I suggest to the Senator from Mississippi, any such challenge by running away from this treaty.

Mr. EASTLAND. But how can we start the rehabilitation of which the Senator speaks when we make the entire Italian economy subject to the whims of Tito?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I disagree completely with the Senator's statement.

Mr. EASTLAND. How much of the Italian coal production goes to Yugoslavia?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I shall give the figures to the Senator. I do not have them with me at the moment.

Mr. EASTLAND. Our State Department states that Italy loses 90 percent of her hard coal and 65 percent of her brown coal and soft coal.

Mr. VANDENBERG. There is no doubt in the world that the areas in the Istrian Peninsula which are transferred include a dominant portion of the Italian coal supply. There is not any doubt about that. Neither is there any doubt about the fact—

Mr. EASTLAND. That coal goes to Yugoslavia.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Yes, I would think so; and I do not know how the Senator is going to take it away from her, either.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Michigan a question. Let me put it this way: I noticed that the Senator from Michigan referred to the fact that we could not much longer delay making a separate peace with Germany. I think I understood the Senator to say that we could not delay that settlement too long.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I agree. That is what I said.

Mr. McMAHON. In view of that situation which faces us, does not the Senator feel that perhaps a similar settlement with Italy would be indicated?

Mr. VANDENBERG. It could. I am not sure that I clearly follow the Senator's question.

Mr. McMAHON. What I am trying to point out to the Senator is that, if we have to go to the length of making a separate peace with Germany, it would seem to me to be at least arguable that we would do better to withhold action on this treaty. I am not clear in my own mind that that is so, but I merely put the question for the consideration of the Senator, as to whether it would not be better to delay the ratification of this treaty until we come back in January, to see whether or not we shall have made any progress in the German situation.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield to me to reply to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I thought I had fully covered the Senator's question in my original statement, but I shall be very glad to repeat myself to this extent: I suppose that the most competent witness in the world to respond to the Senator is Secretary of State Marshall, inasmuch as he is the one who has confronted the recent difficulties in negotiating with some of our Allied friends. Upon him rests the necessity for further negotiation. It is Secretary Marshall's categorical statement, as I have quoted it, that, in his opinion, he cannot even proceed further with any degree of hope whatever to negotiate in respect to Germany and Italy if he goes with a record behind

him of a refusal by the United States Senate even to approve the limited agreements to which we have already subscribed our faith.

Mr. McMAHON. I thank the Senator. I think that point needs emphasizing.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield to me so that I may ask the Senator from Michigan a question?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Is it not a fact that the treaty between Italy and Russia has already been ratified?

Mr. WHERRY. Ratified by whom?

Mr. TYDINGS. The point is that it does not need ratification. My idea is that when the Russians signed this treaty it was tantamount to ratification.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Is the Senator referring to the pending treaty?

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Soviets have not formally ratified this treaty. Great Britain has. It is expected that France will do so within a fortnight. There is no information regarding the Soviet attitude.

Mr. TYDINGS. In the event the United States did not ratify the treaty, and in the event the remaining signatories thereto all ratified or confirmed the treaty, would there be any way in the world that we could recapture for Italy, in that impasse, the coal and other advantages which she has had to let go under this treaty?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I do not know how they could be recaptured. On the contrary—and I repeat myself to this extent—I believe that if the tremendously treacherous area between Italy and Yugoslavia, the area which is in such bitter controversy, were left for another 6 months in a state of inconclusive flux, subject to all the techniques of infiltration and indirect control and subjugation for which our Communist friends are so well adapted and in which they have had so much experience, there would not be the slightest hope on earth even of a neutral Trieste.

Mr. TYDINGS. What I am driving at is this: I take it that there are many things in the treaty which the Senator from Michigan and other Senators would like to see otherwise. But the practical consideration which confronts us all is, Is it possible in the case of Italy, the world being in the shape it is in, for us to do anything about it? Is there anything we can do about it, to make the Italian lot easier, and to make the things she has surrendered less than the treaty provides?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I know of no answer to the Senator's question.

Mr. TYDINGS. We are face to face with a situation which we do not like in large measure. What I am thinking about is, What can I, as a Senator, do about it? I am forced to answer my own question in the light of the Senator's explanation by saying that I do not know of anything I can do about it, with Russia on one side, Britain on the other side, and we ourselves over here debating the Italian Treaty on the floor of the Senate. If any Senator can give us an approach that will make the situation better than it is, I certainly am all ears. He is the

man I am waiting to hear. But so far I have been unable to reason out any program by which I could help to improve upon the present treaty.

Mr. VANDENBERG. As usual, I think the Senator from Maryland is right on the beam. I could write myself a questionnaire, to be addressed to the Senator from Michigan, in connection with this debate, asking questions regarding these treaties which would be very difficult for the Senator from Michigan to answer. I could present challenges which would be highly prejudicial to the Italian treaty. That is what seems to happen in these unhappy days when we must liquidate a horrible war, with no available answer which is easy and pleasant for all. I respectfully submit that the thing which ought to be presented by way of argument against the ratification of these treaties is precisely what the able Senator from Maryland indicates—a better plan. I thank the Senator.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. In connection with the question of the Senator from Maryland, I should like to ask the Senator from Michigan whether it is not pertinent to recall the statement of Secretary Byrnes, that the treaty itself contains an invitation to future developments which would be generally favorable to Italy. Is not that correct?

Mr. VANDENBERG. There is no question about that. I undertook to underscore that point in the observations I originally made.

Mr. LODGE. Would the Senator from Michigan agree with the Senator from Massachusetts in hoping that as the future develops, that feature of the treaty will offer an opportunity for better conditions for Italy as time goes on?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I completely agree with the able Senator. I simply wish to add that it seems to me that the opportunity for the new Italy lies in helpful evolution, through the various instrumentalities which are available as a result of having set down the initial foundations upon which to start to rebuild; and I am unable to see that there is remotely as good a chance for the new Italy to rebuild without these foundations.

Mr. LODGE. That is what the Senator wants to do.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is what we all want to do.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. McGRATH. I should like to address a question to the Senator from Michigan. Is it not a fact that ratification of this treaty is essential before Italy can be admitted to full membership in the United Nations?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Oh, yes; that is indispensable.

Mr. McGRATH. How long after ratification would it be possible for Italy to be received into full membership.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I should think that through the necessary hospitality of the United Nations it could be done at

the next session of the General Assembly and the Security Council, this fall.

Mr. McGRATH. Does the Senator believe that the admission of Italy to the family of nations known as the United Nations would serve to strengthen the hand of the democracies in that great body?

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator means the democracies in the United Nations?

Mr. McGRATH. That is correct.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I want to be completely frank with the Senator in my reply. That would depend entirely upon the ultimate evolution of Italy's internal government. Italy is free, under our concept of autonomy, to choose her own government. My expectation would be, based, it seems to me, upon reasonable premises, that Italy will develop democratically if given any remotely reasonable encouragement, under which circumstances most emphatically the answer to the Senator's question would be yes.

Mr. McGRATH. Would it not follow that unreasonable delay or the denial of Italy's right to participate in the councils of the world might have a strong tendency to drive her toward the communistic viewpoint?

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is my point of view, and that is my opinion.

Mr. McGRATH. Is the Senator planning during the course of the debate to enlighten the Senate a little more fully upon the part that Italy might play in order to protect her own interest from within the council of nations rather than from without? Assuming we ratify the treaty and Italy becomes a member, would she not then be in position to do much more for herself than we as her friend could do for her?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I should like to say to the Senator what I neglected to say, that Italy has already made request for membership in the United Nations.

Mr. McGRATH. I understand that.

Mr. VANDENBERG. It seems to me that everything the Senator has said is so in respect to her increased opportunities for preserving her own independence, her own autonomy, and her own place in the world, when once she achieves this new status.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. In the event that the treaty is finally ratified, has the Senator, in his explorations, found any mechanism which would not be in the nature of a crippling reservation, which could be used after or accompanying ratification to hold the door open to a more kindly consideration of Italy's plight?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I do not see how anything of the sort can be done textually. So far as a more sympathetic or friendly consideration of Italy's plight is concerned, I am frank to say that I do not know how there could have been a more sympathetic or friendly consideration, so far as the attitudes of the Peace Conference and the attitudes of 75 percent of the Council of Foreign Ministers were concerned. On the basis of the facts I submitted regarding reparations, for instance, I am unable to believe that any

sort of renegotiation could hope to produce any easier terms. On the contrary, I should think renegotiation would be just as likely to stir up all of the appetites which were so evident in the beginning of our original negotiations over these treaties, and that we would find ourselves far from confronting the sole question as to whether Italy is to have more favorable terms. We could easily confront the alternative: a demand for far less easy terms.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, the Senator has been very kind, and I shall not detain him further. I should like, however, to summarize the situation and see whether the Senator agrees with me: We are confronted first, with the fact that it is this treaty or no treaty at all; and, second, if we ratify this treaty, there has already been explored the possibility of lessening its more harsh features, and the possibilities resulting from that exploration show that there is very little which statesmanship can now conceive, for the time being, to improve on the provisions affecting Italy which are set forth in the treaty.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is true, plus the fact, I repeat, that inherent in the situation are at least available formulae for future review and revision as the facts may ultimately justify.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is the one ray of hope that permeates the arrangement by which Italy may improve her lot. There is nothing else visible in the picture. Does the Senator agree?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I know of nothing else.

Mr. TYDINGS. In conclusion, I should say that if I should finally vote to ratify this treaty, I would do so in a spirit of great regret that more favorable terms in some respects of the treaty could not be found, and with no reflection on the negotiators, who evidently did the best they could do with an impossible situation; but I should also want to say that if opportunity comes in the future to soften some of the terms of this Italian treaty, I believe I would look on that generally with favor, because I am of the opinion that the Italian people are not warlike, but were the victims of a dictator who carried them in the main much further than most of them would perhaps have wanted to go under a more kindly and more democratic avenue of expression.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. FLANDERS. I wish to ask an elementary question of the Senator from Michigan: Is Italy's signature to the treaty necessary?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I would think so; yes.

Mr. FLANDERS. Is it assured?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I do not think anything is assured, I say to the Senator, in this highly unassured world. I certainly would underwrite nothing in respect to international relations 5 minutes hence.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, before the 5 minutes have elapsed, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator to go back to the question of reparations. But

before I ask about that, I again make the premise that I also was informed, as was the distinguished Senator from Mississippi, that the power and coal necessary for the operations would be apportioned to Tito on approximately the same basis as the Senator suggested. Regardless of whether that percentage changes, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator if it is true that the treaty makes it mandatory for Italy to furnish the labor to fabricate the raw materials and also to provide a certain amount of the coal and the power which are necessary in that connection; and, if that is so, I ask whether such a requirement places a considerable mortgage upon the backs of the Italian people in their efforts to work their way out?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Yes, certainly, and I do not know how a nation could emerge from a war as a defeated nation, in the first half of its experience in that connection, without confronting some such situation as that.

Mr. WHERRY. I suppose that if we followed that process all the way through to a conclusion, we might make even harsher terms. But what leads me to the next question is the fact that, as I believe, Russia did not have one soldier on Italian soil. She did not; did she?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Not that I know of.

Mr. WHERRY. Yet Russia—not the United States of America—is the one who is insisting upon harsher terms.

Mr. VANDENBERG. It does not make any difference whether the Russians were on Italian soil. The important fact is that Italians were on Russian soil.

Mr. WHERRY. But the important fact is that no Russians were on Italian soil, and it is not the Russians who should now be dominating this treaty?

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Russians are not dominating this treaty.

Mr. WHERRY. Let me ask the Senator this question: In the light of what the distinguished Senator from Mississippi has already said, how in the world can Italy pay reparations unless she receives gifts and loans from the United States?

Mr. VANDENBERG. As I have indicated, the terms are that the reparations shall begin 2 years hence, shall last for 7 years, and shall amount to \$100,000,000 for Russia, which will be approximately \$15,000,000 a year for 7 years. They constitute about the smallest reparations ever provided for, I think, in respect to a major conflict of this nature. I do not contemplate that that \$15,000,000 a year, beginning 2 years hence, under all the other restrictions that are involved, threatens the economic life of new Italy.

Mr. WHERRY. That brings up another question: As I understand the situation, Italy will continue to pay until the excess of the value of the finished products over the value of the raw materials sent her by Russia amounts to the reparations figure. Is that correct?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Would the Senator mind telling me what he is reading from?

Mr. WHERRY. I am reading from some memoranda I have prepared in or-

der that I may ask the Senator a few questions.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I understand.

Mr. WHERRY. But if the memoranda in anywise interfere, I shall place them on the desk, and shall ask the question in my own words only: I wish to know when the determination is finally to be made in regard to when the excess of the value of the finished products over the value of the raw materials sent to Italy by Russia will amount to the reparations figure. I understand that the Senator from Michigan thinks that will occur in 7 years.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am unable to follow the Senator's question, although I am very anxious to answer anything he wishes to ask.

Mr. WHERRY. I shall elucidate. The distinguished Senator from Michigan has said that he thinks this process will be over in 7 years, at the rate of so many millions of dollars a year. As I understand the terms of the treaty, Russia will have a right to continue to send raw materials into Italy, and those raw materials must be processed by Italian labor.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Does the Senator mean in addition to the reparations?

Mr. WHERRY. I am now speaking about the reparations figure.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Is everything the Senator is asking within the reparations figure?

Mr. WHERRY. It is.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I know of no answer to give the Senator except that for the 7 years there is an obligation in the amount of \$100,000,000, which amounts to approximately \$15,000,000 a year.

Mr. WHERRY. Certainly.

Mr. VANDENBERG. And that is to be worked out, wherever possible on a basis of having raw materials sent into Italy—

Mr. WHERRY. And having fabricated materials go out from Italy?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Yes; and on the basis of having fabricated materials go back to Russia.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. VANDENBERG. So Italy will not be required to draw upon her almost empty treasury or her exchange resources in order to buy the raw materials which she will fabricate for the purpose of paying the reparations.

Mr. WHERRY. Certainly.

Mr. VANDENBERG. All of which, of course, the Senator recognizes as being a great advantage for Italy, as compared with an arrangement which lacked that provision.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. President, let me say that is the point I am trying to reach, and it is the one upon which I should like to have light. It is my understanding that that arrangement will continue to operate until the excess value of the fabricated products sent back to Russia, over the value of the raw materials sent into Italy, when they were sent in, will amount to the value of the reparations for Russia provided in the treaty. I wish to know how the Senator from Michigan knows that that will be done in 7 years.

Furthermore, I should like to know who is to determine what the value is?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I can answer that question for the Senator: If there is any disagreement whatever respecting any phase of the interpretation, if there is any requirement for an adjudication of the terms, it will be the responsibility of the four Allied ambassadors in Rome.

Mr. WHERRY. Of which Russia has one Ambassador.

Mr. VANDENBERG. And of which we have one Ambassador, and our veto is just as good as Russia's.

Mr. WHERRY. Certainly. But if our veto then is no more good than our veto now, I do not see how we shall arrive at a determination of the value of those goods.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I see. What would the Senator from Nebraska do about it?

Mr. WHERRY. In the first place, I think there certainly should be some restriction with regard to how long that process could continue. I think there should be some way to determine the value of the exported fabricated goods, because if no value is placed on them in the treaty, and if Russia is given the right to determine when the excess has been reached, or when the reparations have been paid, it might be found that that would not be done in 7 years; it might be 15 years. The Russians could continue to revalue the difference between the value of the raw materials sent into Italy and the value of the exports of fabricated goods.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am totally unable to follow the Senator. I am sorry; it must be my fault.

Mr. WHERRY. Then let me ask the Senator this question: What becomes of the raw materials that go into Italy from Russia?

Mr. VANDENBERG. They are fabricated and sent back.

Mr. WHERRY. What value is placed on them when they come in?

Mr. VANDENBERG. The language is:

4. The Soviet Union shall furnish to Italy on commercial terms the materials which are normally imported into Italy and which are needed for the production of these goods. Payments for these materials shall be made by deducting the value of the materials furnished from the value of the goods delivered to the Soviet Union.

The measure of value is "commercial terms."

Mr. WHERRY. Arranged by whom?

Mr. VANDENBERG. By the Soviet Union and Italy, with an appeal to the four Ambassadors in the event of a disagreement.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator. I have already read that in the treaty. I think my question is very intelligent and scarcely needs clarification because it is my theory that Russia could continue to make changes and to manipulate those values until she could continue to draw reparations from Italy that would far exceed the \$100,000,000 for a length of time far exceeding the number of years now specified, to wit, 7, during which Russia would have a mortgage on the labor of Italy and also would have a mortgage on Italy's production of the

coal and power that would be needed to produce those fabricated goods.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am sure that is the Senator's view, but it is not my view. I can only say again that if any such abortion were to occur, it would have to be underwritten by the American Ambassador in Rome.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator another question, if he will yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska has the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. I mean I wish to have the Senator yield for a question.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask this question: This treaty was written prior to the time when we apparently changed our foreign policy toward Russia. Does the Senator feel that if the provisions of the treaty were written today, there would be any change in our attitude toward Italy, and would there be any difference between the terms of the treaty now before us and the terms of a new treaty written under those conditions between the four Governments and Italy?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Let us take the Senator's premise first, because we would have to agree upon that. The Senator says this treaty was written after our foreign policy changed with respect to Russia.

Mr. WHERRY. No; I said before it changed.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Very well; the Senator from Nebraska says that this treaty was written before our foreign policy changed with respect to Russia.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. VANDENBERG. So far as the Senator from Michigan is concerned, he has had only one policy toward Russia, although he suspects that he did not state it orally on the floor of the Senate until he returned from the first meeting of the General Assembly, in London, which was in February 1946. It has been said that the new policy with Russia, which, let us say, is a policy of friendly firmness—which is an understatement—commenced with my speech on the floor of the Senate when I returned from the first General Assembly, and the address, 24 hours later, by the distinguished then Secretary of State, Mr. Byrnes, I think before the Foreign Policy Association, in New York. That was in February 1946. The negotiation of this treaty started in April 1946. Therefore, if the Senator from Nebraska bases his question on the calendar which I have indicated, I would say the answer is "No," and that the policy with Russia to which he refers antedates even the beginning of the negotiation of this treaty.

Furthermore, I add, in answering the final portion of the Senator's question, that in the 213 days we sat across the table from Molotov, last year, I know of no single instance where the effort of the United States was not relentlessly pressed for the American point of view, in respect to what it believed to be justice in regard to this settlement. It would be absurd to say that we always won our point of view; but I think anyone familiar with

the record would have to agree by way of verdict that we were amazingly successful in what I consider to be the appropriate approach to the Russian question, the appropriate approach being, not one of aggressive belligerence, but one of unyielding allegiance to certain fundamental essentials which shall be stated in a fashion which indicates that we mean what we say, and which shall be accepted, I hope sooner or later, on the basis that we say what we mean.

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

Mr. WHERRY. Let me finish this inquiry. In view of the fact that so much was accomplished in those deliberations, such as the reduction and the scaling down of the reparations, does the Senator feel that if we attacked this problem with the distinguished Senator from Michigan spearheading it with all his zeal, we might not now get a better peace treaty with Russia than that outlined in the provisions of the treaty which is now before the Senate.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator means the treaty for Italy?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; and I am inquiring whether the Senator feels better terms might not be obtained from Russia in the treaty we are writing for Italy?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I do not.

Mr. WHERRY. I yield now to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does not the Senator from Nebraska feel that if we cannot get a better treaty from Russia for Italy, it will be necessary to make a separate treaty of peace with Italy, a treaty of peace which will protect the Italian economy, which will permit the Italians to earn a living, and not leave them a prey to communism and place the Italian economy at the mercy of the Communists, as this treaty does?

Mr. WHERRY. I wonder if the distinguished Senator from Michigan would answer that question.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am very sorry; I did not exactly comprehend the question.

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senator does not mind, I shall make an observation, and then ask a question. The distinguished Senator from Mississippi has asked the Senator whether he does not feel that, if this treaty were not ratified, as time went on the United States could make a separate treaty with Italy, and in doing so afford Italy better protection, so far as her economy was concerned, than is done in the treaty before us; that we could provide for Italy the basis upon which Italy could establish a democratic government, and not be infiltrated by Communists, as it no doubt will be under the pending treaty, with its provisions and terms.

Mr. EASTLAND. In that regard, Mr. President, I should like to make a statement. The Senator from Michigan has questioned some figures on power production and coal production.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Let us answer the other question first; shall we?

Mr. EASTLAND. My present question is related. I want to make clear what the Senator from Nebraska said.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Very well.

Mr. EASTLAND. I quote an advertisement inserted in the RECORD by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] on April 21 last:

The treaty gives Tito's Communist government all but one of Italy's coal mines.

The treaty also gives to Tito all of Italy's bauxite mines in Istria, and nearly all of the great hydroelectric plants developed by Italy in Istria since the last world war.

We have just voted to give \$300,000,000 to Greece. One of the arguments used in support of the gift, or loan, was that if we did not make it, and save Greece from the pressures of communism, there would be a general reaction, that Italy would next be swept into the Communist orbit, and the Middle East would fall. One of the considerations of the loan was the desire to prevent Italy becoming a Communist satellite; that was one of the reasons; yet here we are, a few days later, asked to ratify a treaty of peace which would turn Italy's coal resources, and largely her electric-power resources, over to Tito, and make it impossible for her economy to function.

The question was, Does not the Senator from Michigan think that if we would hold off and make a separate treaty of peace which would save those resources for Italy, this country's interest would be better protected?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I will see if I can remember the sum total of the inquiry.

My first answer is that the impossibility of making a better treaty with Italy it seems to me is self-evident. The Senator from Mississippi says, Why should we not make a separate treaty with Italy which would be more favorable to her? Let us see how that would work. Let us say that the Senator from Mississippi is making the treaty the way he wants to make it, and he gives the bauxite mines to Italy, and we sign the treaty with Italy. Italy has the bauxite mines, so far as we are concerned, under our treaty. Yugoslavia and Russia come along and say, "Well, now you have made a separate treaty with the United States; make a separate treaty with us, and the basis upon which we want to make a separate treaty is to have those bauxite mines in Yugoslavia."

Under those circumstances, who liquidates the question as to who gets the bauxite mines, unless we put the American Army in to settle it?

Mr. EASTLAND. The answer to that question is, Yugoslavia and Russia are not going to invade Italy so long as American soldiers are there.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, that is a very comforting theory in one aspect, and a very disturbing one in another. The premise which the Senator now poses depends upon American arms in Italy as a substitute for a treaty, and so far as I am concerned, I am not prepared to face the indefinite armed occupation of Italy, the indefinite armed defense of Italy against Russian and Yugoslavian claims, when there is an alternative available which at least sets a limitation upon the responsibilities which we confront.

I say to the Senator again that I am unable to fathom how to make a separate treaty of peace respecting matters which inevitably involve multilateral

decisions. Who is to decide what happens in Trieste? We cannot decide for ourselves. As a matter of fact, if we waited 6 months, as some Senators would apparently like to have us do, before we even negotiated a treaty with Italy, I suspect we would find that by that time Trieste was so effectively infiltrated under the Hungarian formula that it would not make much difference whether we set up a free state and called it neutral or not.

In other words, what I am saying to the Senator is that the answer to his question always requires an assessment of the alternative. I may be all wrong, and the Senator may be entirely correct, and if the Senator is right in his judgment, he certainly should vote against the ratification of this treaty. I do not press my view upon him at all. I merely say to him that my view is that the situation which he so fears will so infinitely deteriorate during the next 6 months without a treaty, and will so infinitely multiply the hazards and jeopardies for Italy, that the net result will be nothing short of tragic. Therefore I shall vote to ratify the treaty.

Mr. EASTLAND. I cannot see how the situation would deteriorate if we did not have a treaty. Under the pending treaty, we are giving Italy's natural resources to an enemy state.

Mr. VANDENBERG. To what enemy state?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yugoslavia.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is not an enemy state.

Mr. EASTLAND. Legally, technically, no; in reality, it is.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I have given the Senator my answer.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator answer this question? If we should ratify this treaty and there should be the wholesale infiltration which it is said by many of those who are opposing the treaty there might be, what difference, so far as the bauxite mines are concerned, would there be between that action and the making of a separate treaty?

Mr. VANDENBERG. There would be a good deal of difference.

Mr. WHERRY. What would be the difference?

Mr. VANDENBERG. The difference would be that we would have challenged, first, the signatories in the Council of Foreign Ministers, three of which at least would be ignored in this action. We would have challenged 18 of the 21 nations in the Peace Conference.

Mr. WHERRY. They ratified it.

Mr. VANDENBERG. They have nothing to do with ratification.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. VANDENBERG. It would be a situation which certainly would challenge the other fundamentals of the United Nations. In my opinion, it would be a situation which would be sufficiently repressive, so that the danger to Italy would be infinitely less than if the whole situation is left in the present state of flux and uncertainty, with the obvious disintegration which is going on.

Mr. WHERRY. What is the difference between signing a separate peace with

Italy and signing a separate peace with Germany?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Oh, there is a very great deal of difference.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to have the Senator explain that.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I shall be very glad to explain it. In the first place, when I have spoken about a separate peace with Germany, I have spoken about a separate peace involving those areas of Germany which are under the control of like-thinking allies; let us say the British, the Americans, and the French. I have never talked about a separate peace with Germany which would undertake to involve the Russian area of Germany. Therefore, I am talking about an agreement between those who have a disposition and a will to agree, and who have sufficiently common ideas so that there is a likelihood of agreeing. I submit to the Senator that is a totally different concept from undertaking a separate peace with another independent nation which, in turn, is at the mercy of other nations; which would not be the situation in connection with the German peace I have been describing.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, would the Senator from Nebraska let me ask the senior Senator from Michigan a question?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does the Senator from Michigan think that in the future, whether we like it or not, there will be two worlds?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am not prepared to answer that question, because, as I indicated a little earlier, I would not undertake to be a prophet for 5 minutes in respect to what is going to happen on this painful and unhappy earth. The Senator knows what my dedications and hopes are. I still hope and pray, and still have some degree of belief, that it is possible to create in the United Nations a common, functioning conscience of this earth which can make itself effective in behalf of peace with justice. Whether or not that is a vain hope, time alone will tell; but I am very proud still at least to nurse the hope.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator has done fine work, and I congratulate him. But does not the Senator believe at this time, then, that we shall have two worlds in the future?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I decline to answer the question, because I am not in possession of sufficient facts, any more than is the Senator from Mississippi, or any other living man, to know the undisclosed events of day after tomorrow in our international relationships. If it be necessary to confront the concept of two worlds, I am prepared to confront the concept. I do not want to confront that concept until the last possible opportunity to avoid it has been exhausted, and I do not think we have yet exhausted the alternative.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does the Senator think that the Italian settlement should go over, then, until there is a general European settlement, to see whether or not we shall have one world, and then, if there are to be two worlds, draw that line definitely, so that Italy will not fall within the Communist orbit?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I think if we stood here all afternoon, apparently we should have no meeting of minds in respect to the Senator's reiterated question, would it not be better for Italy if we waited for 6 months before ratifying the treaty? I can only reiterate that in my opinion, and in the opinion of the Secretary of State—which is far more important; infinitely more important—a delay of 6 months, a continuation of the existing uncertainty and flux in these highly controversial and prejudicial areas, will not only result in Italy's tremendous disadvantage, but is well calculated, in the words of Secretary Marshall, to make any sort of hopeful approach to an Austrian and German treaty almost impossible.

Mr. WHERRY. One question right at that point, Mr. President, if the Senator from Michigan will yield further for a question. If the treaty is ratified, and there is infiltration in Italy, such as has been made, apparently, in Hungary, would the Senator be in favor of the United States continuing to loan money to Italy, to make good on this treaty, for Italy's payment of reparations to Russia?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I decline to answer on a premise to which I disagree, to begin with.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator accept my premise?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I decline to accept the Senator's premise.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well. Then I ask the Senator to state his own premise, and to answer, please.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I have stated my own premise so often, and answered it, that I do not know which one the Senator wishes me to repeat.

Mr. WHERRY. What I want to know is, if this treaty is ratified and there is a wholesale infiltration into Italy, would the Senator be in favor of continuing to make loans to Italy with which to pay reparations to Russia? That premise, I think, is in the minds of many Senators, because I made the statement when I returned from Europe that I did not feel that I would ever vote for an appropriation or for the ratification of a peace treaty that would compel the taxpayers of the United States to pay reparations indirectly to Russia. We are asked to accept a peace treaty here, pursuant to which apparently the United States will have to loan money to Italy, to enable Italy to make good on the settlement of reparations.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, may I repeat that the reparations involved amount to slightly less than \$15,000,000 a year for 7 years? I do not think Italy is going to require any loans in order to pay \$15,000,000 a year in reparations out of current production. On the other hand, it would be just as fair to suggest to the Senator that any estimated degree of expense to American taxpayers—which might be involved in this relationship, I freely admit, at some point—any burden which the American taxpayer confronts in that aspect is nothing compared to the burden that the American taxpayer confronts, if the theory of some Senators is followed, and

we keep the American Army in perpetual occupation of Italy. That is where the American taxpayer will meet the bill.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point for a question?

Mr. WHERRY. I shall yield in a moment.

I do not want the distinguished Senator from Michigan even to assume that I have advocated keeping an American Army in Italy, because that is one thing I have not done. The only thing I have said is, What is the difference between a separate peace and one in which we permit legally the infiltration of communism into Italy? I ask that, especially in view of the fact that we have loaned \$400,000,000 to Greece and Turkey, and provided a total for Greece and Turkey of approximately \$800,000,000—among other things, for a military installation, which I call intervention—in an effort to stop the threat of communism. We shall certainly have to loan money to Italy to enable her to pay the reparations, on the theory that we are to assist Italy in establishing a sound government. It seems to me that the theory upon which it is based, is to enable Italy to pay the reparations, and so that she may turn her face westward, and attempt to set up a democratic government. When the first loan is made to Italy, the Senator from Michigan knows it will not be merely the first \$100,000,000. Italy will want \$100,000,000, and then she will want another \$100,000,000, and other hundreds of millions in order to stabilize her economy. I repeat, especially in view of the fact that we are lending money to Greece and Turkey for the very purpose of military intervention, and that we are here loaning money to Italy with which to pay reparations, would the Senator advocate continuing to loan money to Italy, on the basis of an understanding that from such loans reparations are to be paid to Russia? I think it is a fair question. I think that certainly Senators are entitled to know the answer. I am not a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations. I have not heard these matters discussed. I did not sit across the table from Molotov for 213 days. I did not trade any mules with him. But I want to say here that I represent the State of Nebraska and the people of the United States of America, and I have many letters in my files protesting against the ratification of the treaty. The protests are based on the fact that it mortgages Italian labor, that it would give up the Italian coal and the Italian electric power, when the Italian people themselves need it to stabilize themselves. Are we going to continue to make loans to Italy or to any other country—there are some other countries to be considered in this connection—so that they may continue to pay reparations to Russia, simply because Russia exacts the pound of flesh and the United States does not? I think that is a fair question.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Well, what is the question? I should like to answer it and sit down. Have I not answered it?

Mr. WHERRY. No, the Senator has not answered it; and I have asked it in good faith. I think I am entitled to know about the matters concerning which I have asked questions. Too often treaties have been brought on the

floor of the Senate, or other matters have been placed before us, and we have been told "This is it, and this is what you ought to take." Certainly those of us who want to find out what it really is we are asked to vote upon have the right to ask pertinent questions of those who are responsible for the legislation. I think it is only proper that such questions should be asked.

Mr. VANDENBERG. May I interrupt the Senator?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. VANDENBERG. To inquire whether in the course of the debates of the last few months he has been curtailed in any fashion in his cross-examinations of the Senator from Michigan ad infinitum.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator has been very, very generous to me, and I want to thank him for it.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I did not want any impression to be created that the Senator has been in any wise curtailed in his questions.

Mr. WHERRY. I want to say that if I had not cross-examined the Senator I would not have obtained the information I wanted. I would not have supported IRO if it had not been that on the basis of answers to exhaustive questions which I addressed to the distinguished Senator from Michigan I was convinced on the floor of the Senate that I should support the IRO. But I would not have reached such a conclusion if I had not continued to ask questions of the Senator from Michigan.

I am not sure what the Senator has in mind respecting the length of the debate over the treaty, or whether the few questions which have been asked since 1:30 o'clock today are too exhaustive. I certainly do not want to try the Senator's patience too much. But I still think, as one representing the people of a great State, and as a Senator of the United States, that it is entirely proper for me to submit such a question as that which I have asked of the distinguished Senator from Michigan, which is whether the Senator feels that we should continue to make loans to countries who must pay reparations to Russia, the reparations to be paid from such loans. Should we continue to do so, or should we at this time consider the subject and decide upon some other policy?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I tried to answer the Senator, I thought, many times, in response to that specific question.

Mr. WHERRY. I have not heard the answer.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The answer is in the first instance that I know of no loans which have been made or are contemplated to be made for the purpose of paying reparations. And inasmuch as the reparations scale down to less than \$15,000,000 a year, and since they involve primarily Italian labor rather than resources which require loans or investments, I would not think that the amount involved in Italian reparations by any stretch of the imagination could involve the question of American loans. Now, how can I answer the Senator any more distinctly and definitely than that?

Mr. WHERRY. I wish to say to the distinguished Senator from Michigan that he has gone clear around the ques-

tion and answered it in a round-about way. In effect he has said, "I do not know how it could happen. I cannot even conceive of it." But I will say, in concluding this particular line of questioning, that it is my judgment that a proposal for a loan to Italy will come before the Senate of the United States. It will be asked for in behalf of the Italian people so that they may be able to maintain their government, to maintain their economy. Certainly a part of such a loan, if it should be approved by the Senate, and made to Italy, will go toward payment of reparations to Russia, which are provided for in this treaty.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. I should like to ask the senior Senator from Michigan this question. In considering the amount the Italians are to pay each year, I heard the sum of \$15,000,000 mentioned quite often.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I averaged the \$100,000,000 to be paid to Russia over 7 years. We were discussing the payment to Russia.

Mr. MALONE. Yes. The Italians will have to pay it all during the 7 years.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Yes.

Mr. MALONE. Then it will be about \$14,000,000 a year.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Yes.

Mr. MALONE. Have any estimates been made as to the number of days' work which will be required in order for the Italians to pay the reparations due to Russia, Greece, and other countries—the total sum involved?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I do not know.

Mr. MALONE. I should like to make an observation in that respect. It seems to me that is the first thing which should be considered. Wages in most countries are figured on a subsistence basis. In other words, laborers make the amount of money it takes to provide them and their families a living, and we know that Italy is now on the bottom. Italy is starting from scratch again. So it seems to me that the number of days of labor which would be required over the 7-year period to pay the reparations would have to be paid for by someone during that period. From where would the money come? Has the Foreign Relations Committee considered that subject? It seems to me the money must come from the people while they are performing their work.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, this is an infinitesimally small segment of the total Italian economy. The Foreign Relations Committee certainly has not figured out how the Italian economy is going to sustain itself during the next 7 years. The Italian economy is an infinitely broader problem—I suppose multiplied by 10,000, compared with this particular problem. I should say that the maintenance of Italian economy is an over-all problem and not a segmentary problem, if there is such a word.

Mr. MALONE. I think there is such a word. I also would like to pursue that theory a little further, since requests for loans have been coming before the Senate very regularly. We understand there are proposals for other loans coming to us. I join with the Senator from Nebraska. I really expect that when the

payments of reparations begin to bog down, and when the labor cannot be paid for in other ways, we will be asked for a loan to maintain Italy's national integrity, so the Italian Government can make good with its people, and so again we can keep them from falling into communism. All that we expect. Therefore, I want to join with other Senators who think that it is not the thing for us to do to put money into one end of the economy and siphon it out at the other end. If there have been any estimates made as to what this all amounts to, and where the money is coming from, I should certainly like to have further information about it. If the Foreign Relations Committee has such information, I should like to have it.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. I realize the tremendous responsibility which rests upon the Senator from Michigan by reason of the position which he occupies as chairman of the great Foreign Relations Committee, and I can recognize his reluctance to answer "iffy" questions; yet this thought occurs to me. If within the next 60 days, after we ratify this treaty, there should be repeated the kind of theft of the Government of Italy which has been perpetrated with respect to Hungary, I am wondering whether our position with regard to Italy would be prejudiced in view of the fact that we had ratified this treaty, because I say to the Senator that, so far as I am concerned, and as a Senator of the United States, I could not look with equanimity upon the taking over of the Government of Italy by a Communist coup d'état, thereby sealing up the Mediterranean.

As I said, I recognize that the Senator from Michigan cannot stand here and answer "iffy" questions, but that very possibility is one of the things that is in many Senators' minds, if I am not mistaken, in answering ourselves as to whether our position would not be seriously impaired and prejudiced in the event such a sad thing should occur.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask the distinguished Senator from Michigan if it is his intention to have a vote on the Italian treaty this afternoon?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Oh, no.

Mr. WHERRY. I realize that the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] is anxious to take up the conference report on the tax bill.

At this time I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a resolution by the Order Sons of Italy in America, which I recently received in the mail.

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

Resolution urging postponement of the consideration of the treaty with Italy until such time as the treaty with Germany shall have been concluded.

Whereas our organization is dedicated, among other worthy objectives, to cementing the bonds of friendship and promoting closer relations between the freedom-loving people of the United States and Italy; and

Whereas there is now under consideration by the Senate of the United States a treaty of peace with the Republic of Italy; and

Whereas we, the executive committee of the supreme council, Order Sons of Italy in

America, in special meeting convened at New York City, March 29, 1947, believe that the said treaty should be considered in the light of the historic events that have preceded it which we understand to be as follows:

Italy declared war on Germany on October 12, 1942, was immediately recognized officially as a cobelligerent by the Allied powers and for 20 months fought valorously by their side with her entire Navy, Army, and Air Forces, including thousands of irregular or guerrilla troops known as "Partisans."

In this struggle she lost over 300,000 in killed alone, suffered billions of dollars in property damage, of which not a small part consisted of priceless works of art which can never be replaced. Immediately after hostilities ended in Europe in June of 1945, she declared war upon Japan. Only the collapse of Japan shortly thereafter prevented her active participation in the theater of the South Pacific with her fleet of torpedo, motor craft, and light cruisers, the finest in Europe for the type of fighting required around Japan.

That Italy's contribution to the defeat of Germany was important, timely and valuable has been recognized by every military leader acquainted with the tremendously difficult terrain she faced, from Maj. Gen. Mark Clark down. That it was material was proclaimed at Potsdam, when the Tripartite Conference officially declared:

"Italy was the first of the Axis Powers to break with Germany, to whose defeat she made a material contribution, and has now joined with the Allies in the struggle against Japan."

Both before the armistice and during the period of active participation as a cobelligerent, the government and the people of Italy received from President Roosevelt, Prime Minister Churchill, and all of the political and military leaders of the Allies the most ample assurances and promises that Italy would not be considered as a defeated enemy, but that a just and liberal account would be taken of her contributions to the common victory, and especially in overthrowing the Mussolini regime and being the first of the Axis Powers to fight with the Allies.

Here in the United States our Government, through its Department of State, the OWI, and the OSS, urged the people of Italy to revolt against their Fascist-Nazi oppressors, lay down their arms, and accept the guarantees of the Atlantic Charter and the blessings of the "four freedoms."

Our organization was requested by the OWI, as patriotic American citizens, to assist in broadcasting this appeal over the air waves to Italy. We were asked specifically to tell the people of Italy to stop fighting; that we were going in as liberators, not as conquerors; that the slogans were, "Save Italy now"; "Victory for America—Freedom for Italy."

We responded gladly, as requested, and did supply speakers of ability and national reputation who made the broadcasts. What happened subsequent to these and other diplomatic solicitations is history: Italy overthrew Mussolini and went over to the Allied cause.

Certainly, if any nation can be said to have a valid claim to just consideration, both as a matter of morals and of contract, that nation is Italy.

Despite this valid claim for just consideration and treatment, the treaty of peace, purporting to define and settle the status quo with Italy and the Big Four powers, and now presented to the Senate of the United States for ratification, contains none of the assurances and the promises that Italy would not be considered as a defeated foe, but that a just and liberal account would be taken of her contributions to the common victory.

Not only are these absent, but terms are inserted so harsh, so unjust, so impossible, as to make her survival as a sovereign democratic state with a republican form of government impossible. It can be fairly said

that this is not a treaty of peace but a sword of war for the future, because the treaty:

1. Mutilates the territorial integrity of what is universally recognized as the Italian homeland by ceding Briga, Tenda, and Venezia Giulia to other powers and by separating Trieste from it to form a so-called Free Territory of Trieste.

2. Imposes the renunciation of title to the colonies in Africa, i. e., Libya, Eritrea, and Somaliland, which governments, previous to Mussolini, poured out billions to develop.

3. Imposes the renunciation of acquired rights and interests in China and other places and all special rights in any territory mandated or deriving from the mandate system.

4. Reduces the Naval, Military, and Air Establishments to mere token forces so small as to make adequate defense of her borders impossible.

5. Compels the complete demilitarization of her Yugoslav frontier while imposing no similar restriction on Yugoslavia, thus leaving Italy open to invasion any time Yugoslavia chooses to attack.

6. Enforces economic enslavement by compelling the payment of \$365,000,000, in reparations, said payment to come from various sources including current industrial production and raw materials. Russia will take her \$100,000,000, in part, by furnishing raw materials to Italy to be finished in her factories at "values" (price) to be fixed by the four ambassadors; and

Whereas the said treaty—

1. Rescinds the assurances and pledges made to Italy that she would not be regarded as a defeated foe if she overthrew her government and joined the cause of the allies, and will jeopardize America's integrity and pledged word if ratified.

2. Imposes economic enslavement by requiring the payment of millions of dollars in reparations beyond the ability of the Italian people to pay, in effect constituting a perpetual mortgage to be satisfied by "slave labor" and which in truth can never be paid or satisfied, unless the United States underwrites the payment of the same.

3. Sows the seeds of future wars by setting up in its territorial clauses as a craven compromise to Yugoslavia's demand for domination beyond the Adriatic, an alleged "Free Territory of Trieste" out of land and population universally recognized as Italian for centuries, thereby creating another Danzig with all its implications of tragedy and disaster.

4. Makes homeless and casts out into the world as pariahs the entire populations of the cities of Pola, Zara, and other portions of Venezia Giulia ceded to Yugoslavia.

5. Imperils the defense and maintenance of Italy as a free democratic sovereign state by reducing its means of military defense.

6. Invites invasion by compelling the complete demilitarization of its Yugoslav border.

7. Violates the letter and spirit of the Atlantic Charter by failing to afford to the Italian nation the means of dwelling in safety within its own boundaries and by ordering territorial changes which do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned.

8. Clashes with the policy of the United States in foreign affairs to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressure, recently announced by President Truman, it being obvious that if it be necessary to protect Greece and Turkey from Communist satellite infiltration and expansion because the security of the United States requires that these nations be kept strong as bastions of defense, then with equal forces it follows that the largest nation in the Mediterranean and the third largest in Europe should be protected for the same reasons.

It should be observed, in conclusion, that everybody knows, who knows anything about political conditions in Italy, that none of the extreme demands made by Yugoslavia with Russian support would have been made if

Italy had agreed to accept Communist direction. And that even now said demands reflected in the treaty would be withdrawn and direct negotiation had if Italy at this late hour would accept said Communist direction.

Italy and Greece are parallel cases in this regard. And both are indissolubly linked with the German problem. Until that problem is resolved and the pattern of the peace of Europe and the Western World is established, any attempt to settle the peace of Italy by the United States on these harsh terms is not only an act of ingratitude, but is premature and illusory.

America, in the days not too far distant, will need the friendship and the loyalty of the freedom-loving people of Italy. They should not suffer any injustice at our hands; on the contrary, they should be welcomed with the same spirit and the same enthusiasm shown them when they were welcomed as allies on the battlefield. Certainly now is not the time to fasten the fetters of communism on the oldest Christian civilization in the western world: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we urge the Senate of the United States to vote to delay ratification of said treaty of peace with Italy pending further study and until such time as the European settlement and the treaty with Germany shall have been concluded; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be spread upon the minutes and forwarded to his Excellency, the President of the United States; the Secretary of State; the President of the Senate, and every Senator of the United States.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF
THE SUPREME COUNCIL,
ORDER SONS OF ITALY IN
AMERICA,
FELIX FORTE,
Supreme Venerable.
S. LOPRESTI,
Assistant Supreme Venerable.
F. J. GIMINO,
Supreme Orator.
S. PARISI,
Supreme Financial Secretary.
V. BIANCO,
Supreme Treasurer.

Attest:

A. A. DE MARTINIS,
Supreme Recording Secretary.

Mr. WHERRY. I also ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a letter from the Omaha (Nebr.) Chapter of the Order Sons of Italy in America.

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

ORDER SONS OF ITALY IN AMERICA,
Omaha, Nebr., March 25, 1947.
HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: The Grand Council of the Order Sons of Italy in Nebraska, with a large membership, all of whom are American citizens and voters, respectfully requests that you vote against the adoption of the Italian peace treaty. It is felt that the terms are too drastic and unfair to Italy.

Yours truly,

JOSEPH VACANTI,
Venerable.

Mr. WHERRY. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a letter from the Risveglio Italo-Americano, beneficial society of Omaha, Nebr., an Italian-American organization.

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

MARCH 25, 1947.
HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building, Washing-
ton, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: The Lodge Risveglio Italo-Americano, of Omaha, Nebr., with a large membership, all of whom are American citizens and voters, respectfully requests that you vote against the adoption of the Italian peace treaty. It is felt that the terms are too drastic and unfair to Italy.

Yours truly,

ALFIO LA FERLA,
Venerable.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a letter from a friend in California.

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

LA MESA, CALIF., March 15, 1947.
HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY,
United States Senator From Nebraska,
Senate Office Building, Washington,
D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR WHERRY: You will possibly recall that during the time that our national sovereignty was in jeopardy and assailed by alien guns and ideologies that I spared neither time, effort, nor material resources to serve as consultant to the Office of Strategic Services on Italian affairs, and to help the office of OWI and other Government agencies in marshaling the forces of our Nation and to solicit the sympathies of liberty-loving Italians in Italy to help overthrow the Mussolini regime, and to line up what forces and influences could be made available in helping us win the war.

As national secretary of the American Committee for Italian Democracy (this committee was headed by Justice Ferdinand Pecora, of New York, and other outstanding leaders of Italian extraction), we appealed and made known to the people of Italy that we were going in as liberators and not as conquerors. In this I feel that our Nation in many ways has more than kept its promise, but now comes the peace treaty for ratification by the Senate of the United States, and, my dear Senator, that treaty is worse than Munich. The Italian people have been treated in it as conquered slaves and not as liberated free people. The compromises have sown the seeds for a third world war. I am sure that its ratification is impossible, and that it should be sent back to the Department of State for further study and adjustments. It is my opinion that the present treaty cannot be ratified by the Senate without jeopardizing America's integrity.

No one respects Secretary of State Byrnes more than I do as a great American, but I feel that in this case he has been out talked, out guessed, and out foxed, and the facts have been deliberately misrepresented to him in favor of Tito of Yugoslavia, the puppet of Russia, and the never-satisfied grizzly bear of the north, together with the suave, but unappreciative, French.

In writing you this letter, sir, I am voicing the feeling not only of myself, who has helped to defend this Nation in two World Wars, but of hundreds of thousands of Americans of Italian extraction who have given of themselves unstintingly to the cause of freedom, justice, and democracy, and who were and are willing to lay down their lives on the altar of sacrifice in behalf of our beloved America were occasion or circumstances to demand it.

Yours in the service of our country,
FRANK B. GIGLIOTTI.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, these are personal letters written to me by outstanding Italians of my State and others.

I have selected these letters from among many letters which I have received.

REDUCTION OF INDIVIDUAL INCOME-TAX PAYMENTS

As in legislative session, Mr. MILLIKIN submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1) to reduce individual income tax payments, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, and 16, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 2 of the Senate engrossed amendments in lieu of the table there appearing insert the following:

"If the aggregate is:	The reduction shall be:
Not over \$200-----	33½% of the aggregate.
Over \$200 but not over \$279.17.	\$67.
Over \$279.17 but not over \$100,000.	24% of the aggregate.
Over \$100,000 but not over \$250,000.	\$24,000, plus 19¼% of excess over \$100,000.
Over \$250,000-----	\$52,875, plus 15% of excess over \$250,000."

and on page 3 of the Senate engrossed amendments in lieu of the table there appearing insert the following:

"If the aggregate is:	The reduction shall be:
Not over \$200----	19¼% of the aggregate.
Over \$200 but not over \$265.52.	\$38.50.
Over \$265.52 but not over \$100,000.	14½% of the aggregate.
Over \$100,000 but not over \$250,000.	\$14,500, plus 12% of excess over \$100,000.
Over \$250,000-----	\$32,500, plus 10% of excess over \$250,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

E. D. MILLIKIN,
ROBERT A. TAFT,
HUGH BUTLER,
WALTER F. GEORGE,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

HAROLD KNUTSON,
DANIEL A. REED,
ROY O. WOODRUFF,
R. L. DOUGHTON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, as in legislative session, for the present consideration of the conference report.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THYE in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

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

Alken	Brewster	Buck
Baldwin	Bricker	Bushfield
Ball	Brooks	Cain

Capehart	Holland	Revercomb
Capper	Ives	Robertson, Wyo.
Chavez	Jenner	Russell
Connally	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Cooper	Johnston, S. C.	Smith
Cordon	Kem	Sparkman
Downey	Kilgore	Stewart
Dwornshak	Knowland	Taft
Eastland	Lodge	Taylor
Ecton	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Ellender	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Ferguson	McCarthy	Thye
Flanders	McClellan	Tobey
Fulbright	McFarland	Tydings
George	McGrath	Vandenberg
Green	McKellar	Watkins
Gurney	McMahon	Wherry
Hatch	Magnuson	White
Hawkes	Malone	Wiley
Hayden	Millican	Williams
Hickenlooper	Moore	Wilson
Hill	Morse	Young
Hoey	O'Daniel	

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

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, the Senate conferees went to conference with 16 Senate amendments. The House conferees agreed to all the Senate amendments with the exception of No. 1. As to that the House accepted it with an amendment of its own. Senate amendment No. 1 adopted an additional rate reduction bracket to take care of the reduction between \$1,400 and \$302,400. On that part of the tax attributable to income in excess of \$79,000 and not in excess of \$302,400, the Senate allowed a reduction for 1948 and subsequent years of 15 percent instead of the 20 percent allowed under the House bill. A compromise was agreed upon by the conferees by which the 15-percent reduction starts at approximately \$137,000 instead of at \$79,000. This has the effect of allowing the full 20-percent reduction with respect to the tax on incomes between \$1,400 and \$137,000, and a 15-percent reduction on the tax applicable to that part of income between \$137,000 and \$302,400.

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

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. Was it necessary for the Senate conferees to agree to push the amount from \$79,000 to \$137,000?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I did not understand the Senator's question.

Mr. McMAHON. Was it necessary to recede from the Senate amendment providing the cuts would stop at \$79,000? Did the Senate conferees have to raise it?

Mr. MILLIKIN. The junior Senator from Colorado thought it was necessary.

Mr. McMAHON. I think it is most regrettable, I may say to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I do not know whether it should be called most regrettable. I think it is regrettable when the Senate has to yield any concession on any of its amendments; and to that extent I share the Senator's regret. I wish it had stayed where it was. But, as I stated before, we went to conference with 16 Senate amendments. The conference necessarily involved some compromise. That was the point of compromise; and I do not regard it as a highly material matter.

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

Mr. MILLIKIN. I gladly yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. What the conferees have done is further to increase the amount of tax reduction for those persons in the middle and higher income tax brackets over what was agreed upon in the Senate?

Mr. MILLIKIN. The conferees agreed to extend the 20 percent reduction from \$79,000 to \$137,000 as distinguished from the Senate's version of starting a 15 percent reduction at \$79,000.

Mr. LUCAS. Is that merely an arbitrary decision?

Mr. MILLIKIN. No.

Mr. LUCAS. Was there any basis for making that raise?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Yes. We considered the revenue loss. We necessarily had to consider the viewpoint of the House, that the 20-percent reduction should run from about \$1,400 to \$303,000. The figure agreed upon of \$137,000 is a sort of midway station. It is the kind of thing which the Senator knows happens when we are compromising figures.

Mr. LUCAS. I appreciate the fact that in any legislation there must be compromise in order to obtain legislation. But I notice that the compromise was applicable only to the middle and upper income brackets, and there was no compromise with respect to the lower income brackets where a reduction is really needed.

Mr. MILLIKIN. We did not take any amendments to the conference that would have raised that question.

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

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Could the Senator give the Senate the amount in dollars of the total tax reduction as represented by the conference report?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Yes. The amount is \$3,300,000,000.

Estimated Federal receipts, general and special accounts, for the fiscal year 1948 under present law, House bill, Senate bill, and conference report

(In billions of dollars)

Item	Estimated receipts in fiscal 1948 of—				Estimated effect upon the budget for fiscal 1948 of—		
	Present law	House bill	Senate bill	Conference report	House bill	Senate bill	Conference report
Direct taxes on individuals:							
Income taxes.....	20.0	\$15.1	16.8	16.7	-4.9	-3.2	-3.3
Estate and gift taxes.....	.7	.7	.7	.7			
Total direct taxes on individuals.....	20.8	15.8	17.5	17.4			
Direct taxes on corporations.....	8.6	8.6	8.6	8.6			
Excise taxes.....	7.8	7.8	7.8	7.8			
Net employment taxes ¹8	.8	.8	.8			
Customs.....	.5	.5	.5	.5			
Miscellaneous receipts:							
Existing legislation.....	2.6	2.6	2.6	2.6			
Proposed legislation ²4	.4	.4	.4			
Total miscellaneous receipts.....	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0			
Net receipts.....	41.4	\$36.5	38.2	38.1	-4.9	-3.2	-3.3

¹ After deduction for appropriation to Federal old-age survivors insurance trust fund.

² As proposed by the President in the 1948 Budget.

³ Part of the reduction in liability under the House bill will result in increased refunds rather than decreased receipts; however, for comparative purposes, the full amount is shown here as a decrease in receipts. The estimate of increased refunds is \$450,000,000.

Source: Staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two tables, table I being a comparison of individual income tax under present law, House bill, Senate bill, and conference report, single person—no dependents; and table II being a com-

Mr. TYDINGS. How much does the conference report raise the amount of tax reduction over that in the Senate amendment.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The item which I have mentioned comes to between \$56,000,000 and \$60,000,000.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is the only increase in the amount of tax reduction as a result of the conference over the original Senate amendment?

Mr. MILLIKIN. That is correct, with the exception of minor technical adjustments which would follow from changing the bracket.

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

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The \$60,000,000 which the Senator is now discussing goes directly to those persons who have incomes in excess of \$73,000 and up to \$303,000?

Mr. MILLIKIN. They will have a 20-percent reduction instead of 15 percent in the brackets between \$79,000 and \$137,000.

Mr. LUCAS. In other words, the \$60,000,000 will go to that one group of people who are now receiving from \$79,000 per annum up to \$137,000 per annum?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Yes; and who are working about 3 days a week for Uncle Sam at the present time.

Mr. LUCAS. And 3 days for themselves. It is pretty fair pay.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I would not call 50-percent slavery a very happy condition.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD at this point a table of estimated Federal receipts, general and special accounts, for the fiscal year 1948, under present law, House bill, Senate bill, and conference report.

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

parison of individual income tax under present law, House bill, Senate bill, and conference report, married person—no dependents.

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

TABLE I.—Comparison of individual income tax under present law, House bill, Senate bill, and conference report

SINGLE PERSON—NO DEPENDENTS

Table with columns: Net income before personal exemption, Amount of tax (Present law, House bill, Senate bill, Conference report), Amount of tax reduction (House bill, Senate bill, Conference report), Percent tax reduction (House bill, Senate bill, Conference report). Rows range from \$500 to \$5,000,000.

Source: Staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation.

TABLE II.—Comparison of individual income tax under present law, House bill, Senate bill, and conference report

MARRIED PERSON—NO DEPENDENTS

Table with columns: Net income before personal exemption, Amount of tax (Present law, House bill, Senate bill, Conference report), Amount of tax reduction (House bill, Senate bill, Conference report), Percent tax reduction (House bill, Senate bill, Conference report). Rows range from \$1,000 to \$12,000.

TABLE II.—Comparison of individual income tax under present law, House bill, Senate bill, and conference report—Continued

MARRIED PERSON—NO DEPENDENTS—Continued

Net income before personal exemption	Amount of tax				Amount of tax reduction				Percent tax reduction							
	Present law	House bill	Senate bill		Conference report		House bill	Senate bill		Conference report		Senate bill		Conference report		
			For 1947	For 1948 and subsequent years	For 1947	For 1948 and subsequent years		For 1947	For 1948 and subsequent years	For 1947	For 1948 and subsequent years	For 1947	For 1948 and subsequent years	For 1947	For 1948 and subsequent years	
													Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent
\$13,000	\$3,230.00	\$2,584.00	\$2,907.00	\$2,584.00	\$2,907.00	\$2,584.00	\$646.00	\$323.00	\$646.00	\$323.00	\$646.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00
\$14,000	3,638.50	2,910.80	3,274.65	2,910.80	3,274.65	2,910.80	727.70	363.85	727.70	363.85	727.70	20.00	10.00	20.00	10.00	20.00
\$15,000	4,047.00	3,237.60	3,642.30	3,237.60	3,642.30	3,237.60	809.40	404.70	809.40	404.70	809.40	20.00	10.00	20.00	10.00	20.00
\$20,000	6,393.50	5,114.80	5,754.15	5,114.80	5,754.15	5,114.80	1,278.70	639.35	1,278.70	639.35	1,278.70	20.00	10.00	20.00	10.00	20.00
\$25,000	9,082.00	7,265.60	8,173.80	7,265.60	8,173.80	7,265.60	1,816.40	908.20	1,816.40	908.20	1,816.40	20.00	10.00	20.00	10.00	20.00
\$30,000	11,970.00	9,576.00	10,773.00	9,576.00	10,773.00	9,576.00	2,394.00	1,197.00	2,394.00	1,197.00	2,394.00	20.00	10.00	20.00	10.00	20.00
\$40,000	18,097.50	14,478.00	16,287.75	14,478.00	16,287.75	14,478.00	3,619.50	1,809.75	3,619.50	1,809.75	3,619.50	20.00	10.00	20.00	10.00	20.00
\$50,000	24,795.00	19,836.00	22,315.50	19,836.00	22,315.50	19,836.00	4,959.00	2,479.50	4,959.00	2,479.50	4,959.00	20.00	10.00	20.00	10.00	20.00
\$60,000	31,891.50	25,513.20	28,702.35	25,513.20	28,702.35	25,513.20	6,378.30	3,189.15	6,378.30	3,189.15	6,378.30	20.00	10.00	20.00	10.00	20.00
\$70,000	39,273.00	31,418.40	35,345.70	31,418.40	35,345.70	31,418.40	7,854.60	3,927.30	7,854.60	3,927.30	7,854.60	20.00	10.00	20.00	10.00	20.00
\$80,000	46,939.50	37,551.60	42,245.55	37,551.60	42,245.55	37,551.60	9,387.90	4,693.95	9,387.90	4,693.95	9,387.90	20.00	10.00	20.00	10.00	20.00
\$90,000	54,891.00	43,912.80	49,596.40	43,912.80	49,596.40	43,912.80	10,978.20	5,489.10	10,978.20	5,489.10	10,978.20	20.00	10.00	20.00	10.00	20.00
\$100,000	63,127.50	50,502.00	57,226.00	50,502.00	57,226.00	50,502.00	12,625.50	6,312.75	12,625.50	6,312.75	12,625.50	20.00	9.35	18.76	10.00	20.00
\$150,000	105,383.50	84,306.80	96,368.40	84,306.80	96,368.40	84,306.80	21,078.50	10,539.25	21,078.50	10,539.25	21,078.50	20.00	8.55	17.25	9.74	19.51
\$200,000	148,124.00	118,499.20	135,959.60	118,499.20	135,959.60	118,499.20	29,624.80	14,812.40	29,624.80	14,812.40	29,624.80	20.00	8.21	16.60	9.06	18.21
\$250,000	191,359.50	153,071.60	175,690.80	153,071.60	175,690.80	153,071.60	38,269.70	19,134.85	38,269.70	19,134.85	38,269.70	20.00	8.02	16.24	8.67	17.48
\$300,000	234,564.00	187,651.60	216,030.80	187,651.60	216,030.80	187,651.60	46,912.00	23,456.00	46,912.00	23,456.00	46,912.00	20.00	7.90	16.01	8.43	17.03
\$400,000	321,014.50	264,723.50	297,869.00	264,723.50	297,869.00	264,723.50	63,801.00	31,900.50	63,801.00	31,900.50	63,801.00	20.00	7.21	14.58	7.60	15.32
\$500,000	407,464.00	342,073.50	379,769.00	342,073.50	379,769.00	342,073.50	81,491.00	40,745.50	81,491.00	40,745.50	81,491.00	20.00	6.80	13.72	7.10	14.30
\$750,000	623,589.50	535,448.50	584,519.00	535,448.50	584,519.00	535,448.50	122,149.50	61,074.75	122,149.50	61,074.75	122,149.50	20.00	6.27	12.61	6.47	12.90
\$1,000,000	839,714.50	728,823.50	789,269.00	728,823.50	789,269.00	728,823.50	164,891.00	82,445.50	164,891.00	82,445.50	164,891.00	20.00	6.01	12.07	6.16	12.36
\$2,000,000	1,704,214.50	1,502,323.50	1,608,269.00	1,502,323.50	1,608,269.00	1,502,323.50	329,782.00	164,891.00	329,782.00	164,891.00	329,782.00	13.21	11.55	5.63	12.29	5.70
\$5,000,000	4,275,000.00	3,822,823.50	4,050,000.00	3,822,823.50	4,050,000.00	3,822,823.50	852,176.50	426,088.25	852,176.50	426,088.25	852,176.50	20.00	5.26	10.53	5.26	10.53

Source: Staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield for a question?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. If I correctly understand the conference report, it means that an additional reduction of $4\frac{3}{4}$ percent of the total income of the taxpayer is made to every taxpayer whose income is \$50,000 a year and upward. Is that correct?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Those taxpayers whose incomes fall between \$79,000 and \$137,000 will get a 20-percent reduction, instead of a 15-percent reduction, as provided in the Senate version as it went to the conference.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is it correct that every taxpayer receiving an income of over \$100,000 will receive an additional reduction of his taxes in the amount of \$2,375 for each year?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Will the Senator repeat the question, please?

Mr. HOLLAND. Is it correct that every taxpayer receiving in excess of \$100,000 of income a year will receive in each taxable year an additional reduction of his tax bill in the amount of \$2,375?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I would have to compute that. I do not find the tax burden table that makes that clear. If the taxpayer is in the \$100,000 income bracket, he receives a 20-percent reduction, instead of the 15-percent reduction which was provided by the Senate amendment. That will continue up to \$137,000 of income, after which point the reduction decreases to 15 percent, and that continues up to about \$302,000, after which it decreases to about $10\frac{1}{2}$ percent.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is the reduction cumulative, in that every taxpayer with an income above \$100,000 will receive the full benefit of the increased rate up to

that stage, and will carry that benefit all the way up, no matter how high his income may go?

Mr. MILLIKIN. A taxpayer who has an income of \$100,000 will get a 20-percent tax reduction on his \$100,000. A taxpayer who has an income of \$150,000 will receive a 20-percent reduction on the first \$137,000 and a 15-percent reduction on the balance.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

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

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. As I understand the parliamentary situation on a conference report of this character, the Senate must vote it either up or down, and no amendments can be made to the report. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct; the conference report is not open to amendment. The question is on agreeing to the report.

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

Mr. LUCAS. I ask for the yeas and nays. Mr. President.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. WHITE. On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], who is unavoidably detained. I am informed that, if he were present, he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "yea."

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], who is absent on official business, is paired with the Senator from Vir-

ginia [Mr. ROBERTSON]. The Senator from New Hampshire, if present and voting, would vote "yea," and the Senator from Virginia, if present and voting, would vote "nay."

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], who is absent on official business, is paired with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. The Senator from Nebraska, if present and voting, would vote "yea," and the Senator from Wyoming, if present and voting, would vote "nay."

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL], who is absent by leave of the Senate, is paired with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. The Senator from Missouri, if present and voting, would vote "yea," and the Senator from Virginia, if present and voting, would vote "nay."

The junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], who is absent by leave of the Senate, is paired with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS]. The junior Senator from Pennsylvania, if present and voting, would vote "yea"; and the senior Senator from Pennsylvania, if present and voting, would vote "nay."

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], who is absent by leave of the Senate, has a general pair with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. The Senator from Kansas, if present and voting, would vote "yea"; and the Senator from New York, if present and voting, would vote "nay."

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is detained on official business at the Government departments. If present and voting, he would vote "nay."

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], who is absent by leave of the Senate, is paired on this vote with the

Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONNOR], who is absent on public business. If present and voting, the Senator from South Carolina would vote "nay" and the Senator from Maryland would vote "yea."

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], who is absent on public business, is paired with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Wyoming would vote "nay" and the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea."

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], who is absent on official business, is paired with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL]. If present and voting, the Senator from Virginia would vote "nay" and the Senator from Missouri would vote "yea."

The senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], who is absent on public business, is paired with the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN]. If present and voting, the senior Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "nay," and the junior Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "yea."

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], who is necessarily absent, has a general pair with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. If present and voting, the Senator from New York would vote "nay," and the Senator from Kansas would vote "yea."

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], who is absent by leave of the Senate, is paired with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. If present and voting, the Senator from Virginia would vote "nay," and the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "yea."

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. UMSTEAD], who is absent on public business, is paired with the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], who is absent on public business. If present and voting, the Senator from North Carolina would vote "yea," and the Senator from Florida would vote "nay."

I further announce that the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], who is absent on official business, and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], who is absent by leave of the Senate, would vote "nay" on this question, if present.

The result was announced—yeas 48, nays 28, as follows:

YEAS—48		
Aiken	George	O'Daniel
Baldwin	Gurney	Revercomb
Bell	Hawkes	Robertson, Wyo.
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Saltonstall
Bricker	Hoy	Smith
Brooks	Ives	Stewart
Buck	Jenner	Taft
Bushfield	Kem	Thye
Cain	Knowland	Tobey
Capehart	Lodge	Vandenberg
Capper	McCarran	Watkins
Cordon	McCarthy	Wherry
Dworschak	McKellar	Wiley
Ecton	Malone	Williams
Ferguson	Millikin	Wilson
Flanders	Moore	Young
NAYS—28		
Chavez	Hill	Magnuson
Connally	Holland	Morse
Cooper	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Downey	Johnson, S. C.	Sparkman
Eastland	Kilgore	Taylor
Ellender	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Fulbright	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Green	McFarland	Tydings
Hatch	McGrath	
Hayden	McMahon	

NOT VOTING—19

Barkley	Maybank	Reed
Bridges	Murray	Robertson, Va.
Butler	Myers	Umstead
Byrd	O'Connor	Wagner
Donnell	O'Mahoney	White
Langer	Overton	
Martin	Pepper	

So the conference report was agreed to.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to absent myself from the Senate tomorrow. For the purpose of the RECORD, should there be a vote on any of the treaties before the Senate previous to the time fixed in the unanimous-consent agreement, Thursday at 2 o'clock, I announce myself in favor of the treaties as presented to the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, leave is granted.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be absent from the Senate beginning tomorrow, until next Tuesday, in order to attend the commencement exercises and the inauguration of the new president of the University of Arkansas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, leave is granted.

TREATY OF PEACE WITH ITALY

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of Executive F (80th Cong., 1st sess.), the treaty of peace with Italy, signed at Paris on February 10, 1947.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] and I have canvassed the Senate as generally as we could in respect to the debate on the pending treaty. We find only one Senator, apparently, who has any desire to speak on the treaty, and there is some doubt about his doing so. It is probably advisable, however, that a definite hour be set for a vote, so that all Senators may be on notice regarding the terminal vote. I think it is agreeable to everyone interested if I make the following request, that at 4 o'clock p. m. tomorrow the Senate proceed, without further debate, to vote upon the four treaties in the order in which they are listed on the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I shall not object, but I should very much appreciate if the Senator could find it possible to amend the unanimous-consent request suggested so as to make the hour 3:45 o'clock tomorrow. If he cannot, I shall abide by the hour suggested.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Very well, Mr. President; I suggest that the vote be taken at 3:45 o'clock p. m. tomorrow.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to propound a parliamentary inquiry. Is it in order now to move to postpone the further consideration of the pending treaty to January 25, 1948?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the unanimous-consent request is agreed to, a motion to postpone will not be in order.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The unanimous-consent request, if agreed to, would preclude such a motion. If we agreed unanimously to vote tomorrow, nothing

could set aside the agreement except another unanimous consent agreement. I should like to know if it is in order now to move to postpone further consideration of the treaty until a day certain.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate has before it at this time a request for unanimous consent that a vote be taken at 3:45 o'clock tomorrow.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Let me rephrase the request to cover the suggestion of the Senator from Arkansas. I ask unanimous consent that at 3:45 o'clock tomorrow the Senate proceed without further debate, to vote upon the four treaties, and any motions in connection therewith, the treaties to be taken up in the order of their appearance on the calendar, which request, in the opinion of the Senator making it, leaves the Senator from Arkansas entirely free to make the motion to which he refers.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I may say, for the information of the Senator from Michigan, that unfortunately I shall be away tomorrow, and I shall be forced, under those circumstances, in any case, to make my position in regard to the treaty clear at this time. I considered making such a motion today, and I did not want to be foreclosed.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator can proceed immediately. We are now considering the treaty, it is before the Senate, and if the Senator will permit the agreement to be made so that we may know what the final termination plans are, the Senator can proceed immediately in the direction he indicates.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. With that understanding, I have no objection to the request.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, if we agree now by unanimous consent to vote tomorrow at 3:45 o'clock, the Senator could not make his motion today and get a vote on it.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Oh, yes; he could. The request I have made would include all motions respecting the treaty.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the agreement as now proposed were entered into, the motion could then be made, and action could be taken upon the Senator's motion at any time between now and 3:45 o'clock tomorrow afternoon.

Mr. CONNALLY. With that construction, of course, it would be proper for the Senator to proceed now.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I very much dislike to object to any unanimous-consent request, and if the request were for a vote to be taken 24 hours later than the time suggested I should have no objection. I think, however, that the importance of the pending question, and the consequences which would flow from the Senate's action in this matter, demand that we at least take time to give it more thought and more consideration. So far as I know, it was not until yesterday that the Senate was advised that this treaty would be taken up today, and today being Tuesday, I think that if we were to take until Thursday at 3:45 o'clock in considering it, the request might be reasonable. I shall, however, be forced to object to the unanimous-consent request to vote at 3:45 o'clock tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut objects.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I wish to make a further suggestion. I have no interest in hurrying the Senator from Connecticut, or any other Senator, to a premature vote. The suggestion about a vote tomorrow was based upon a very careful canvass, by the Senator from Nebraska and the Senator from Michigan, of Senators who were interested, so far as we knew, and the result of our inquiry left us without any speaking program, even for the remainder of this afternoon. The only interest the Senator from Michigan now has is to fix a time certain for the vote, so that all Senators may be on notice as to when it is to occur, and without any attempt to mortgage or divide the time between now and then, because in the opinion of the Senator from Michigan the debate in respect to the treaty will exhaust itself very promptly, and I should like to have the Senate free to proceed to something else in the interim, if the debate should end. So, with that understanding, I shall rephrase my request, and I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday, at 2 o'clock, the Senate shall proceed to vote upon the pending treaties or any motion still pending in connection with them.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I cannot understand why it is necessary to postpone this matter until Thursday if the list of speakers has been exhausted, and if it is for the purpose of saving the time of the Senate. I do not understand the reason for postponing the vote.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Neither do I.

Mr. LUCAS. In other words, the Senate will be proceeding for 2 days without further discussing the treaty. I do not understand it at all. It seems to me we ought to proceed this afternoon and try to conclude the matter, if no other Senator desires to discuss it.

Mr. VANDENBERG. It has just been disclosed that I cannot even get an agreement for tomorrow.

Mr. LUCAS. I think we should proceed and go through with it.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HATCH. If no further debate is desired, should we not proceed to vote this afternoon?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I think perhaps the debate is exhausted for this afternoon, but I cannot say that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] does not wish to speak tomorrow, although he may not be prepared to speak today. It was in the spirit of ultrafairness, to protect the rights of all Senators, that I was making the suggestion in respect to tomorrow.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I merely wanted to observe that this strikes me as unusual procedure. While I appreciate that, as the Senator from Michigan says, his suggestion was made in a spirit of cooperation and in a desire to have the vote set for an hour certain, yet, since there is no further debate to be had, I am unable to understand why there should be a delay in the voting until tomorrow. I raise the point merely to get action.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator just saw me try to get an agreement

for tomorrow, in which effort I failed. I submit my request.

Mr. LUCAS. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois objects.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I withdraw my request, and will make none further.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE NOMINATIONS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, there are on the Executive Calendar the nominations of two judges whom it is important to confirm. I ask unanimous consent, as in executive session, to consider the nominations of ROBERT EWING THOMASON, of Texas, and of Albert V. Bryan, of Virginia, to be United States district judges.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wonder if the Senator would not include the nomination of Peyton Ford, of Oklahoma, in the Department of Justice, which is on the calendar. The position in the Department of Justice is vacant, and has been vacant for a month.

Mr. WILEY. I have no objection whatever, and I include that.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I ask that the unanimous-consent request be agreed to, including, with the two judges mentioned, the nomination of Peyton Ford, of Oklahoma, as Assistant Attorney General, to fill an existing vacancy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request. The Chair hears none, and the clerk will state the nominations.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Peyton Ford, of Oklahoma, to be Assistant Attorney General to fill an existing vacancy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Hon. ROBERT EWING THOMASON to be United States district judge for the western district of Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Albert V. Bryan to be United States district judge for the eastern district of Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, has the Executive Calendar been concluded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin has the floor. Does the Senator from Georgia desire to ask the Senator from Wisconsin a question?

Mr. RUSSELL. No, Mr. President; I am asking the floor in my own right.

Mr. WILEY. I ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I am very glad the Senator from Wisconsin brought up the judicial nominations and had them disposed of. I want to say that there is another nomination on the calendar similar to the ones just considered

in which I am very much interested. I hope we may agree on an early date for consideration of the nomination. The Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], the distinguished majority leader, a few days ago, expressed some concern about the matter and some anxiety in connection with its consideration. I wish to join him in his expressions. I have spoken to the Senator from Wisconsin about the case.

Mr. WILEY. The Senator from Texas has spoken to me about the nomination. I have agreed that as soon as we can have an understanding in relation to legislative measures which are on the calendar, we will immediately fit in somewhere the nomination of Joe B. Dooley. I shall be happy to bring it up. Since it is a contested matter, I felt I could not bring it up today.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am not insisting on it being considered today, but I hope the Senator from Wisconsin will exert his powers to bring about an understanding regarding it. As I have no voice in the understandings on the other side of the aisle, I hope that he will bring his powerful influence to bear, to secure some sort of understanding, so that it will not be necessary merely to "fudge in," as the Senator suggests, or to "wedge in," the consideration of this nomination because it is of the highest importance.

Mr. WILEY. I believe the Senator understands my position very well.

Now, Mr. President, I desire to be recognized in relation to a matter that has recently come to my attention, and it will take me probably 15 minutes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I yielded my right to speak on the confirmations sought by the Senator from Wisconsin. I had a perfect right to address the Senate at that time, when the nominations were being considered, but I yielded, in order to expedite the consideration of the appointments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senator from Wisconsin has completed the order of business that he was bringing before the Senate at that time, then the Senator from Georgia will be recognized.

TREATY OF PEACE WITH ITALY—AGREEMENT ON TIME FOR VOTE

Mr. RUSSELL. I wish to express to the senior Senator from Michigan my deep appreciation for the consideration which he had shown a certain member of the minority party in agreeing to let the vote on the pending treaties go over until an hour certain. I must say, Mr. President, it is a little unusual to have the minority leader object to a request that has been made by a member of the minority, when the majority was generous enough to fix an hour certain for a vote on the treaties. It is not unusual in the Senate—or it was not in the old days, when we tried to be somewhat considerate of each other's rights—for matters to be carried over for a day or 2 days, when a Senator has been taken by surprise by a matter being brought to the floor of the Senate and has not had an opportunity to prepare to speak, or, in some cases, to go through the material in his files and determine whether or not he should make a speech.

I regret very much, Mr. President, to see that practice abandoned. I think it has not only been beneficial to the Senate and to individual Senators, but it has been very helpful to the Nation as a whole for Senators to be given a chance first to determine whether or not they wish to address themselves to a subject and, when they do wish to address themselves to it, to have an opportunity to express their views.

Mr. President, it has been well said that in the clash of mind with mind the truth scintillates. Any debate, within reason, which takes place on the floor of the Senate on these very perplexing questions respecting which the mind of our own people are confused or divided, is helpful, and assists the Senate to perform its high function to the American people. As one member of the minority I wish to express again to the Senator from Michigan my appreciation of the fairness which he has always manifested toward the members of the minority, and which he extended to some individual Senator in this case. I do not know what Senator is involved, but I do know it is nothing unreasonable for a Senator to request that a matter of this great importance shall go over for a day in order that he might have an opportunity further to determine the action he will take.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. In view of what the Senator from Georgia has said I withdraw the objection I made a moment ago, and shall permit the unanimous-consent request to be entered into respecting a definite hour on Thursday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois withdraws his objection to the unanimous-consent request that a vote be had at 2 o'clock p. m. on Thursday next. Is there further objection to the unanimous-consent request previously made by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG]? The Chair hears none, and the unanimous-consent request is entered into.

The unanimous-consent agreement, as reduced to writing and agreed to, is as follows:

Ordered, That on the calendar day of Thursday, June 5, 1947, at the hour of 2 p. m., the Senate without further debate proceed to vote upon any motion, amendment, or reservation that may be pending, or that may be made or proposed with respect to the treaties with Italy, Rumania, Bulgaria, and Hungary, and upon the question of ratification of the said treaties in the order named.

ORDER OF BUSINESS IN EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. Is the Senate still in executive session?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes; the Senate is in executive session for the consideration of the Italian peace treaty only.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a further parliamentary inquiry. As the Senate is in executive session for the consideration of peace treaties, and is also in executive

session for the purpose of considering nominations which have been sent to the Senate by the President of the United States, what is the status of the nominations for postmasters with respect to which resolutions have been submitted to discharge the Committee on Civil Service and Postoffice?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate has not gone into formal executive session. Unanimous consent requests have been considered on the basis of the individual requests.

Mr. LUCAS. Do I understand the Chair to hold that the Senate has not been in executive session?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate has been in executive session on each specific question which has been raised.

Mr. LUCAS. A further parliamentary inquiry. When the Senate goes into executive session, even under unanimous-consent agreement, does that in anywise affect the resolutions to discharge the committee with respect to the nominations of postmasters?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Specific requests were made from the floor for the consideration of matters which were on the Executive Calendar.

Mr. LUCAS. If I correctly understand the Chair's ruling, I must say that I cannot agree with it. The Senate can go into executive session under a unanimous-consent agreement, but when the Senate goes into executive session that in nowise affects the resolutions which have been submitted to discharge the committee concerning certain nominations of postmasters submitted by the President of the United States. Do I have a correct understanding of that matter?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senate went into executive session by unanimous consent or by motion generally, then the ordinary procedure would be followed; but the Senate went into executive session by unanimous consent for a specific purpose.

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

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I simply want to explain to the Senator from Illinois that in his absence yesterday afternoon I asked unanimous consent that, as in executive session, the Senate should proceed with the consideration of the treaties. The request was deliberately made in that fashion and explained to minority Members, including the Senator from Maryland, for the purpose of avoiding the precise question which the Senator from Illinois now raises.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the able Senator from Michigan, but I want to make the statement, Mr. President, that sooner or later I am going to be constrained to object to the taking up of anything by unanimous consent on the Executive Calendar until some disposition is made of the resolutions which are now on the table to discharge the committee from the further consideration of about 700 postmasters, all told, throughout the United States of America. I have been agreeing to the unanimous-consent requests, but sooner or later I shall object, and some of us will be constrained to

compel the Senate to go into executive session on a show-down as to whether or not the Senate is going to confirm or reject the nominations of postmasters.

Mr. FULBRIGHT obtained the floor. Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. I wish to propound a parliamentary inquiry. Is it the ruling of the Chair that when consent is given to a unanimous request that the Senate go into executive session, that the matters which can be considered in such executive session are limited by the terms of the unanimous-consent request?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The unanimous-consent request was made for the specific purpose of considering the Italian peace treaty, and the Senate is limited to that one specific question.

Mr. GEORGE. The parliamentary inquiry I wish to make is as follows: When the Senate goes into executive session, under unanimous consent or on motion, is the Senate limited to consideration of particular matters in that session?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is not ordinarily limited to consideration of particular matters when it goes into executive session by unanimous consent or on motion. But unanimous consent was asked yesterday that the Senate proceed, in executive session, to consider a specific matter, that is the Italian treaty. It was so recognized and so held. The Chair might say further that the Senator from Wisconsin asked unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session specifically for the purpose of acting upon certain nominations.

Mr. GEORGE. I must respectfully submit that the reasons the Senators wanted the Senate to go into executive session were as stated by the Chair, but when once the Senate goes into executive session, the Senate is in executive session. The Senate cannot, by a preliminary unanimous-consent agreement, limit its activities within an executive session. I am merely inquiring regarding the view of the Chair, for if it were pertinent at this time I should appeal from it, because it cannot be a sound rule of procedure. If the Presiding Officer please, any Senator may state the reason why he wishes an executive session, and that he wishes the Senate to consider only one or two or three matters, but if he obtains consent for an executive session, then the Senate is in executive session, and, in my judgment, any executive business is in order.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] has been recognized. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, as I understand the situation, and I think I understand it rightly, the Senator from Michigan asked unanimous consent that the Senate, as in executive session, proceed to act for a specific purpose, namely, the consideration of a treaty. Now the Senator from Wisconsin has made a pre-

cisely similar request. He asked unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session for the consideration of designated nominations, and named them, and the Senate consented to going into executive session upon those terms and those conditions, which were a part of the Senator's request. I submit, Mr. President, that after having reached an agreement, and having agreed that we should go into executive session for a definite, specific, limited, and defined purpose, that commitment follows us into executive session, and that it does not follow that immediately we cross the line, as in executive session, we have the right then to disregard the conditions and the terms upon which the Senate entered into executive session.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, the unanimous-consent agreement is merely in lieu of a vote. It is simply one method by which the Senate goes into executive session. It does not go halfway in and halfway out, or two-thirds in and one-third out.

I most respectfully submit to my distinguished friend that when we go into executive session we are in executive session. If it were a pertinent question, I should appeal from the ruling of the Chair, because it is a ruling which simply cannot be defended. The only reason on earth why the Senate proceeds by unanimous-consent agreements is in lieu of motions, in lieu of a parliamentary procedure which is dispensed with by the unanimous-consent agreement. I am not protesting because these are the only particular nominations which are to be considered in this executive session, but I do protest against the limitation of an executive session when once we have it.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] has the floor. Does he yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. Is the Senate in executive session or in legislative session at the present time?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, by unanimous order of the Senate, the Senate is in executive session for a limited purpose, namely, the consideration of certain treaties.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I ask unanimous consent to amend the unanimous-consent agreement so as to go further into executive session, to consider the resolutions which have been lying on the table, for the discharge of the Committee on Civil Service in relation to approximately 700 postmasterships throughout the United States.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Illinois asks unanimous consent to amend the existing unani-

mous-consent agreement in the particulars described by him. Is there objection?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I feel very much inclined to agree with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] with respect to the ability of the Senate to go into executive session for a particular purpose and not be in executive session for anything else. But it may be entirely a moot question. Personally I doubt very much whether it was necessary for the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, our very distinguished President pro tempore, to ask that the Senate go into executive session for the purpose of considering the treaties, to avoid the situation which he said a moment ago he sought to avoid, in connection with the question raised by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS].

I do not think there is any Senator on this side of the aisle who would wish to interfere with the consideration of the treaties in order to confirm the nominations of postmasters. Certainly I myself would not consent to such interference, much as I am interested in the confirmation of postmaster nominations, and much as many of us are interested. I believe that the importance of confirming postmaster nominations, as compared to the importance of ratifying these treaties, is out of all proportion, and I myself would not consent to laying the treaties aside for one moment in order that we might take up the question of the discharge of a committee from further consideration of the postmaster nominations, or their confirmation.

I do not think it was the purpose of the Senator from Illinois to try to inject that question. Rather it was his purpose to clarify the situation. I am certain that neither the Senator from Illinois nor any other Senator is bereft of the sense of responsibility to the extent that he would ask that we lay aside an important treaty to consider postmaster nominations.

However, the question is raised as to whether, when we go into executive session, we are in executive session. I do not know of any rule of the Senate which provides that the Senate may go into executive session for one purpose and not for any other purpose that may be legitimate. I have no fear that we are going to lay aside these treaties in order to consider postmaster nominations.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. I merely wish to say for the advise of the chair, whoever may be in the chair, that this is a very simple matter, to be resolved in the right way by forcing a vote for an executive session whenever it is desired to consider any executive business. If the ruling of the chair is to be adhered to, I must join with other Senators who say that there should be some limitations on unanimous consent agreements.

Mr. MORSE and Mr. LUCAS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator from Oregon was on his feet first, I yield to him.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I simply wish to make a brief comment on the parliamentary situation in which we find ourselves. I believe that if the ruling of the Chair stands, it will be a very unfortunate precedent.

There seems to be a growing opinion in the Senate that we can do anything by unanimous consent under the rules. I submit that such is not so. We cannot destroy fundamental procedural rights in the Senate by unanimous consent, because such rights accrue to the individual Senator. We are dealing here with a question of jurisdiction necessary to take up executive business. From the standpoint of jurisdiction, we cannot take up under the rules a treaty until we first go into executive session. The executive session goes to the totality of the jurisdiction. We cannot limit that jurisdiction by unanimous consent because we cannot transact any business of an executive nature until we are in executive session. Once we are in executive session the jurisdiction rests in each Senator to call up any executive business that is pending. We can vote him down but we cannot take his jurisdictional rights away from him by any agreement in advance of the executive session that only certain executive business will be discussed, if and when we go into executive session.

In my opinion, the Chair will look in vain in the rules of the Senate to find a rule which supports his ruling. I do not believe that we need to carry the question to the extent of an appeal this afternoon, but I think the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] has placed his finger on the essence of the point we are raising when he says that if we have to protect our rights from such a ruling as the Chair has handed down this afternoon, we shall have to object to ever going into executive session with any attempted limitation upon jurisdiction.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair does not know what the ruling is which has been handed down, which is so bitterly assailed. The Chair is not conscious of having handed down any ruling, except to recognize the fact that the Senate gave unanimous consent, as in executive session, to consider the treaties. There has not been any ruling on anything that the Chair knows about.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The present occupant of the chair was not in the chair when the ruling was made. Certainly a ruling has been made that no other business on the Executive Calendar may be considered under the unanimous-consent agreement requested by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] yesterday.

The Senator from Georgia, the Senator from Oregon, and other Senators disagree with that opinion. I wish to

associate myself with them. I raised the question in the first instance. I definitely believe that once we go into executive session we cannot place any limitation of time on the executive session, and we cannot go into executive session for one particular purpose. Once we are in, we are in.

Let me say further, in reply to the able Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], that I do not wish the inference to be drawn from the remarks which he made that I raised this question simply for the purpose of laying aside the treaties which are now before the Senate.

After the unanimous-consent agreement was made, the able Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] rose and obtained unanimous consent to go into executive session for the purpose of considering the nominations of Mr. Ford, Mr. Holt, and Mr. Overby. It was after that that the Senator from Illinois raised the question as to the motions to discharge the Committee on Civil Service. In view of the fact that the Senate did go into executive session at the request of the Senator from Wisconsin to consider certain nominations, I thought it was perfectly proper to raise the question which has been debated for the past 30 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one comment?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois points out that there has been a ruling by the predecessor of the present occupant of the chair. He is quite correct. I think the present occupant of the chair has, in effect, ruled when he stated with apparent approval what the unanimous-consent agreement was. He states it as though such a unanimous-consent agreement would be subject to the interpretation that has been made of it. The point we are raising is that the Senate cannot, by unanimous-consent agreement, agree to go into executive session with a limitation upon the jurisdiction of the Senate while in executive session in advance of going into that session itself. Once the Senate goes into executive session it is the same thing as the jurisdiction of a court vesting in a case. If a court as a matter of law has jurisdiction then once it takes jurisdiction it has jurisdiction. Its jurisdiction cannot be taken away from it by any attempt of the parties or of another court to limit its jurisdiction. Once the Senate goes into executive session it has jurisdiction over all executive matters until the Senate itself votes itself out of executive session. Any attempt to limit the jurisdiction of the Senate while in executive session by any unanimous-consent agreement entered into with that objective in mind, prior to the Senate's actually going into executive session, cannot be binding upon individual Senators because it goes to their jurisdictional rights which automatically accrue to them once the Senate is in executive session.

TREATY OF PEACE WITH ITALY

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of Executive F (80th Cong., 1st sess.), the

treaty of peace with Italy, signed at Paris on February 10, 1947.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, now that the parliamentary situation is clarified I want to advert to the question of the ratification of the treaty with Italy. I may say that I was forced to be absent from the Senate yesterday afternoon in order to make a commencement speech and I did not anticipate making a speech today on the subject. But since it has been brought up I think it is necessary to express myself regarding ratification of the treaty with Italy.

I should like to say by way of introduction that I have not had a single letter from an Italian constituent or from any foreign-born person in my State regarding the treaty, and it is not a case of trying to protect their interests in either Italy or any of the other countries concerned.

I have been considering the treaty for some time and have been very doubtful about the propriety of its ratification prior to the settlement of the relations between Austria and Germany; in other words, the over-all settlement of the peace in western Europe. But when the newspapers carried the announcement of the Communists taking over the Government of Hungary it seemed to me that was final confirmation of what many of us have believed was their policy. I have the feeling that if we proceed now to ratify the treaty, the significant part of which is the withdrawal of our troops from Italy, we shall create such a condition that the Communists in Italy, with the backing of the Communists in eastern Europe and in Russia, will proceed to take over the Government of Italy in a similar fashion.

Therefore, I think that a discussion of reparations, as to whether they are too large or too harsh, or a discussion of clauses regarding the retention of art objects, as to whether or not they are good or have any significance, is quite beside the point. In the face of what happens, as I understand, when Communists take over control of a government, as they have in Hungary, in Rumania, and in Bulgaria, all the details of the treaty designed to protect the inhabitants of course have no significance whatever. I think that is a persuasive reason why consideration of the treaty should be delayed. I want to make it clear that it is not because the treaty itself is an unreasonable one in consideration of all of the factors which faced the conference. I have great sympathy for the position of the distinguished chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, and my criticism of the treaty has nothing whatever to do with his efforts or with the efforts of our representatives in obtaining the terms which they did obtain in this treaty. I realize that if we were treating with people who would live up to their treaties—in other words, with responsible persons on the other side, and with people upon whom we could depend to carry out the treaty—it is very probable the situation would be different. It is very likely that our representatives did the best they could. I realize that they must compromise and must give and take on points such as

Trieste, hydroelectric projects, and coal. My basic difficulty regarding the treaty is not the details which have been mentioned and about which so much has been said by Italians in this country. They call them basic injustices. I think the important thing at this particular time which causes me to believe that consideration of the treaty should be delayed is the renewed expansion of the Communists as exemplified by their actions in Hungary. That gives them a constitutional basis. At least, what they have done, it is claimed, was done in accordance with the constitution, although everything indicates that it was done by force and the threat of violence. Certainly the former Premier of Hungary, in his statement from Switzerland, indicated that it was for fear of his life that he went to Switzerland, as a result of such violence. In any case, the Communists now have control right up to the border of Italy, and it looks clear to me that they would refuse to make any effort to arrive at a treaty with Austria in order to maintain there the troops they have in Hungary, under the terms of the armistice, and to take over that country.

Therefore, in consideration of all the happenings within the past few weeks it seems to me that by withdrawing our troops Italy would be subjected to the very probable repetition of what has occurred in Hungary. I do not think we ought to do that.

I have on occasion in the past urged in the Senate that we approach the problem in Europe in connection with the settlement of the peace from an over-all point of view, and that we try to look at the problem and see what is needed from an economic point of view and from the standpoint of how much money is needed, and from an over-all point of view regarding non-Communist Europe. I think the plan which I understand is being considered by the State Department, which is called the continental economic plan, is a step in the right direction. On the other hand, I think the State Department has been very slow in developing that policy. It seems to me that taking this action now would in a sense prevent the creation of any unification of action or any economic or political unification in western Europe, because it would be a step in the direction of setting up a recreated Italy separate and distinct, without any regard to any over-all agreements or arrangements between the western European states. I think the basic difficulty in considering the Italian treaty is due to the fact that the principal signatory, other than the United States, is, I believe, completely undependable with regard to carrying out its terms. When we look back and consider the agreements at Tehran and at Yalta—particularly at Yalta and at Potsdam—and consider the lively discussions which went on in the press and on the floor of the Senate regarding the wisdom of those agreements, and then consider how completely they were ignored, how wholly ineffective they were in practice in their application to the way governments were set up in Poland, in Rumania, and in Yugoslavia—

how completely the tripartite participation provisions were ignored in setting up governments—it seems like a sort of dream; there is something completely unreal about it. I have the same feeling, at the moment, regarding the treaty with Italy. In view of what has happened in Hungary, and in view of the fact that that is not the first time such a thing has happened, it seems to me quite unrealistic and sort of other-worldly to be bothering about the specific provisions of the treaty. The fact is—and this is the important fact—that if we withdraw our troops from Italy, the result will be the creation of a situation in which the Communists, who already are very strong in Italy, will be able to proceed by force as well by intrigue—the latter being the well-known method they have used in other countries—to take over the Italian Government at the proper time. My guess is that if we do ratify the treaty, that proper time will not be in the immediate future, but probably will be after they have succeeded in obtaining the release of Italian credits and Italian property in this country, amounting to approximately \$150,000,000, or at least more than \$100,000,000. Of course, they will wait until they have received payment on the loan which already has been extended to the Italian people, just as the Communists in Hungary timed their action by waiting until there had been returned to Hungary the \$32,000,000 in gold which we had only a few weeks ago.

So I would not expect such action to be taken in Italy next week. On the other hand, after weighing all the possibilities and, in my opinion, the probabilities, I cannot see how delaying the ratification of this treaty until next January, let us say, would result, under existing conditions, in any greater disintegration than that which would occur if we withdrew from Italy. In fact, I think the presence of our troops in Italy gives her some assurance that the assistance we give to Italy will be applied for the purposes for which we intend it to go, and at the same time I think the presence of our troops there is a deterrent to the taking over of the Italian Government by the Russians. All of us recall that about the only time the Russians have refrained from completing an expansionist move which they had undertaken was in the case of Iran; and I think their action at that time was in response to a very positive and definite position on the part of the United States, and was in accord with a specific agreement which has been made with the United States and Britain and Iran regarding the date of withdrawal of the Russians from Iran. In other words, a line had been drawn there, so to speak, by a treaty; and when the Russians were challenged, they did not wish to proceed regardless of our protest.

But that situation is very different from the situation in Italy. Upon our withdrawal from Italy upon the recreation of an independent Italy, the Russians' procedure will be to gain their objectives while proceeding in accord with the Italian constitution, just as the Russians did in the case of Hungary. Of course, such action is in a sense in accord with their constitution, but in an-

other sense the use of force and threats, as was done in Hungary, seems to me to be a complete perversion of what was intended by the constitution, either in the case of Hungary on the one hand or in the case of Italy on the other hand.

Mr. President, I realize the momentum of the move to have the Senate ratify the Italian treaty; and I also recognize that the great persuasive powers and influence of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], the chairman of our Foreign Relations Committee, coupled with the statement of the Secretary of State, undoubtedly will procure the ratification of this treaty. I make this statement only because I feel so strongly that the ratification of the treaty at this time would be an error and would lead to disastrous results not only in Italy but, more particularly, in respect to the plan, if there is one, or the idea of creating in western Europe some system of federation, economic unification, or whatever word we may like to use, to bring those countries together in a relationship which will enable them to trade freely among themselves and, I hope, in time to work out a political federation of some kind which will withstand the shocks of ill fortune in the future, and which, I would hope, would make a great contribution to a peaceful world.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks a few editorials dealing with the subject of a federated Europe. I make this request primarily for the purpose of showing to the Senate and to the people of the United States the widespread interest in the proposal to promote a federation in western Europe. I think many persons are unaware of the fact that all over the United States, and in all kinds of newspapers, editorials and expressions in various articles on this subject have appeared.

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

[From the Evansville (Ind.) Courier and Press of May 18, 1947]

THE ONLY WAY

Now that Congress has approved the Greek-Turkish-aid program and we are launched upon the Truman doctrine, a question arises that must be answered:

Is it to be merely a holding operation against communistic aggression?

If it is just that, if we lack the imagination and the daring to make it any more than that, then we probably are embarking upon a losing proposition.

Long-term policies and programs must be evolved and supported, if the Truman doctrine is to succeed.

Such a long-term program is imperative for Europe.

Such a program has been advanced in the Congress through a concurrent resolution introduced in the House by Representative Boggs of Louisiana and in the Senate by Senator FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas. It says:

"The Congress hereby favors the creation of a United States of Europe within the framework of the United Nations."

There never was a more timely moment to push this program. As a matter of fact it seems the only alternative to chaos and the disappearance of Europe as a bulwark of western civilization.

Once this country adopts the goal of European federation as a major part of our for-

eign policy, a great many problems and issues will fall into place and make possible a more sane handling of them. One of the great weaknesses in our feeble efforts to counteract Russian radio propaganda has been the lack of sane long-term objectives that make sense to the suffering millions of Europe.

There is still more than half of Europe left free of Soviet domination. That part could provide a sufficient foundation to demonstrate the workability of the federation idea. But there isn't any time to lose. The part not under Soviet domination may be much smaller a year from now.

The idea of European federation is old. But it has been advanced more and more frequently in the last few years. Senator FULBRIGHT in a Senate speech the other day used some quotations supporting the idea, some of which we are going to repeat.

Take this sentence from the book, "Strategy for Democracy," published in 1942 by Kingsley and Petergosky:

"Europe must unite. Peace on the European continent can be made a stable affair only through some process of federalization."

Here is what William Bullitt, former ambassador to Russia, said in a speech at New York University, on March 28, 1943:

"The world needs a strong, integrated, democratic Europe. A loosely-held-together agglomeration of weakness is not strength. Such a Europe might slip rapidly into another uneasy balance of power or, if it should not be armed, into another uneasy balance of impotence and fall prey to internal and external pressures."

From the book, *Revolt of the Masses*, by Ortega and Gasset, we read: "The real situation of Europe would, then, appear to be this: Its long and splendid past has brought it to a new stage of existence where everything has increased; but at the same time the institutions surviving from the past are dwarfed and have become an obstacle to expansion. Europe has been built up in the form of small nations. In a way the idea and the sentiment of nationality have been her most characteristic invention. And now she finds herself obliged to exceed herself. This is the outline of the enormous drama to be staged in the coming year. Will she be able to shake off these survivals, or will she remain forever their prisoner? Because it has already happened once before in history that a great civilization has died through not being able to adopt a substitute for its traditional idea of the state."

Further in this book, we find: "To my mind the feeling of shrinkage of impotency, which undoubtedly lies heavy on the vitality of Europe in these times, is nourished on that disproportion between the great potentialities of Europe and the form of political organization within which they have to act."

In the *Courier*, in December 1943, Dorothy Thompson said: "For no peace can be made without Europe, which happens to contain 350,000,000 people. The crux of the whole peace is the reconstruction of Europe. But so far not a single basis in principle or in action has been laid for that reconstruction."

Last December, at Zurich, Winston Churchill made this statement: "I am now going to say something which will astonish you. The first step in the recreation of the European family must be a partnership between France and Germany. In this way only can France recover the moral and cultural leadership of Europe. There can be no revival of Europe without a spiritually great France and a spiritually great Germany."

This is the way history must be shaped unless Europe is to slip back into the Dark Ages again, to be reformed behind the iron curtain of its Soviet masters.

The Truman doctrine is not enough as a holding operation. It must involve much more than that. It must involve a plan for the reconstruction of Europe which, as

Dorothy Thompson says, is the crux of the whole peace.

Only the federation plan holds forth hope of permanent peace and economic well-being for Europe—all of Europe.

[From the Atlanta (Ga.) Journal of May 20, 1947]

FAITH OF A EUROPEAN

Whatever one may think of the political implications in Winston Churchill's proposal of a united Europe, there is no denying the brilliant act of faith which his words compose. The "rubble-heap, charnel-house, breeding ground of pestilence and hate"—that Europe we of today see plainly. "Has she nothing to give to the world," Mr. Churchill asks, "but the contagion of the black death?" His categorical denial, moving in its terms and its associations, is the language which for two dismal postwar years we have been awaiting.

"There is the fairest, most temperate, most fertile area of the globe. The influence and the power of Europe and of Christendom have for centuries shaped and dominated the course of history. * * * Religion, law, learning, art, science, industry throughout the world all bear in so many lands, under every sky and in every clime, the stamp of European origin and traces of the European influence."

Winston Churchill, for years the first citizen of Britain, has constantly thought of himself as a citizen of Europe. "We hope to reach again," he says, "a Europe purged of the slavery of the ancient times in which men will be as proud to say: 'I am a European' as once they were to say: 'Civis Romanus sum.'"

Is Churchill, great traditionalist that he is, here looking at the present through the eyes of the past, or is he glancing prophetically at the future? He says that it is often a mistake to try to settle everything at once. "Far off, on the skyline, we can see the peaks of the delectable mountains. But we cannot tell what lies between us and them."

When he couples his plea for a united Europe with an unequivocal statement on the imperative need of some effective world supergovernment, we can take the measure of his time scale, which projects him far into the future.

That, likewise, brings into greater perspective the implications of his more specific statements on European unity. By defining the "four pillars of peace" as the United States, the Soviet Union, the British Commonwealth, and a united Europe, and placing Britain in the last two of these, does Mr. Churchill open himself to the charge of creating a purely anti-Russian bloc? He denies it, and explains that the Europe he envisions is not only a geographical entity but a cultural entity in which individual human liberties form the touchstone.

It was not so, of course, with the Romans or the Holy Roman Empire; Napoleon made it so very imperfectly and Hitler rose to power through the attempt to deny history itself. But Churchill's Europe, as he makes clear in speaking of France's future role, will be the creation of an act of faith if it is created at all. It is, he says, a spiritual conception which so long as men feel its worth will not die.

[From the Buffalo (N. Y.) News of May 22, 1947]

UNITY IS EUROPE'S PROBLEM

The ancient Greeks used the word "problem" to mean some thing or event thrown unexpectedly into experience, creating difficulties, and requiring man's mind to find new and different ways of getting on in a world suddenly disordered. As Prof. Horace M. Kallen suggested at the U. B. Centennial, it marks the intrusion of conflict into

order—"the irruption of the obscure or unknown into the clear and known." Europe today is confronted with the problem, in the original use of the word, of disintegration rather than recovery after combat. Mr. Churchill's plan for a United States of Europe is designed to solve this problem, and deserves the attention of whatever nation-saving statesmen there remain on that unhappy Continent that cradled western civilization as we know it.

This half-American Briton speaks generously and grandly as a European whose patriotism is not alone to a nation but to a continent and a civilization. Surely his is the voice of Europe speaking for common survival. He would smooth away frontier lines, demolish tariff impediments to rising standards of living, so all European states can, as he well puts it, assure their peoples "those fundamental human and personal rights and liberties on which our democratic civilization has been created." He asks the pointed question: "Are we Europeans, through our poverty and our quarrels, forever to be a burden and a danger to the rest of the world?" He calls for France and Britain to become the cofounders of a federal union through western Europe, in order that prosperity can live as freedom's guest.

His offer of common citizenship to Frenchmen in the despairing summer of 1940 shows that this calls for a United States of Europe is no sudden Churchillian dream. Indeed, a solution of this sort has been in the imagination of great leaders in Europe since France's Henry IV put forward his grand design over three centuries ago. Surely, Mr. Churchill is right in saying that the present is the supreme opportunity for unity in Europe in some form.

Anne O'Hare McCormick says that the best argument against it is the political impossibility of concord at the moment. At the same time, this political nuclear fission is the very best argument that the time for unity is at hand. The people of that unhappy Continent have only to look across the Atlantic as it was 160 years ago to find one of history's most powerful analogies by example. But for the chaos that was confounding the United States that had emerged from the war of independence, the founding fathers would not have been able to have brought into being the more perfect Union that has now grown into the strongest as well as the freest power the world has ever known.

The United States had achieved its independence from George III, but the individual States were unwilling to entrust the Confederation Congress with the power to operate as a central government. Each State had its own tariffs and excises; the New York of Gov. George Clinton, levied on schooners from Massachusetts and provision boats from New Jersey as though they were from Bremen, Brest, or Bristol. Paper money became not worth a continental because printing presses turned it out night and day. The Confederation Congress could tax nothing, and the States showed little interest in meeting the requisitions made upon them. At length things reached so low a point that George Washington, James Madison, and others were able to project a new frame of government and to persuade the jealous States to put it into commission. The gravity of the need forced efficient solution.

History does not repeat exactly, but it does afford analogies that are serviceable to statesmen seeking the way out from catastrophe. The peoples in the ruins of Europe can take heart from the perils that beset Americans in 1787—perils that were overcome through resolute action. Mr. Churchill puts it well for the Continent whose self-regeneration he seeks: "This is the hour of choice, and surely the choice is plain. If the peoples of Europe resolve to come together and work together for mutual advantage, to exchange blessings instead of curses, they still have it in their

power to sweep away the horrors and miseries which surround them and to allow the streams of freedom, happiness, and abundance to begin again their healing flow."

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch of May 22, 1947]

THE VOICE OF A STATESMAN

(The United Nations has failed because it recognizes national sovereignty. There can be no international law while nations retain self-willed sovereignty.—Former Supreme Court Justice Owen J. Roberts.)

It is not necessary to be as pessimistic as Justice Roberts is to observe that at the present stage the chances of the United Nations to become the potent arbiter of peace seem scarcely greater than were those of the League of Nations.

The chance for the League of Nations to be endowed with the degree of governance necessary to prevent war was thwarted by the bitter-enders in the Senate who prevented the effective participation of the United States. The United Nations was launched with the handicap of the veto power, and the opportunity to correct this weakness by exempting the control of armaments from the veto has been resolutely blocked by Russia.

We can hope that UN will yet be endowed with the vitality and authority if needs, but the possibility that this may not happen is at least sufficient to suggest the wisdom of working meanwhile for more limited objectives which will contribute to the preservation of peace. The doctrine of limited objectives is especially applicable to the proposal for a United States of Europe, the consummation of which would not conflict with but rather strengthen the ultimate chance for a powerful United Nations.

The Fulbright resolution would place Congress on record as favoring a United States of Europe within the framework of the United Nations. Winston Churchill sees a United States of Europe not as a rival but as a corollary of the United Nations. In his speech last week launching the United European Committee, Mr. Churchill said:

"In the UN constitution agreed on at San Francisco, direct provision is made for regional organizations to be formed. United Europe will form one major regional entity. There is the United States, with all its dependencies; there is the Soviet Union; there is the British Empire and Commonwealth; and there is Europe, with which Great Britain is profoundly blended. Here are the four main pillars of the world temple of peace. Let us make sure that they will bear the weight which will be reposed upon them.

"After the first great war the League of Nations tried to build * * * an international order upon a weak, divided Europe. Its failure cost us dear. Today, after the Second World War, Europe is far weaker and far more distracted. One of the four pillars of the temple of peace lies before us in shattered fragments. It must be reassembled and reconstructed before there can be any real progress in building a spacious superstructure of our desires."

This speech will go down as one of the great orations of the greatest British orator of this generation. With the same exaltation that marked his speeches in the war, Churchill rose above his own predilections and loyalties and appealed to the conscience of mankind.

Has Europe nothing to give the world, he asked, but war and vengeance until all that invests human life with dignity and comfort has been obliterated? With all that modern production and transportation can offer, is Europe to strangle herself with trade barriers until she is incapable even of averting famine from the masses of our people? Or

will the European states come together to allow the streams of freedom, happiness, and abundance to begin again their healing flow?

Churchill asked Prime Minister Attlee to resume the advocacy of a united Europe which he voiced before the last war, and he appealed to France to share with Britain the duty and the opportunity to unite the Continent. While Communists marched with anti-Churchill banners in front of the hall in which he spoke, he appealed to the Russian people to understand how much they stand to gain by the elimination of the causes of war in Europe.

Here was a speech to wake the lagging imagination of our statesmen in Washington, as well as in London, Paris, and Vienna. Can they not see that this is the same Churchill, the same man of vision, who tried to warn Europe of what should have been done to avert the last eruption? Is he to be again the man before his time, the voice crying in the wilderness?

[From the Mankato (Minn.) Free Press of May 20, 1947]

UNITED STATES OF EUROPE

Winston Churchill attracted much attention, in his own country and throughout the world recently when he spoke in London in behalf of a United States of Europe.

This is not a new theme for Mr. Churchill—he was advocating it vigorously before the beginning of World War II; it was part of the eventual plan he had in mind when he offered France joint citizenship with Britain during the dark hour which the French experienced in June of 1940.

But if a united Europe was advisable and desirable in those seemingly faraway days, it is an absolute necessity now. Broken, battered, and weakened by two devastating wars within a quarter century the democratic nations of Europe, all of them, are now so prostrate that it is virtually impossible to talk about the emergence or the independence of any one, even the strongest of them, standing alone.

Either Europe must stand united against the threat of Communist totalitarianism or it will be submerged by that form of collectivist threat. Churchill is as sound, his vision is as clear and sure on this question as it was 10 years ago when he repeatedly warned against the growing danger of Hitlerism.

Out of the present chaos and confusion there will either come a united, coherent group of states, acting in unison for a common purpose, or there will come the collapse of all that we have regarded as good and essential in western Europe's civilization. The aid which the United States is extending to various countries and regimes can be only temporary—the long run solution of Europe's basic problem lies in the program which Winston Churchill has outlined with prophetic vision, born of long years of study and experience with Europe's tangled affairs.

[From the Springfield (Mo.) News and Leader of May 23, 1947]

BARIS TO EUROPEAN UNION

Back in the early thirties Winston Churchill put forward the idea of a united Europe. It was an idea foreign to the thinking of its time—a time of going Fascism, dawning Hitlerism, Maginot mentality, ultranationalism, insincerity, and appeasement. Mr. Churchill, a Tory with a vision, saw the evils and their remedy. But no one of comparable vision and authority in all Europe answered and supported him.

It took a second World War—which a strong, united Europe almost surely could have prevented—to show the true value of Mr. Churchill's remedy. Europe of 15 years ago had all the necessary ingredients of that

remedy except one—wisdom. Today such important ingredients as stability, prosperity, health, and strength are gone. And there is some question whether wisdom has been gained.

A few nights ago Mr. Churchill again appealed to Europe to unite. It was an eloquent, intelligent plea which took into account all the grim realities of the present.

Mr. Churchill urged a European federation as one of the "four pillars of the temple of peace." The others, he said, are the United States, the Soviet Union, and the British Commonwealth. They would support a United Nations expanded into a world super-government to prevent war.

"Are the states of Europe," Mr. Churchill asked, "to continue forever to squander the first fruits of their toil upon the erection of new barriers, military fortifications and tariff walls and passport networks against one another?"

For the most part, Europe's answer was silence. France, which with Britain would be the backbone of any European union, showed a slight reaction. Her statesmen were too busy for comment. Most French newspapers ignored his speech.

Instead there came from France the voice of Charles de Gaulle, wartime hero, interim President, and now head of a new and somewhat disturbing political movement. Following Mr. Churchill by a day, M. de Gaulle made a speech in which he called for a strong state in France.

The former general said he meant by a strong state "what others mean in reference to themselves—for example, in Moscow and Washington—a state whose chief is a chief and in which no confusion of powers hampers or dilutes responsibility."

It is odd that M. de Gaulle should mention Washington and Moscow in the same breath—especially since he must know that in the United States the powers of government are delegated, though not confused, and that responsibility is divided, though not diluted.

Substitute the word "authority" for "responsibility" in the quotation above and you have a statement that might have been made by Hitler or Mussolini in the days when Mr. Churchill first proposed a united Europe.

If M. de Gaulle expresses a growing sentiment in France today, then the difficulties of adopting Mr. Churchill's plan are increased enormously. For the same reason the plan becomes even more urgently necessary.

[From the Clarksburg (W. Va.) Exponent of May 22, 1947]

BARIS TO EUROPEAN UNION

Back in the early thirties Winston Churchill put forward an idea of a united Europe. It was an idea foreign to the thinking of its time—a time of going fascism, dawning Hitlerism, Maginot mentality, ultranationalism, insincerity, and appeasement. Mr. Churchill, a Tory with a vision, saw the evils and their remedy. But no one of comparable vision and authority in all Europe answered and supported him.

It took a Second World War—which a strong, united Europe almost surely could have prevented—to show the true value of Mr. Churchill's remedy. Europe of 15 years ago had all the necessary ingredients of that remedy except one—wisdom. Today such important ingredients as stability, prosperity, health, and strength are gone. And there is some question whether wisdom has been gained.

A few nights ago Mr. Churchill again appealed to Europe to unite. It was an eloquent, intelligent plea which took into account all the grim realities of the present.

Mr. Churchill urged a European federation as one of the "four pillars of the temple of peace." The others, he said, "are the

United States, the Soviet Union, and the British Commonwealth. They would support a United Nations expanded into a world supergovernment to prevent war."

"Are the states of Europe," Mr. Churchill asked, "to continue forever to squander the first fruits of their toil upon the erection of new barriers, military fortifications and tariff walls and passport networks against one another?"

For the most part, Europe's answer was silence. France, which with Britain would be the backbone of any European union, showed slight reaction. Her statesmen were too busy for comment. Most French newspapers ignored his speech.

Instead there came from France the voice of Charles de Gaulle, wartime hero, interim president, and now head of a new and somewhat disturbing political movement. Following Mr. Churchill by a day, M. de Gaulle made a speech in which he called for a "strong state" in France.

The former general said he meant by a strong state "what others mean in reference to themselves—for example, in Moscow and Washington—a state whose chief is a chief and in which no confusion of powers hampers or dilutes responsibility."

It is odd that M. de Gaulle should mention Washington and Moscow in the same breath—especially since he must know that in the United States the powers of government are delegated, though not confused, and that responsibility is divided, though not diluted.

Substitute the word "authority" for "responsibility" in the quotation above and you have a statement that might have been made by Hitler or Mussolini in the days when Mr. Churchill first proposed a united Europe.

If M. de Gaulle expresses a growing sentiment in France today, then the difficulties of adopting Mr. Churchill's plan are increased enormously. For the same reason the plan becomes even more urgently necessary.

[From the Lima (Ohio) News of May 7, 1947]

BARIS TO EUROPEAN UNION

Back in the early thirties Winston Churchill put forward the idea of a united Europe. It was an idea foreign to the thinking of its time—a time of going fascism, dawning Hitlerism, Maginot mentality, ultranationalism, insincerity, and appeasement. Mr. Churchill, a Tory with a vision, saw the evils and their remedy. But no one of comparable vision and authority in all Europe answered and supported him.

It took a second world war—which a strong united Europe almost surely could have prevented—to show the true value of Mr. Churchill's remedy. Europe of 15 years ago had all the necessary ingredients of that remedy except one—wisdom. Today such important ingredients as stability, prosperity, health, and strength are gone. And there is some question whether wisdom has been gained.

A few nights ago Mr. Churchill again appealed to Europe to unite. It was an eloquent, intelligent plea which took into account all the grim realities of the present.

Mr. Churchill urged a European federation as one of the "four pillars of the temple of peace." The others, he said, are the United States, the Soviet Union, and the British Commonwealth. They would support a United Nations expanded into a world supergovernment to prevent war.

"Are the states of Europe," Mr. Churchill asked, "to continue forever to squander the first fruits of their toil upon the erection of new barriers, military fortifications and tariff walls and passport networks against one another?"

For the most part, Europe's answer was silence. France, which with Britain would be the backbone of any European union, showed slight reaction. Her statesmen were too busy for comment. Most French newspapers ignored his speech.

Instead there came from France the voice of Charles de Gaulle, wartime hero, interim President, and now head of a new and somewhat disturbing political movement. Following Mr. Churchill by a day, M. de Gaulle made a speech in which he called for a strong state in France.

The former general said he meant by a strong state "what others mean in reference to themselves—for example, in Moscow and Washington—a state whose chief is a chief and in which no confusion of powers hampers or dilutes responsibility."

It is odd that M. de Gaulle should mention Washington and Moscow in the same breath—especially since he must know that in the United States the powers of government are delegated, though not confused, and that responsibility is divided, though not diluted.

Substitute the word "authority" for "responsibility" in the quotation above and you have a statement that might have been made by Hitler or Mussolini in the days when Mr. Churchill first proposed a united Europe.

If M. de Gaulle expresses a growing sentiment in France today, then the difficulties of adopting Mr. Churchill's plan are increased enormously. For the same reason the plan becomes even more urgently necessary.

[From the Albany (N. Y.) Knickerbocker News of May 21, 1947]

A UNITED EUROPE

Mr. Churchill—again at his best, eloquently urging his countrymen to dedicate themselves to a cause "majestic and high"—is championing a united Europe which will assure the blessings of peace and prosperity to its own people and to the world.

Mr. Churchill is laying the foundation for a broad campaign in the field of public opinion and he rightly refused to complicate the situation with details. He makes it clear that the whole design for a United Europe is within, and subordinate to, the United Nations and that the way must be prepared by a favorable public opinion before particular governments can be expected to act. He asks that from now on his own and other governments should meet continental problems from the European rather than from the nationalistic angle.

The plan for a stable and peaceful Europe should command the support of Russia. Mr. Churchill regrets that this is not the case, but says that the peace, amity, and well-being of so many millions of men and women must not be frustrated by the veto of any single power, however respected.

It is important that we in this country recognize that a program for a United Europe does not run counter to the United Nations, any more than does the existence of the United States itself. It is also equally essential that our own policies in Europe shall be guided by principles applicable to the continent as a whole and not merely to separate nations. Behind the German problem or the Austrian or the Italian problem is that of Europe as a whole.

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch of May 25, 1947]

TIME FAVORABLE FOR DEVELOPMENT OF JOINT ECONOMIC PROJECT FOR RECOVERY OF ALL WESTERN EUROPE—LELAND STOWE SAYS THIS WOULD MEAN COORDINATION OF PRODUCTION, EXPORTS, POWER, MONETARY POLICIES—EXPERTS THINK THIS IS ONLY WAY TO REHABILITATION

(By Leland Stowe)

As a spokesman for postwar Europe's salvation, Winston Churchill has made himself both vulnerable and suspect by his Greek policy, his Fulton, Mo., speech, and other matters. But when the old organ master of the King's English discusses the need of a European union—or of a federation of west-

ern Europe, if necessary, as a starter—he is not dealing with a personal monopoly. Some of us, alas, can remember the moving humanitarianism of Aristide Briand as he pleaded vainly at Geneva in the late 1920's, for a "United States of Europe." If only governments and peoples had listened then.

I happen to prefer vastly the Briand approach to the recent Churchill approach. Given his background and convictions, Churchill is bound to consider a possible union of European countries chiefly in terms of a counterbalance to Soviet Russia.

Would it not be more constructive, and also safer and more practical, to think of Europe today as a natural bridge and a potential neutralizer between Russia and the Anglo-American powers?

Does not this prostrate Europe need recovery, an over-all economic treatment, far more than it needs strategic injections?

These are questions which the American Government now begins to face. Washington must have answers prepared before the menace of a general European collapse slides into reality within a year or 18 months.

It is of some real encouragement that important administration officials now are directly concerned with the economic basis of the growing crisis in Europe. If we can evolve a program that puts European recovery ahead of power politics, we may reduce the area and excuse for power politics in due time. This is where the concept of a European federation assumes exceptional significance.

When Briand crusaded bravely for a United States of Europe there were pitifully few in London or Washington who were at all interested, least of all, those in political power. But these 20 intervening years of ceaseless crises and disasters have served as a brutally effective plow turning up a certain amount of promising new soil in high places.

The mental attitudes of British and American leaders are changing at last. The terrible facts of Europe's alarming plight are proving more powerful than the clear-sighted logic of lone idealists like Briand. So we hear serious talk at last about union or federation for Europe.

What has caused this pronounced change in attitude? Obviously it has been precipitated by the depredations of World War II. Nations and men have finally wrought such chaotic havoc on Europe, the center of modern civilization, that no purely nationalistic cures—applied nation by nation, without regard for resources and geography—can be expected to cure anything.

This Europe is much too ravaged, dislocated, and impoverished to be restored separately, piece by piece. Yes, it might be propped up piece by piece for a short time—\$500,000,000 prop for Italy today, a similar prop for France tomorrow, and so on. But it is now clear that each operation of this sort—like our present one in Greece—would only be a blood transfusion of short-term efficacy.

Europe has become too weakened and poverty-stricken to respond to anything less than an all around treatment which attacks her economic disease as what it really is—an entity, a common whole.

When this much is recognized as fact in Washington, it raises an interlocked question: Can America's Government and her taxpayers afford to finance Europe's recovery in any way except by treating much or most of Europe as an economic whole?

Some highly placed Washington officials are beginning to face this question also. They have to face it because America, it is said by very competent authorities, may have to provide some 15 billion dollars, or perhaps more, to underwrite European recovery between 1948 and 1951.

There seems no likelihood that this step or this cost can be avoided. The alternatives would be near-anarchy, civil bloodshed, or revolutions in several leading European coun-

tries. The consequent increase in communism, or in totalitarian governments of whatever kind, would certainly be very considerable. Quite aside from this, a Europe in protracted anarchy, being totally unable to buy from us, would dangerously increase unemployment in the United States.

Thus two unprecedented situations now exist. For the first time European nations are in such intolerable economic circumstances that they may be forced to eschew narrow nationalisms in support of a European union. For the first time also the United States Government and people have a personal dollars-and-cents interest in helping build a union of European countries.

Finally, all concerned have a time-limit gun pointed at their heads unless they cooperate to do something about it. Never before has this combination of imperatives existed.

Within 5 years we shall see whether the intelligence of western leadership was sufficient to grasp and act upon the drastic meaning of these present imperatives.

By "European union" we do not now mean an early emergence of a United States of Europe, with individual countries playing an identical role with the States in the United States. It would probably take many years for anything so integrated and federalized to emerge in Europe—possibly decades. As of now, however, it is certainly possible to develop a common economic plan for the recovery of all of western Europe.

That would mean coordinated production and export schedules, joint distribution of the Ruhr's coal and steel, inter-related systems of electrical power, correlated monetary policies, and similar cardinal features of economy and finance.

It would mean a joint economic plan for Allied Germany, France, and Italy. Around this nucleus the Netherlands, Scandinavia, Belgium, Austria and Switzerland would be brought in. Such an economic European union should be equally open to Czechoslovakia, Poland and Danubian Nations now in the Soviet zone.

In the view of some Washington experts, and others in London, Europe's economic recovery must be achieved through this federated, over-all approach, either with the Soviet's assistance or without it, if necessary. They insist that western Germany, France, and Italy constitute the heart and stomach of any vital European organism. Only taken together and treated together do they make any economic common sense.

Now, the experts insist, it has become far too costly to attempt to treat them in any other way. Around the German-French-Italian nucleus a general European recovery can be built. As a living and growing central organism it could scarcely fail to attract other countries into a coordinated economic program.

Only hope for Europe

It is expected that Moscow will be suspicious or antagonistic to any synchronized steps toward European economic union. Nevertheless Europe's millions are as hungry for hope as they are for food. They want to live; and they wait impatiently for some program, some major action, which promises them life. Only a plan and a big plan can give them hope and offer them life.

The ironies of our common world predicament are many. One of these ironies is now becoming evident. An American Congress, which often registers itself as skeptical or opposed to economic planning, will find itself compelled to approve economic planning on a very large scale in order to save Europe—in order to save Europe from chaos, Communism or a number of other things. Washington will also have to plan for Europe's recovery in order to have any assured recovery here at home.

We shall have to lay the foundations for an economic European union—or else.

[From the Dallas (Tex.) Times-Herald of May 23, 1947]

CHURCHILL IS THINKING ALONG RIGHT LINE

Winston Churchill, in renewing his plea for a United States of Europe, points to a step that may be necessary to the salvation, not only of the continent in question, but of the world.

Whether the union could be formed along the line favored by Mr. Churchill is open to debate. He seems to contemplate an organization similar to the United States of America. However, there are age-old differences among the European nations in language and culture.

But the need of a large degree of political and economic unity in Europe seems obvious. The lack of such unity breeds war, and war today quickly spreads. A peaceful Europe probably would mean a peaceful world.

Mr. Churchill does not wish to supplant the United Nations as a global organization, but holds that a federalization of European nations would go a long way toward insuring success of the U. N. by eliminating sources of discord. Some day his dream may come true.

[From the Terre Haute (Ind.) Star of May 21, 1947]

BARriers TO EUROPEAN UNION

Back in the early thirties, Winston Churchill put forward the idea of a united Europe. It was an idea foreign to the thinking of its time—a time of going fascism, dawning Hitlerism, Maginot mentality, ultranationalism, insincerity, and appeasement. Mr. Churchill, a Tory with a vision, saw the evils and their remedy. But no one of comparable vision and authority in all Europe answered and supported him.

It took a Second World War—which a strong united Europe almost surely could have prevented—to show the true value of Mr. Churchill's remedy. Europe of 15 years ago had all the necessary ingredients of that remedy except one—wisdom. Today such important ingredients as stability, prosperity, health, and strength are gone. And there is some question whether wisdom has been gained.

A few nights ago Mr. Churchill again appealed to Europe to unite. It was an eloquent, intelligent plea which took into account all the grim realities of the present.

Mr. Churchill urged a European federation as one of the "four pillars of the temple of peace." The others, he said, are the United States, the Soviet Union, and the British Commonwealth. They would support a United Nations expanded into a world super-government to prevent war.

"Are the states of Europe," Mr. Churchill asked, "to continue forever to squander the first fruits of their toil upon the erection of new barriers, military fortifications, and tariff walls and passport networks against one another?"

For the most part, Europe's answer was silence. France, which with Britain would be the backbone of an European union, showed slight reaction. Her statesmen were too busy for comment. Most French newspapers ignored his speech.

Instead there came from France the voice of Charles de Gaulle, wartime hero, interim president, and now head of a new and somewhat disturbing political movement. Following Mr. Churchill by a day, M. de Gaulle made a speech in which he called for a "strong state" in France.

The former general said he meant by a strong state "what others mean in reference to themselves—for example, in Moscow and Washington—a state whose chief is a chief and in which no confusion of powers hampers or dilutes responsibility."

It is odd that M. de Gaulle should mention Washington and Moscow in the same breath—especially since he must know that in the United States the powers of govern-

ment are delegated, though not confused, and that responsibility is divided, though not diluted.

Substitute the word "authority" for "responsibility" in the quotation above and you have a statement that might have been made by Hitler or Mussolini in the days when Mr. Churchill first proposed a united Europe.

If M. de Gaulle expresses a growing sentiment in France today, then the difficulties of adopting Mr. Churchill's plan are increased enormously. For the same reason the plan becomes even more urgently necessary.

[From the New York (N. Y.) Times of May 26, 1947]

A "CONTINENTAL PLAN"

According to a dispatch to this newspaper by James Reston, official Washington is beginning to consider a new approach to European reconstruction which will take account of both the developing economic crisis in Europe and the growing apprehensions in Congress and elsewhere as to how far the United States can go in pouring out billions of dollars for foreign aid and relief without ruining itself. The new approach is a result of the growing realization that the old policy of shoring up the shattered economies of individual European nations and feeding their hungry is insufficient to bring about a real recovery, and that what is needed is a "continental plan" which will permit American aid to be concentrated on key problems and at key points and thus become a lever for the economic advancement of the continent as a whole without producing that general exhaustion on which Russia appears to count.

This new trend of thought was clearly indicated in Secretary of State Marshall's call for a worldwide survey of economic conditions to determine just what the reconstruction demands on the United States are. Since the end of the war, and in addition to more than \$300,000,000,000 spent on the war itself, the United States has allotted for foreign aid and relief the enormous sum of more than seventeen and a half billion dollars. Despite this, and notwithstanding a partial recovery in some countries, Europe, which at one time was the economic power center of the world and still possesses enormous resources, has been unable to get on its feet and now faces a growing crisis as its productive capacity remains crippled and its foreign assets are literally being eaten up.

The main reason for this is, of course, the lack of peace and security caused by the deadlock between Russia and the West. But the events of the last 2 years have also taught us some lessons which we are only now beginning to heed. They have taught us that this is, indeed, one world, not only politically but above all economically; that the economies of all nations are mutually interdependent, and that in Europe in particular, as Under Secretary Acheson said, recovery cannot be complete until the various parts of European economy are coordinated in a harmonious whole. They have also made us realize that behind our allies and our former enemies stands a continent of which they are all a part, and that the infliction of a destructive peace on some nations must be paid for by the distress of all nations. Finally they are teaching us that revolutionary reforms which do not first assure the subsistence of those to be reformed are bound to defeat themselves.

The growing realization of all this is beginning to widen the vision of men everywhere above the narrower viewpoints of the war. It has brought the American Government around to the conviction that if any nation is to revive in Europe all nations must revive, including our former enemies. It has brought forth in Europe itself a growing movement for both political and economic integration, demonstrated by the

customs union between the Netherlands, Belgium, and Luxembourg, by the plans for greater integration of the British and French economies, and by the increasing appeal of the idea of a United States of Europe. But two other things are likewise evident. The first is that the European plans, excellent as long range solutions, are yet unable to deal with the immediate situation. The second is that the immediate situation can be dealt with only with the cooperation of the Europeans themselves.

For that reason it might be well to weigh the idea of calling a European economic conference to consider the working out of the continental plan now being suggested in Washington. It might have to be called even if the next meeting of the Big Four leads to better progress toward peace than was achieved in Moscow, and it would appear to be essential if London turns out to be another failure. Such an economic conference should embrace as many nations as are willing to participate, but the rejection of it by some should not stop it. For the past 2 years Russia has been integrating that part of Europe under her control into her own economy, irrespective of past agreements or the recently concluded satellite peace treaties. If Russia will abandon these plans and join in an all-European reconstruction, well and good; she has as much to gain from it as any nation. But the western world can no longer afford to watch the Russian process of mastication with paralyzing fascination. The time has come to go ahead, with Russia if possible, without her if necessary. And the economic conference looks like the best step toward making such a move effective.

[From the Duluth (Minn.) News-Tribune of May 22, 1947]

THE UNNECESSARY WAR

Winston Churchill revealed the other day that back in 1943 when President Roosevelt asked him what name should be given to the war then raging, Churchill had suggested "the unnecessary war." That name did not become widely circulated at the time. Perhaps that was just as well, for whatever its truth, it might have done our morale no good.

The Churchill remark is much more than an epigram. It is a complaint, bitter and cynical, but it is also an accusation and a declaration of high hope.

That bitterness is important, because it is something all thinking persons can identify in themselves. This country, Britain, and France had immense power and prestige in 1919. The people of the world had learned the grim lesson that war is no fun. The statesmen of these and of other countries tried to find some kind of program. We can pity them all, we can respect many of them, but as a group we must brand them failures. That is the complaint, the accusation that grows out of Churchill's remark.

But it is also a word of hope, perhaps the most impressive uttered so far. We have learned that condemning old wars and scoffing at possible future wars will not prevent those future wars. We know that the nonnecessity of a war is a minor question when we find ourselves in it. With this knowledge so recently burned into our consciousness we are too likely to accept the idea that wars are entirely inevitable, that our efforts to prevent, to avoid, to postpone them are doomed from the beginning.

We can admire Mr. Churchill's designation of the recent war as the view of a man who is both statesman and historian. From there we can go on to examine his own program for the future, presumably for the prevention of other unnecessary wars.

He calls for a United Europe within the United Nations. Only thus, he says, can Europe find respite from wars and their attendant agonies. He denies that this would be a blow at Russia.

It is possible that a United Europe is not the answer, and that if it is, Mr. Churchill is not the man best able to convince doubters of that. He has gone on record on many questions at many times and has a powerful array of enemies everywhere.

He does come out and say that the most recent war was not necessary and he appears to offer a way by which the world might escape another unnecessary war. The terrible slowness of recovery on the continent and in Britain itself may give his idea more of a chance than it would otherwise have had.

[From the Syracuse (N. Y.) Herald-American, May 18, 1947]

A EUROPEAN UNION TO FACE RUSSIA

(By Bertram Benedict)

Europe is slipping into chaos while nothing is accomplished on the peace treaty with Germany, the American people were told by Secretary of State Marshall in his radio report after returning from the fruitless Moscow conference. Yet at the same time Secretary Marshall gave only a counsel of patience, patience. If the State Department has any other proposal up its sleeve, none has been disclosed.

Yet many students of world problems, both in Europe and the United States, have a plan. It calls for a union of western European states, predominantly economic but also to some extent political, into what has come to be known as a United States of Europe. Senator FULBRIGHT, Democrat, Arkansas; Senator THOMAS, Democrat, Utah; and Representative BOGGS, Democrat, Louisiana, have introduced in Congress a resolution reading in full:

"That the Congress favors the creation of a United States of Europe within the framework of the United Nations."

It is no new idea. Disregarding such early advocates as Henry IV, William Penn, Immanuel Kant, and Victor Hugo, the proposal was pushed after World War I by so practical a statesman as Aristide Briand, 10 times Premier of France, and is now supported by hard-bitten Winston Churchill.

In fact, under Briand's instigation, the 27 European states that were members of the League of Nations met in Geneva in 1930 to discuss ways and means of creating a United States of Europe. The conference got nowhere fast. The delegates praised the principle, disagreed violently on how to achieve it. Some objected that a body outside the League would weaken the League. Others disagreed with the Briand thesis that political should precede economic unification. Others saw an attempt at economic and financial rivalry with the United States.

It will be noted that the Soviet Union was not represented. Some of the delegates at Geneva in 1930 thought it futile to project a United States of Europe with the largest and most populous European state left outside. Others even saw in the 1930 Conference another attempt to strengthen the existing "cordon sanitaire" against Moscow.

At all events, any move to create a United States of Europe in 1947 would in effect be an anti-Soviet move. The great difference would be that in 1930 the Soviet Union was on the defensive; in 1947 it is on the offensive. The move today would be an attempt to avert the chaos which is threatened by the Soviet tactics in international affairs and which the Soviet Union is widely suspected of actually desiring. If objection is raised that a union of western Europe now would create two worlds instead of the one world visualized by the United Nations Charter, the answer would be that in actuality Europe is already divided into two worlds.

[From the Wilkes-Barre (Pa.) Times-Leader News of May 21, 1947]

MR. CHURCHILL'S PLAN

Back in the early thirties Winston Churchill put forward the idea of a united

Europe. It was an idea foreign to the thinking of its time, a time of going fascism, dawning Hitlerism, Maginot mentality, ultranationalism, insincerity, and appeasement. Mr. Churchill, a Tory with a vision, saw the evils and their remedy. But no one of comparable vision and authority in all Europe answered and supported him.

It took a Second World War, which a strong united Europe almost surely could have prevented, to show the true value of Mr. Churchill's remedy. Europe of 15 years ago had all the necessary ingredients of that remedy except one, wisdom. Today such important ingredients as stability, prosperity, health, and strength are gone. And there is some question whether wisdom has been gained.

A few nights ago, Mr. Churchill again appealed to Europe to unite. It was an eloquent plea which took into account all the grim realities of the present.

Mr. Churchill urged a European federation as one of the four pillars of the temple of peace. The others, he said, are the United States, the Soviet Union, and the British Commonwealth. They would support a United Nations expanded into a world super-government to prevent war.

"Are the states of Europe," Mr. Churchill asked, "to continue forever to squander the fruits of their toil upon the erection of new barriers, military fortifications, and tariff walls and passport networks against one another?"

For the most part, Europe's answer was silence. France, which with Britain would be the backbone of any European union, showed slight reaction. Her statesmen were too busy for comment. Most French newspapers ignored his speech.

Instead there came from France the voice of Charles de Gaulle, wartime hero, interim president, and now head of a new and somewhat disturbing political movement. Following Mr. Churchill by a day, M. de Gaulle made a speech in which he called for a strong state in France.

The former general said he meant by a strong state "what others mean in reference to themselves—for example, in Moscow and Washington—a state whose chief is a chief and in which no confusion of powers hampers or dilutes responsibility."

If M. de Gaulle expresses a growing sentiment in France today, then the difficulties of adopting Mr. Churchill's plan are increased enormously. For the same reason the plan becomes even more urgently necessary.

[From the Charlotte (N. C.) Observer of May 19, 1947]

UNION OF EUROPE

Winston Churchill, in his speech in London last Wednesday launching the actual campaign for a United States of Europe, reduced the problem to its simplest terms—too simple, we fear, for actualities.

Europe, he said, the originator and once leading protagonist of western civilization, has degenerated into "a rubble-heap, a charnel-house, a breeding ground of pestilence and hate. Ancient nationalistic feuds and modern ideological factions distract and infuriate the unhappy, hungry populations."

As a result of this continuous, internecine strife, Europe has lost its place of leadership in western civilization, and, instead of giving hope and guidance to the rest of the world, it now has "nothing to offer but the contagion of the black death."

"Has Europe's mission," asks Churchill, "come to an end?"

He believes not and conceives that the only way of regaining her lost leadership is to bury the ancient hatreds and antagonisms under the pressing necessity for survival through a united Europe.

But, can the people of Europe be made to realize that this necessity for union supercedes all of their age-old differences?—that

the alternative is the death of a continent? Can all of its diversified races and cultures be welded into a single whole?

Let us inquire, for a moment, what it takes to make a nation or a federation.

Common race and language, a community of religion, literature, history, tradition, and background—all of these two peoples may have and yet not be a single nation. The United States and Britain have all these in common, but they are not and never will be one country.

Of the 21 nations of Latin America, all but one speak the same language, have the same background, traditions, history, literature, and culture; many of them had the same liberator in the person of Simon Bolivar; but they remain vehemently and determinedly separate and independent states.

On the other hand the world has no more compact nation than Switzerland, with its three races, three languages, three cultures. The Germans of Switzerland have not the slightest feeling of communality with the Germans across Lake Constance; the Italian Swiss hold themselves distinct from the Italians beyond the Simplon Pass; and the French Swiss are a different nationality from the French below Geneva. They are neither Germans nor Italians nor French, but all are Swiss.

What, then, unites these Swiss while their blood relatives below the mountains are forever at one another's throats? The answer to that question should solve the riddle of how to submerge the racial hatreds of Europe in a continental union.

The bonds that unite diverse peoples into a single nation, we should say, are these: (1) A common political, social, and economic philosophy; and (2) a common aspiration for the future. The second is the more important, because it could overcome differences in the first.

Without that aspiration, for example, it would be impossible to merge a police state with one enjoying constitutional government; to harmonize a hereditary caste system with equality of opportunity; to adapt communism to free private enterprise.

But, when a common aspiration for the future becomes so overwhelming that it can force a reconciliation of racial and ideological animosities, then we have the makings of a nation or of a federal union.

Mr. Churchill believes that the basis of such an aspiration can be found in the inefable weariness of Europe, in the profound despair of people so sick unto death of rapine, famine, and slaughter that their yearning for peace becomes the overmastering impulse of their lives.

If they can be convinced that the one way to achieve that peace is through a federal union of Europe that will transcend all disruptive forces, the common aspiration will have been planted in the minds and hearts of the people. The union will then be attainable.

As Churchill said, it is not the work of a day, but of many years, and we can make only the beginning. To the practical mind the obstacles seem almost insuperable, but, when human suffering becomes insufferable, it may react with a force stronger than all of the dictators, all of the nationalists, and all of the hatreds they have been able to engender.

For the sake of that bare possibility, we should give to the European Union movement our most hopeful blessing and our most energetic support.

[From the Manchester (N. H.) Union of May 20, 1947]

UNITED EUROPE

Winston Churchill has once more focused attention on the idea of a federated Europe. This idea has long been recognized by students of world politics as the logical basis of a stable and prosperous continent. The curse of Europe has been its sectional hatreds and

rivalries that have made it a continent of division and conflict. Split up into comparatively small states, separated from each other by trade barriers, and looking upon each other as potential enemies, life on that Continent has been rendered economically and politically intolerable.

The chaotic conditions following World War II has made the demand for unity more imperative. Premier Attlee's prewar words that Europe must federate or perish are truer today than ever. Impoverished by the ravages of war, the European nations must work out some plan of standing together and striving to restore their ruined economic structure, or sink together into chaos and ruin.

The proposal made by Churchill therefore is nothing novel or unreasonable. It is backed up by both common sense and experience. There exists in the United States today an illustration of what a vast area can do when it makes union and not division its mainspring. It is not difficult to imagine the United States divided into 48 States rivaling each other, instead of the great American Union living at peace with its 2 neighbors, Canada and Mexico. What Churchill foresees is a United States of Europe in many ways similar to the United States of America.

There exists, however, one strong impediment to a federated Europe today, in the form of the basic division between Russia and the Western World. This impediment makes it inevitable that when Churchill talks about a federated Europe, his words must be taken as applying to western Europe alone. The union Churchill conceives is one based on the principles of western democracy, in which civil liberties would be guaranteed. This type of union will not be accepted by Russia and her eastern European allies. In fact, when Churchill talks about a federated Europe, the Russians regard him as simply making another play in the game of power politics.

Yet, it is a grave question whether the plan of federation should not be applied to western Europe, including Germany, or as much of it as is occupied by the western powers. There is no reason why the refusal of Russia to cooperate should be allowed to throw western Europe into chaos and ruin. That is exactly what Russia wants to pave the way for communism in western Europe, and it is exactly what the western powers cannot permit.

Some plan must eventually be worked out whereby the economic and political union of western Europe can be realized if that area is not to be engulfed by communism.

[From the Miami (Fla.) News of
May 19, 1947]

FAITH OF A EUROPEAN

Whatever one may think of the political implications in Winston Churchill's proposal of a united Europe, there is no denying the brilliant act of faith his words compose. The "rubble heap, charnel house, breeding ground of pestilence and hate"—that Europe we of today see plainly—"Has she nothing to give to the world," Mr. Churchill asks, "but the contagion of the black death?" His categorical denial, moving in its terms and its associations, is the language which for two dismal postwar years we have been awaiting.

"There is the fairest, most temperate, most fertile area of the globe. The influence and the power of Europe and of Christendom have for centuries shaped and dominated the course of history. * * * Religion, law, learning, art, science, industry throughout the world all bear in so many lands, under every sky and in every clime, the stamp of European origin and traces of European influence."

Winston Churchill, for 6 years the first citizen of Britain, has constantly thought of himself as a citizen of Europe. "We hope to reach again," he says, "a Europe purged of the slavery of the ancient times in which

men will be as proud to say: 'I am a European' as once they were to say: 'Civis Romanus sum.'"

Is Churchill, great traditionalist that he is, here looking at the present through the eyes of the past, or is he glancing prophetically at the future? He says that it is often a mistake to try to settle everything at once. "Far off, on the skyline, we can see the peaks of the delectable mountains. But we cannot tell what lies between us and them." When he couples his plea for a united Europe with an unequivocal statement on the imperative need of "some effective world super-government," we can take the measure of his time scale, which projects him far into the future.

That likewise brings into greater perspective the implications of his more specific statements on European unity. By defining the "four pillars of peace" as the United States, the Soviet Union, the British Commonwealth, and a united Europe and placing Britain in the last two of these, Churchill opens himself to the charge of creating a purely anti-Russian bloc. He denies it, and explains that the "Europe" he envisions is not only a geographical entity but cultural entity in which individual human liberties form the touchstone.

It was not so, of course, with the Romans or the Holy Roman Empire; Napoleon made it so very imperfectly and Hitler rose to power through the attempt to deny history itself. But Churchill's "Europe," as he makes clear in speaking of France's future role, will be the creation of an act of faith if it is created at all. It is, he says, a spiritual conception which so long as men feel its worth will not die.

[From the New York (N. Y.) Post of May 21,
1947]

MAN TO MAN

(By Harold L. Ickes)

The advocacy by Winston Churchill of a United States of Europe again brings into sharp focus the resolution introduced into the Congress a few weeks ago by Senator FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, and Representative BOGGS of Louisiana proposing support for a United States of Europe within the framework of the United Nations.

I do not believe I can remember an occasion when a resolution of this character has received such widespread support. Few have ever been offered that held out such a hope for world peace and a higher civilization.

It may be that the newspaper readers have not read much about it in their local papers. Until last week the press services had carried no accounts about it. The radio networks had not yet told the story. The reason for this is that the movement did not originate in any one particular place. It has been in the nature of a spontaneous ground swell.

The proposal for a United States of Europe did not come from a conference such as the Moscow meeting of foreign ministers. It was not the result of a convention in Geneva or Luxembourg Palace, or London. The suggestion was not made at a press conference at the White House, and so there had been no real news story. But that the movement for a United States of Europe is in reality a truly great news story is evidenced by the spontaneous support that the proposal received throughout this country.

Even a partial list of newspapers that have supported the proposal editorially is noteworthy. So far as I know, the first paper to take up the idea was the New Orleans Item. Within a matter of days favorable editorials appeared in the New York Times, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, the Chicago Daily News, the Portland Oregonian, the Memphis Commercial Appeal, all of the Scripps-Howard newspapers throughout the country, and Time magazine. In Washington three newspapers have advanced the proposal editorially—the Washington Post,

the Washington Daily News, and the Times-Herald.

I cannot but wonder if there has ever been an issue on which so many newspapers of such different colorations have been in agreement. That the Patterson-controlled Washington Times-Herald and Henry Luce's Time magazine should be found in the same rendezvous with the Washington Post and the St. Louis Post-Dispatch is almost unbelievable.

Finally, on May 14, the proposed United States of Europe became front-page news when Winston Churchill spoke in Royal Albert Hall, London, before more than 6,000 representatives of every shade of political opinion to be found in England. Among other things, he said:

"If the peoples of Europe resolve to come together and work together for mutual advantage, to exchange blessings instead of curses, they still have it in their power to sweep away the horrors and miseries which surround them and to allow the streams of abundance to begin again their feeling flow. It is, of course, alleged that all advocacy of the ideal of United Europe is nothing but a maneuver in the game of power politics and that it is a sinister plot against Soviet Russia. There is no truth in this. The whole purpose of a united democratic Europe is to give decisive guaranties against aggression. Looking out from the ruins of some of their most famous cities and from amid the cruel devastation of their fairest lands, the Russian people should surely realize how much they stand to gain by the elimination of the causes of war and the fear of war on the European continent. * * *

If I understand Mr. Churchill's proposal it is that the nations of Europe that were our allies in the late war should begin to organize a United States of Europe leaving the latch string out for other nations, including Russia, which may not be among the first converts to the idea.

Mr. Churchill's eloquent plea is the more impressive when one reflects that Prime Minister Attlee, who possesses widely different political views, has likewise expressed himself in favor of the proposal.

We may be, if we press forward, on the threshold of one of the greatest political experiments of our times. But it is an experiment that must be made. As Mr. Churchill wisely observed, "let there be no mistake upon one point. Without a united Europe there is no prospect of world government."

It is my personal conviction that the nations of Europe either must federate, or perish, one by one. Even if an attempt to unite Europe should fail, the world would be no worse off than it is today. And if the undertaking should succeed, all humankind would take heart. Europe and the world will have peace if they are bold enough to take it.

Never has there been a Holy Grail so worth the seeking.

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Bulletin of
May 21, 1947]

UNITED STATES OF EUROPE—CHURCHILL'S SPEECH FOR UNION UNANSWERABLE

(By Ralph W. Page)

WASHINGTON, May 21.—Winston Churchill is the greatest living master of language and for the same reason one of the clearest thinkers and greatest leaders of the age.

His speech last Thursday upon the necessity for the Federation of Europe is unanswerable.

What is Europe? Why it is a system of beliefs and ideas—a priceless compound of the Hebrew belief in God; the Christian message of compassion and redemption; the Greek love of truth, beauty and goodness; the Roman genius for law.

But what has befallen this Europe? Why is it a rubble heap, a charnel house, a breeding ground of pestilence and hate? Ancient nationalistic feuds and modern ideological

factions distract and infuriate the unhappy, hungry population.

Now comes the vital question.

Are the states of Europe to continue forever to squander the first fruits of their toil upon the erection of new barriers, military fortifications and tariff walls and passport networks against one another?

Americans, who live under the impregnable protection and harmony of a federal system, readily agree with the great statesman's conclusion, with Prime Minister Attlee that Europe must federate or perish.

He is quite right in saying that the United States has a vital interest in a peaceful and prosperous Europe. "This," he says, "is surely not unnatural when we remember how the manhood of the United States has twice in a lifetime been forced to recross the Atlantic Ocean and pour out their treasure as the result of wars originating from ancient European feuds."

This is a past reason. But today we have an urgent present reason. To save our civilization and our trade and prosperity, as well as to forestall another war, we are compelled to devote more, and indefinite, treasure to the reconstruction of this Europe.

We understand that no amount of relief and charity distributed in the disruptive situation he so graphically described will succeed.

Our intent is to finance production, the revival of self-support, the return of trade, and so to receive back our investment and establish a profitable market for our produce.

We recognize, as well as the great English statesman, that the only hope of such a consummation is for the people of Europe to come together and work together for mutual advantage and to exchange blessings instead of curses.

In order to make American approval official, Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, and Representative HALE BOGGS, of Louisiana, have introduced a joint resolution saying:

"The Congress hereby expresses itself as favoring the creation of a United States of Europe within the framework of the United Nations."

The only hesitancy anyone in this country has to enthusiastic support of this purpose is the idea that the Russians would object and claim that the object is to create a coalition against them.

Such a strong, peaceful, and prosperous neighbor would in fact be a godsend to the impoverished Soviets. It would not only secure them against any fear of attack, but would provide them the materials for their reconstruction and a market for the great industries they are sacrificing to build.

It is true that such a Europe would offer poor pickings for a process of infiltration and disintegration that depends upon strife and despair. But not even the greatest advocates and admirers of the Kremlin can desire the perpetuation of ruin for the sake of spreading communism.

[From the Youngstown (Ohio) Vindicator of May 18, 1947]

CHURCHILL ON A UNITED STATES OF EUROPE

In the week just ended Winston Churchill proved again that he is one of the great men of all time. He went to the heart of the world's life-and-death crisis; he set forth a way out; and he clothed his wisdom in a moving eloquence unmatched in our time and unsurpassed in any.

The center of the world's trouble, as seen clearly by Mr. Churchill, is the collapse of Europe, which threatens the stability of all the world. The remedy is to unite and reconstruct the Continent, within the framework of the United Nations. The eloquence was displayed in Mr. Churchill's stirring address to the United Europe meeting in London.

It is always profitable to quote at some length from Mr. Churchill. He began with this statement of the situation:

"The influence and the power of Europe and of Christendom have for centuries shaped and dominated the course of history. * * * Religion, law, learning, art, science, industry throughout the world all bear in so many lands, under every sky and in every clime, the stamp of European origin and traces of European influence.

"But what is Europe now? It is a rubble-heap, a charnel house, a breeding ground of pestilence and hate. Ancient nationalistic feuds and modern ideological factions distract and infuriate the unhappy, hungry populations."

Evil teachers, Mr. Churchill went on, urge the paying off of old scores, and false guides point to vengeance as the path to prosperity. This course, he said, would have terrible results:

"Is there, then, to be no respite? Has Europe's mission come to an end? Has she nothing to give to the world but the contagion of the black death? Are her peoples to go on harrying and tormenting one another by war and vengeance until all that invests human life with dignity and comfort has been obliterated?"

"Are we Europeans * * * through our poverty and our quarrels, forever to be a burden and a danger to the rest of the world? Do we imagine that we can be carried forward indefinitely upon the shoulders—broad though they be—of the United States?"

As Mr. Churchill asserted, the time has come when these questions must be answered. Wisely he did not offer a detailed program for uniting Europe, for "it is often a mistake to try to settle everything at once." So he stated only in general terms his proposal that Britain and France join hands as founder-partners in the enterprise. They must, in friendly manner, bring the German people back into the circle of Europe, for otherwise the continent cannot be revived. He suggested that the old states and principalities of Germany, now being reconstituted, be invited to take their place in the Council of Europe.

It is already widely recognized that the revival of Germany is essential as part of a reconstructed Europe. As Secretary Marshall has asserted, the German problem cannot be settled by itself, or Poland's position by itself, or Austria's. In each case, as he told the Moscow conference, settlement must be regarded from the view of what is best for Europe as a whole. Nothing can be gained, and all will be lost, by keeping Germany an economic slum in the center of Europe.

Some sort of United States of Europe is of vital interest to America. Next year, if not this year, we shall have to consider granting very large additional aid to Europe. If present conditions there continue, there will be a very real danger—which some have remarked in respect to Turkish aid—that more help will be pouring money down a rathole.

It would be different if the European nations could come together, under the leadership of France and Britain, for a political and economic reorganization. We could feel that a new lend-lease program might well be as good an investment for peace as the old one was for war. Strong support for the United States of Europe idea has already appeared in this country. As Mr. Churchill said:

"This is surely not unnatural when we remember how the manhood of the United States has twice in a lifetime been forced to recross the Atlantic Ocean and pour out their treasure as the result of wars originating from ancient European feuds."

Russia has even more reason to want an end of dictator-breeding poverty and hatred in Europe. Twice in living memory she has suffered sorely from invasion by Europeans.

Indeed a great merit of the unification plan, in the form proposed, is that it shifts from the idea of forming an anti-Russian bloc to that of organizing Europe under the U. N. as a pillar of peace and prosperity for all nations, including Russia.

At first Russia would, of course, suspect a plot. She would keep her satellites out of any European union. But as Mr. Churchill said, those nations which now wish to join can begin the enterprise, holding the door constantly open for the others. We could hope that in time Russia and her followers would learn that the United States of Europe did not threaten them. A recent favorable development along this line was the meeting of economic officials of Poland and Czechoslovakia, seeking to develop more trade with the western countries. They have found that Russia's standard of living is so low that nothing can be gained from trade with her.

In any case the European effort must be made. It is vital primarily to give millions of human beings a chance to live in human decency. Mr. Churchill spoke of the many, in Europe and outside it, who have suffered so much from military and economic war:

"Is the honest, faithful breadwinner never to be able to reap the fruits of his labor? Can he never bring up his children in health and joy and with the hopes of better days?"

"Can he never be free from the fear of foreign invasion, the crash of the bomb or the shell, the tramp of the hostile patrol, or what is even worse, the knock upon his door of the secret political police to take away the loved one far from the protection of law and justice?"

In trying to answer these questions the United Europe movement could get the support of the British Government. Prime Minister Attlee has said that Europe "must federate or perish." Strong support also can be expected from President Truman and Mr. Marshall. It is a commonplace that if we are to avoid waging war, we must wage peace. The way to wage peace now is to strive for a federation which will end Europe's war-breeding and revive its former beneficent influence, to which American civilization owes its existence.

[From the Wilmington (Del.) News of May 19, 1947]

UNITED STATES OF EUROPE?

Formation of a "United States of Europe," as proposed in a speech by Winston Churchill last week, is not a new idea. Nor is it anti-Russian, though Russian ambitions stimulated by the break-down of the old Europe lend it a particular urgency now. What is novel in Churchill's suggestion is that it should come from a Briton. For the British have always felt instinctively that a divided Europe was less dangerous than one which at some future time might be united against them.

With British and American support the dream might at last be realized—unless, indeed, Europe is already too far gone to be saved. There are obstacles that seem insurmountable. But political systems are in flux; their rigidities may dissolve where we least expect it.

The whole European peninsula is so disorganized, abject, and impotent today that the alternative may be a return to the patchwork pattern of the Middle Ages. If that break-down occurs, it does not seem likely that the Catholic Church will again have the power to provide the stability and unification that can hold the structure together. Today it is the quasi-religion of communism which is prepared to muscle its way into that role.

Observers report that the people of Europe, whose opinion should carry weight, are convinced that the only hope left is for Europe—west of Russia—to be a much more compact unit than it has been in the past. That is

why the Czechs and the Poles are seeking to collaborate more closely, both with each other and with the West. It is why the low countries—Belgium, Holland, Luxembourg—are removing trade barriers among themselves by a customs union to start August 1. Unable as yet to unite into one, Europe is trying at least to unite into fewer components.

[From the Cleveland (Ohio) Plain Dealer of May 18, 1947]

UNITED EUROPE

A united Europe is not so wild a dream as those who would profit by the Continent's continued division pretend.

The day is here when the first steps toward unification must be taken if Europe is not to drift into deeper chaos. Czechs and Frenchmen, Norwegians, and Greeks, must be able to travel the Continent in safety and assurance saying, "I am a European" as the ancients traveled the known world with the universal passport, "Civis Romanus sum."

But the need of united Europe today is neither a recollection of past glories nor the expression of hope for the future, but the statement of an immediate practical need.

Winston Churchill, the Conservative who is fundamentally more radical and forward-looking than modern liberals bogged in ideological swamps, talking last week in historic Royal Albert Hall before the first meeting of the United European Committee which he launched in January, expressed sound reasons for continental solidarity.

There can be no solution of the German problem except in a European framework. The Moscow conference proved this. Europe cannot help itself without coming together for mutual aims, for, as Churchill rhetorically expressed it, "Do we imagine that we can be carried forward indefinitely upon the shoulders—broad though they may be—of the United States?"

Europe simply cannot go on and fill its role in western civilization under conditions which Britain's wartime Prime Minister described when he asked:

"Are the states of Europe to continue forever to squander the first fruits of their toil upon the erection of new barriers, military fortifications, and tariff walls and passport networks against one another?"

The continent today finds itself "a rubble heap, a charnel house, a breeding ground of pestilence and hate. Ancient nationalistic feuds and modern ideological factions distract and infuriate the unhappy, hungry populations."

Europe must help itself if it is to overcome these hard facts and face the future with any hope of peace and stability. There are difficulties in the way, but a start must be made. Churchill reminded his politically mixed audience of 6,000 persons of some of them when he recalled that 15 years ago, when he first proposed the idea of a United Europe, the United States was skeptical of the suggestion.

Today the United States, tragically aware of its inevitable connection with all European trends and events, realizes that a United Europe would be the greatest possible guaranty of peace. It concurs in Churchill's belief that there cannot be an effective world order until Europe is united. It sees Europe as one of the pillars of international order, the others being the American sphere, the Soviet Union, and the British Commonwealth of Nations.

What America fears is not a Europe united by free and equal component parts, but a Europe dominated by one power, whether or not it may be aggressive at the moment. In that sort of forced organization lies potential danger. Because of it the Truman doctrine was evolved. With a real United Europe no application of the Truman doctrine would be needed.

A difficulty still active is the attitude of the Soviet Union which sees in any European federation, however limited, a threat to the safety of Russia.

Churchill, who has been grossly maligned as the spearhead of a Europe organized against the Russians, dealt effectively with this fear when he said:

"The whole purpose of a united democratic Europe is to give decisive guaranties against aggression. Looking out from the ruins of some of their most famous cities and from amid the cruel devastation of their fairest lands, the Russian people should surely realize how much they stand to gain by the elimination of the causes of war and fear of war on the European continent.

"The creation of a healthy and contented Europe is the first and truest interest of the Soviet Union. We had therefore hoped that all sincere efforts to promote European agreement and stability would receive, as they deserve, the sympathy and support of Russia. Instead, all this beneficent design has been denounced and viewed with suspicion by the Soviet press and radio. We have made no retort, and I do not propose to do so tonight."

Europe must be united with or without the Soviet Union. To this end the United States will lend its support. The Churchill program, originating in a closer collaboration between Britain and France, is essential for peace. Ideologies must be subordinated. Old nationalistic feelings must go. The watchword was supplied by Churchill: "Without a united Europe there is no prospect of world government."

[From the Bellingham (Wash.) Herald of May 21, 1947]

LAST CHANCE

Winston Churchill, who was an ardent champion of a United States of Europe even before the close of the recent war, declared in a speech last week:

"If the peoples of Europe resolve to come together and work together for mutual advantage, to exchange blessings instead of curses, they still have it in their power to sweep away the horrors and miseries that surround them and to allow the streams of freedom, happiness, and abundance to begin their healing flow. This is the supreme opportunity, and, if it be cast away, no one can predict that it will ever return or what the resulting catastrophe will be."

It is all very simple—perhaps too simple. Churchill is right. But people seem to be as stubborn as realism.

[From the Evansville (Ind.) Courier of May 24, 1947]

WORDS OF VALUE

Winston Churchill, for 15 years an advocate of a United States of Europe as the first essential step toward world peace, is returning to the attack. "It is not true," he said in a recent London address, "that a united Europe would menace Russia." On the contrary, he believes that the U. S. S. R. would gain much from a Europe relieved of the threat of war. He asks that France and Britain take the lead in restoring Germany's economy as a first step, lest Europe remain as it is today—"a charnel house, a rubble heap, a breeding ground for pestilence and hate."

This latest speech by the former Prime Minister came just as Life magazine and the New York Times announced their purchase of the five volumes of his war memoirs totaling about a million words, for a price said to be a million dollars.

Churchill's utterances have been listened to with well-deserved attention for years by those who disagree with him. They are always worthy of that attention, for no living man has participated as actively as he in the turbulent world scenes of the last 30 years.

[From the Pittsfield (Mass.) Berkshire Eagle of May 21, 1947]

EUROPEAN FEDERATION VERSUS REVIVED NATIONALISM

Back in the early thirties Winston Churchill put forward the idea of a united Europe. It was an idea foreign to the thinking of his time—a time of going fascism, dawning Hitlerism, Maginot mentality, ultra-nationalism, insincerity, and appeasement. Mr. Churchill, a Tory with a vision, saw the evils and their remedy. But no one of comparable vision and authority in all Europe answered and supported him.

It took a Second World War—which a strong united Europe almost surely could have prevented—to show the value of Mr. Churchill's remedy. Europe of 15 years ago had all the necessary ingredients of that remedy except one—wisdom. Today such important ingredients as stability, prosperity, health, and strength are gone, and there is some question whether wisdom has been gained.

A few nights ago Mr. Churchill again appealed to Europe to unite. It was an eloquent, intelligent plea which took into account all the grim realities of the present.

Mr. Churchill urged a European federation as one of the "four pillars of the temple of peace." The others, he said are the United States, the Soviet Union, and the British Commonwealth. They would support a United Nations expanded into a world super-government to prevent war.

"Are the states of Europe," Mr. Churchill asked, "to continue forever to squander the first fruits of their toil upon the erection of new barriers, military fortifications and tariff walls and passport networks against one another?"

For the most part, Europe's answer was silence. France, which with Britain would be the backbone of any European union, showed slight reaction. Her statesmen were too busy for comment. Most French newspapers ignored his speech.

Instead there came from France the voice of Charles de Gaulle, wartime hero, interim president, and now head of a new and somewhat disturbing political movement. Following Mr. Churchill by a day, Mr. de Gaulle made a speech in which he called for a "strong state" in France.

The former general said he meant by a strong state "what others mean in reference to themselves—for example in Moscow and Washington—a state whose chief is a chief and in which no confusion of powers hampers or dilutes responsibility."

It is odd that M. de Gaulle should mention Washington and Moscow in the same breath—especially since he must know that in the United States the powers of Government are delegated, though not confused, and that responsibility is divided, though not diluted.

Substitute the word "authority" for "responsibility" in the quotation above and you have a statement that might have been made by Hitler or Mussolini in the days when Mr. Churchill first proposed a united Europe.

If M. de Gaulle expresses a growing sentiment in France today, then the difficulties of adopting Mr. Churchill's plan are increased enormously. For the same reason the plan becomes even more urgently necessary.

[From the Dubuque (Iowa) Telegraph-Herald of May 24, 1947]

BARriers TO EUROPEAN UNION

Back in the early 1930's Winston Churchill put forward the idea of a united Europe. It was an idea foreign to the thinking of its time—a time of going fascism, dawning Hitlerism, Maginot mentality, ultranationalism, insincerity, and appeasement. Mr. Churchill, a Tory with a vision, saw the evils

and their remedy. But no one of comparable vision and authority in all Europe answered and supported him.

It took a second World War—which a strong, united Europe almost surely could have prevented—to show the true value of Mr. Churchill's remedy. Europe of 15 years ago had all the necessary ingredients of that remedy except one—wisdom. Today such important ingredients as stability, prosperity, health, and strength are gone. And there is some question whether wisdom has been gained.

A few nights ago Mr. Churchill again appealed to Europe to unite. It was an eloquent, intelligent plea which took into account all the grim realities of the present.

Mr. Churchill urged a European federation as one of the four pillars of the temple of peace. The others, he said, are the United States, the Soviet Union, and the British Commonwealth. They would support a United Nations expanded into a world super-government to prevent war.

"Are the states of Europe," Mr. Churchill asked, "to continue forever to squander the first fruits of their toil upon the erection of new barriers, military fortifications, and tariff walls and passport networks against one another?"

For the most part, Europe's answer was silence. France, which with Britain would be the backbone of any European union, showed slight reaction. Her statesmen were too busy for comment. Most French newspapers ignored his speech.

Instead there came from France the voice of Charles de Gaulle, wartime hero, interim president, and now head of a new and somewhat disturbing political movement. Following Mr. Churchill by a day, M. de Gaulle made a speech in which he called for a strong state in France.

The former general said he meant by a strong state "what others mean in reference to themselves—for example, in Moscow and Washington—a state whose chief is a chief and in which no confusion of power hampers or dilutes responsibility."

It is odd that M. de Gaulle should mention Washington and Moscow in the same breath, especially since he must know that in the United States the powers of government are delegated, though not confused, and that responsibility is divided, though not diluted.

Substitute the word "authority" for responsibility in the quotation above and you have a statement that might have been made by Hitler or Mussolini in the days when Mr. Churchill first proposed a united Europe.

If M. de Gaulle expresses a growing sentiment in France today, then the difficulties of adopting Mr. Churchill's plan are increased enormously. For the same reason, the plan becomes even more urgently necessary.

[From the magazine *America* of May 31, 1947]
SHALL UNITED EUROPE LIVE?

Mr. Churchill's crisp periods (in his Albert Hall speech, May 14) have not formulated the age-old question. They have merely taken it, magnificently, out of the realm of rhetoric into the arena of responsible statesmanship. Are we to be taxed by our children with another light-hearted and perhaps fatal treason to the cause of peace for not rising now to the opportunity of re-creating a Europe we can recognize and revere as our own motherland? The opportunity for the restoration of Europe to our world-community councils was never clearer, despite appearances and smoke screens, as the need for her resurrection was never more peremptory.

To begin with the need, Europe's bodily health and spiritual vigor are a primary assumption in all our plans for the peace and reconstruction of one world. No pontiff, sane philosopher, or nontotalitarian statesman has ever dreamed of a realistic peace of which Europe's mani-colored but uni-patterned civilization was not destined to be

one of the central pillars, if not its cornerstone. No reputable public voice has ever dared dispute the truth or implications of young Gordon Sewell's warning premise for the peacemakers:

"Europe is a spiritual conception. In the rich pattern of this culture there are many strands: the Hebrew belief in God; the Christian message of compassion and redemption; the Greek love of truth, beauty, and goodness; the Roman genius for law."

After our hairbreadth rescue of the soul of this Europe from the menace of Hitler's deadly attack, shall we allow her to disintegrate, to lose consciousness of her collective Christian personality and communion with the West, and to yield her bleeding body in desperation to the undertaker from the East? We shall if we continue to content ourselves with the lethargic, blind-alley policy of piecemeal relief and piecemeal economic and political barter which has characterized our planning for Europe's reconstruction from Yalta through Potsdam to Paris and Moscow.

Europe will not save herself, or be saved for the United Nations, piecemeal. We need to deal with her and appeal to her not merely as an economic whole, but as the single cultural entity she has never ceased to be and as the potential federation of sovereign Christian states toward which she was evolving ever more manifestly and consciously before the twin plagues of nazism and communism made her divided continent a shambles.

The hour of our need is the hour of our opportunity. World opinion is crystallizing about "regional agreement" in Europe, with or without Russia's consent. Americans of every faith and fealty, including high administration officials, are rallying to the support of the Fulbright-Thomas-Boggs concurrent resolution which would have Congress on record as favoring "the creation of a United States of Europe within the framework of the United Nations." Nothing but absurd and paralyzing concern for Communist "sensibilities" to blocs and cordons sanitaires (federation, of course, would be neither) lies in the way of our heading now Mr. Churchill's counsel "to approach the various pressing continental problems from a European rather than from a restricted national angle . . . to design each new arrangement so that it can be fitted later into the pattern of a United Europe." Customs unions, trade agreements, cultural and diplomatic understandings have already progressed far beyond the planning stage in western Europe, and await only the semblance of peace in Germany, Austria, and Italy for their integration within a specifically European system of exchange.

It may take some heroic boldness, the cynics being what they are, for the distinguished delegates to "United Europe's" unofficial parliament convening at Geneva this summer even to broach the subject of a constitution or a charter. Let them be bold. Let them reveal to the peacemakers (including Russia) how widely their famous "Declaration of European Interdependence" is endorsed in Europe and within the UN. Let them make plain the promise of the first practical steps already taken to implement it. From there on, the problem of the unification of Europe becomes an urgent and a cheering challenge to her own restored good sense and to the moral stamina of her spiritual children all over the world.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, in order to place the question before the Senate—and I presume it will be voted on at the first opportunity—I move that consideration of the treaty with Italy be postponed until January 25, 1948.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arkansas moves that consideration of the treaty with Italy be postponed until January 25, 1948.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I move—and I believe the motion is a preferential one—that the Senate now stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I had spoken to the distinguished majority leader. Let me inquire whether he has moved that the Senate now stand in recess.

Mr. WHITE. I am moving—and I think the motion is a preferential one—that the Senate stand in recess until tomorrow at noon.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his motion until I can make a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. WHITE. I withhold it.

Mr. GEORGE. Inasmuch as the Senator from Arkansas has submitted a motion for postponement to a day certain, under the unanimous-consent agreement which has been entered, as I understand—

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; it has been agreed that the vote will be had on Thursday.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It has been agreed by unanimous consent that the vote will occur on Thursday at 2 o'clock.

Mr. GEORGE. Under those circumstances, would it be in order to vote on the motion of the Senator from Arkansas as late as Thursday, before the final vote is taken on the treaty?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion to postpone, submitted by the Senator from Arkansas, can be voted on at any time between now and 2 o'clock on Thursday. If it is not voted on before 2 o'clock on Thursday, it will be voted on at that time.

Mr. GEORGE. I merely wish to have that matter understood, so that there will not be any debate on it at that time.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, in making the motion, did not the Senator from Arkansas mean to have it voted on at this time?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Either at this time or at any other time.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, under rule XXII, I understand that a motion to take a recess takes precedence over a motion to postpone consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. There is no question about that.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in view of the willingness of the Senator from Arkansas to have his motion voted upon at this time, without further debate, would it not clear the atmosphere somewhat to have a quorum call and then have a vote taken on the motion?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock tomorrow.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Maine.

The motion was rejected.

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

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

During the call of the roll,

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in view of the fact that many Senators are engaged in committee work, and other

official duties, and since we can vote on the motion at any time before 2 o'clock Thursday, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the point of no quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request? The Chair hears none, and the point of no quorum is withdrawn.

A PROTEST AGAINST PRESIDENTIAL INVASION OF FUNCTIONS OF LEGISLATIVE BRANCH ON PORTAL-TO-PORTAL LAW

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I rise on a matter which I deem of tremendous consequence to the proper functioning of our system of checks and balances and separation of powers. I want to issue my most fervent protest against certain recent actions taken by the executive branch, with respect to the portal-to-portal law, the effect of which actions is to bring into question the historic separation of powers which has existed throughout American history among the three branches of government.

HISTORY FOLLOWING PORTAL-TO-PORTAL LAW

On May 14, the Chief Executive signed the Portal-to-Portal Act of 1947. At that time he sent an unusual and virtually unprecedented message to the Congress, in which he presented his views with respect to the meaning of certain sections of that act.

The Presidential message was referred to the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, which immediately considered the statement of the President. It did so from the standpoint of determining (a) whether the interpretations suggested by the President were in conflict with those of the Congress; and (b) more important, whether the effect of the President's interpretative statement following the enactment of the bill was an invasion of the prerogatives of the legislative branch, if it should be considered substituting Presidential conceptions for Congress' will and intent in the law.

These significant questions were presented to the committee by two of its distinguished Members, the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] and the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER]. These two men, as the Senate knows, had in subcommittee performed intensive and exhaustive work on the portal-to-portal bill, the equal of which, as I have previously stated, I had rarely seen in my 8 years in the Senate.

However, I personally raised a doubt as to whether the Judiciary Committee should question the Presidential message as the two Senators suggested. But events since the suggestion by the two Senators was made have confirmed the worst fears that they rightly felt for the integrity of our checks-and-balances system of government. Moreover, these events have convinced me that my own judgment in the matter, in underestimating the harmful consequences of the Presidential message, was unwarranted.

RECENT DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE ACTION

Several months ago, the Department of Justice filed a petition for Government intervention in cases pending before the United States District Court for the Northern District of California. These cases involved the alleged failure on the

part of employers to compute properly and pay overtime compensation under the Fair Labor Standards Act, with a resultant liability running from \$20,000,000 to \$50,000,000. The greater portion of that amount would be reimbursable from the Government because the employer was operating during most of the period under cost plus contracts with various Government agencies.

Five days after the Portal-to-Portal Act was signed by the President, a Department of Justice representative moved to amend the Government's answer so as to set forth a defense permitted by section 9 of the Portal-to-Portal Act. That defense related to good-faith reliance on administrative rulings, as well as good-faith reliance on an administrative-enforcement policy which, in effect, was a policy of not enforcing the act with respect to the issues involved in this case.

The motion was allowed by the court on May 22 but, and here is the significant point: 5 days thereafter the Department of Justice representative moved to strike the amended answer allowed by the court and substitute therefor another defense. This defense relied solely upon affirmative administrative rulings. It abandoned completely any defense which was available to the Government under the portion of the act relating to good-faith reliance on enforcement policy.

I understand that the Department of Justice had sent out instructions to its representative for the May 27 amendment, following consultations with the Labor Department.

I ask that the original amendment of May 19 and the subsequent amendment of May 27 be printed following my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the amendments to the Government's answer were ordered to be printed in the RECORD. (See exhibits A and B.)

Mr. WILEY. The effect of the May 27 amendment in its failure to assert legal defenses might obviously lay the Government open for a tremendous liability, not only in these California cases but in innumerable other cases which may involve claims upon the Government aggregating hundreds of millions of dollars. In summary, the Department of Justice is ignoring certain defenses which Congress has made available to it under the Portal-to-Portal Act, but which the President construed in his message as not being available to the Department.

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

Mr. WILEY. If I may conclude briefly, I shall be glad to yield.

REASONS FOR PROTEST

I protest this interpretation of legislation on the part of the Chief Executive and the subsequent action by the executive departments because—

(A) I believe that the Department of Justice should interpose every legal defense available to it in protection of the United States Government from these claims.

(B) If the Presidential message with its conflicting interpretations of the law—as compared with those of the Con-

gress—is allowed to go unnoticed, it will set a dangerous precedent for the President in the future, in effect, to set aside the congressional will and intent. Moreover, it will, in effect, give him an item veto over individual phases of legislation, which the Constitution never intended.

(C) If the Presidential message were to go unnoticed, and if its interpretation of legislation should be adopted by administrative departments and courts, it would be a step toward the undermining of our entire constitutional system wherein each of the three coordinate branches of Government is supposed to exercise its jurisdiction independently.

Mr. President, I ask that a more extensive statement of the history of this case be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

(Subsequently Mr. WILEY withdrew his request that the statement be printed in the RECORD.)

Mr. WILEY. In conclusion, I may say that I shall ask the Senate Judiciary Committee to examine this whole problem at length and to consider inviting the Secretary of Labor and the Attorney General to give a full explanation of their actions.

I am now very happy to yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I wanted to inquire as to whether or not the interpretation now being made by the Attorney General is the interpretation that was set forth in the President's message?

Mr. WILEY. Substantially so; and contrary to the interpretation outlined by the joint managers of the House and Senate when they issued their conference report; and, I believe, contrary to the language of the statute itself. The amendment which was originally granted by the court, as I said, raised the issue of the defense of good-faith reliance on enforcement policy. For some reason, after the President's message had come in, the Department of Justice then was instructed to again amend the answer, and to eliminate the defense of good-faith reliance on enforcement policy.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, as I understand, in the first instance, the Attorney General was following the law.

Mr. WILEY. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. He filed an answer following the interpretation of the law as the Senator sees it, and as the report indicates that it should be?

Mr. WILEY. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. But, after the President sent his message to Congress, the Attorney General changed his idea, and took the ideas from the President's message, following that rather than his previous interpretation. Is that correct?

Mr. WILEY. Yes, that is substantially correct. I should like to call attention to page 16 of the conference report on the Portal-to-Portal Act. The language is as I now quote:

It should be noted that under both sections 9 and 10 an employer will be relieved from liability, in an action by an employee, because of reliance in good faith on an administrative practice or enforcement policy;

only: (1) where such practice or policy was based on the ground that an act or omission was not a violation of the act, or (2) where a practice or policy of not enforcing the act with respect to acts or omissions led the employer to believe in good faith that such acts or omissions were not violations of the act.

I have introduced into the RECORD the two answers but, to simplify the matter, it is clear that what has been done here is that the Government has abandoned, in its second amended answer, any defense which is available to it under the portion of the act relating to good-faith-reliance on enforcement policy.

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

Mr. WILEY. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. Has not a similar question been raised in the matter brought before the Senate by the able junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE] as to the Government failing to file certain pleas in portal-to-portal cases, and is not an investigation now under way by the Committee on the Judiciary of that particular set of circumstances?

Mr. WILEY. The Senator is correct. The chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary appointed a subcommittee, of which the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE] is chairman, and that subcommittee is now investigating what purports to be general claims that for years, when suits were brought, the Government has neglected to set up defenses which were available. After taking this matter up with the Committee on the Judiciary, if it is agreeable to the committee I expect to refer the matter to the subcommittee, of which, I understand, the junior Senator from Michigan is also a member.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. WILEY. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. The able Senator from Wisconsin is familiar with the fact that we have had great difficulty in securing the facts to ascertain exactly what has been done by the Department of Justice in portal-to-portal pay cases.

Mr. WILEY. The Committee on the Judiciary, which is handling over 30 percent of the bills in the Senate, has the same amount of help as committees which are handling a good deal lesser amount of work, say from 3 to 5 percent of the bills in the Senate. The result is that we find ourselves in the position of having practically no investigators available, and certainly a committee which has the amount of work to do that the Committee on the Judiciary has, should have and I hope will have additional funds allotted to it.

Pursuant to direction from the committee I submitted the other day a resolution providing for \$45,000 additional which would provide means to employ efficient investigators so the committee could actively look into these matters which we think are of tremendous concern to the country. We have other matters involving penitentiaries which must be investigated. There are two or three other subcommittees of the Committee on the Judiciary which, if their work is to be really efficient, must be furnished effective investigators.

Mr. President, a statement was prepared by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], which I shall ask to have printed in the RECORD, but which I seem to have mislaid. Perhaps the Senator from Kentucky has the statement. I wish to say that the statement, as I said before, was considered by the Committee on the Judiciary. The committee took no formal action. Some of the members of the committee thought that perhaps it was not wise to enter into any controversy in the matter. But the two Senators I mentioned had foresight. They sensed that perhaps the very intent of the message was to do just what has been accomplished. I for one did not sense it in that way. I acknowledge that I was remiss in not having the prescience they had.

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

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. McGRATH. I may call the attention of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin to the fact that the matter of the issuance of this statement was before the committee on two occasions, the latest of which was yesterday. If my memory serves me correctly, the matter was laid on the table for consideration by the full committee on next Monday. In other words, because of the absence of a quorum of the committee it was decided that we should not issue the statement as a committee statement until a quorum was present and had voted it out.

I am therefore somewhat surprised to find the chairman of the committee acting here on the floor contrary to what I know was the intent of the full committee. The distinguished chairman knows that I do not violently disagree with the legal interpretation which the statement places on the Portal-to-Portal Act. I am not in agreement with the interpretation which the executive department has placed on the act. I made the statement in the committee that I perhaps would not object to the statement being reported out. What I say now is that when our committee has under consideration an item so important as this, which involves the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States, it deserves the action of the full committee, and I do not believe it is proper for the chairman to put the statement in the RECORD this afternoon before the committee has had a chance to act on it, as was our understanding of yesterday.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I am very happy to hear the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island state that he does not agree with the President in his conclusion. I want to set the Senator straight. I am not putting the statement in as a statement of the committee. I am putting the statement in as the statement of myself, endorsing fully the conclusions of the distinguished Senator from Kentucky and the distinguished Senator from Missouri, who spearheaded the portal-to-portal fight on the floor of the Senate.

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

Mr. WILEY. In a moment I shall be glad to yield. I want to say further that

we did take the matter up in committee yesterday, but, because at the time we took it up there were only six Senators present, we were not able to take action on it under the rules. But, Mr. President, since that time the information I have given has come to me from California, and the pleadings have come to me, and I can assure the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island that yesterday when we were considering this matter I had no knowledge of the significant step that was taken in the court of California, which, if we permit it to pass unnoticed, to my mind, will represent a serious threat to the legislative integrity. I am speaking solely for myself, not representing the committee. I have called attention to the fact, as I think it is an obligation of a Senator of the United States to do.

I feel that the check and balances system of the Government is the most important thing that keeps the Government together. We must have a legislative body separate and distinct, with integrity. We must have a judicial body separate and distinct, with integrity. And we must have a similar executive body. In my 8 years as Senator I have never gone over into the other field and criticized the Executive when he performed executive functions. But when and if the Executive steps into the field of the legislative body of which I am a member, I feel it is my sworn duty to call attention to the facts involved, and let the public itself judge of the matter.

I now yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, I am not at all acquainted with what happened in the courts of California or what orders were issued by the Department of Justice. Apparently it is something that happened since 12 o'clock yesterday noon. I know, however, that this was a matter of such grave importance that in committee on two occasions we decided to postpone its consideration until the full committee was present. We were acting on this matter in executive session. I believe that if something has occurred which requires the immediate attention of the committee on the subject which the committee had under consideration, the distinguished chairman of the committee could have gotten us together very quickly this afternoon.

But am I to understand, Mr. President, that hereafter any matter that we have under consideration in the executive councils of the Committee on the Judiciary can be made the subject of a speech on the floor of the Senate by any member of the committee. Am I to understand that henceforth nothing is to be regarded as sacred and secure within the confines of that committee until the committee has finished with it, or that every Member will have the right to express his own personal views prior to consideration by the full committee? If that is the rule, it will be all right with me. I shall be only too happy to abide by it.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I am sorry that my distinguished colleague was not present when I opened my state-

ment. I am only offering the statement of the two Senators—

Mr. McGRATH. That is the statement under consideration by our committee. The Senator is now asking that it be placed in the Record. That is the very statement which our committee voted yesterday to hold over for consideration until a week from yesterday. It is no longer the statement of two members of the committee.

Mr. WILEY. I am sorry that there has been any misunderstanding about this matter.

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

Mr. WILEY. In a moment. I have a responsibility, and I do not yield that responsibility to anyone else. My responsibility came when I found that in the courts of California the executive branch of the Government was failing to plead a defense which might mean millions of dollars lost to this country.

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

Mr. WILEY. In a moment.

In relation to this particular instrument, which is the findings of the two Senators whom I have mentioned, on two different occasions we considered the matter in committee, and the committee refused to adopt those findings as its idea. One of those occasions was yesterday. When the question arose again yesterday we found that only 6 members of the committee were present. The chairman of the committee ruled that no action reporting the findings would be valid. That is why they were not reported.

On the other hand, if my distinguished colleague from Rhode Island feels that this instrument, which I have not read, and which is nothing but the findings of the distinguished Senators I have mentioned, in any way invades his personal prerogative or the prerogative of the Committee on the Judiciary, I can let the matter go for a week.

The statement of the two Senators is not necessary to establish the point which I was making. The point which I was making was not discussed in committee. Neither the committee nor I nor the Senator from Kentucky knew anything about it. It was brought up afterward, when the message came from California, and when these pleadings were placed in my hands. The only reason why I asked that this statement be printed in the Record was to confirm the solid judgment of two of my associates, the Senator from Missouri and the Senator from Kentucky. If any Senator wishes to object, I shall be glad to withdraw the request.

I now yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, are we to understand that the chairman of the Judiciary Committee now seeks to affect some action in the courts in which these pleadings are alleged to have been filed?

Mr. WILEY. Not at all.

Mr. McCARRAN. Is the chairman of the Judiciary Committee of the Senate now trying to affect proceedings in the courts of California?

Mr. WILEY. Not at all.

Mr. McCARRAN. If not, then why does the Senator bring to the floor of the Senate the pleadings of which he complains?

Mr. WILEY. I am sorry that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle cannot see my purpose.

Mr. McCARRAN. Why were not those instruments presented to the committee?

Mr. WILEY. I told the Senator why. They were not placed in my hands until this morning.

Mr. McCARRAN. Well and good. Could they not lie over until Monday, the regular meeting day of the committee?

Mr. WILEY. They will be presented to the committee in due time.

Mr. McCARRAN. Why are they presented to the United States Senate before the Senator presents them to his committee for action?

Mr. WILEY. For the reason which I have outlined. I feel that the people of the country should understand what is going on and the techniques which are being employed. If there is any place where the people should be made cognizant of what is going on it is on the floor of the Senate. That is the reason I brought the matter up. I have no apology to make to the Senator or to anyone else.

Mr. McCARRAN. Does the Senator mean by his speech on the floor of the United States Senate that he wants to affect the action of the courts in California? Is that his object?

Mr. WILEY. I have told the Senator that my purpose is not to affect the action of the courts. The purpose is to straighten out some of the executive officers of the Government.

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

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. I think it is only fair to the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin to make a statement in response to the observations of the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. McGRATH]. I think he will agree, and that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] will agree, that with respect to the action which was taken in the committee concerning the report, the events which occurred in the committee were as follows:

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] proposed, at one or two meetings of the committee, that the findings be reported. No action was taken. The distinguished Senator from Nevada—and I believe also the Senator from Rhode Island—suggested that no action be taken by the committee, but that members of the committee who desired to sign the report as individuals might sign the report and let it be made their report to the Senate.

Yesterday the Senator from Missouri was absent, and at his request I made a motion in the committee that the report be made by the committee to the Senate. It was suggested that a quorum was not present. As I remember, no action of any kind was taken.

I believe I am correct in saying that again the Senator from Rhode Island suggested that in his opinion such action would not be wise, but again suggested

that such action could be taken by individual members of the committee. I think the Senator from Rhode Island will agree with me in my statement of the facts.

I contend that no action was taken, and that the Senator from Wisconsin has pursued the very course which the distinguished Senator from Nevada and the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island proposed several times in the committee.

Mr. McCARRAN and Mr. McGRATH addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. WILEY. I shall be glad to yield in a moment, when the Senator from Kentucky shall have concluded.

Mr. COOPER. As to the other matter, I feel that the Senator from Wisconsin is simply bringing to the attention of the Senate the point that the statement of the President when he signed the portal-to-portal bill did not appear—at least to some members of the committee—to be an accurate interpretation of the intent of the committee and of the Senate when the bill was passed.

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

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator from Kentucky has mentioned the name of the Senator from Nevada as having stated that I favored the report being made by individual Senators. I did nothing of the kind. I distinctly said, and I now say on the floor of the Senate, that for the Judiciary Committee to attempt to make a response to the President's message would be merely bickering with the Executive. Suppose the President should come back with another message, replying to ours, and then we should make further reply to the President. That is all it would amount to. The courts, in applying the rule of construction, will pay no attention to what we say after the bill is enacted.

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

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. Without attempting to argue the point as to what would occur between the Senate and the Executive branch of the Government, I again state that so far as the procedure in the committee is concerned—and I make this statement in support of the chairman of the committee—I distinctly remember that the Senator from Nevada stated that the proposed report should not be the action of the committee, but he stated, as I understood him, that he saw no reason why individual members should not sign the report.

Mr. McCARRAN. I made no mention of individuals whatsoever. I was not present at the meeting last Monday. I was present the previous Monday.

Mr. COOPER. That is correct.

Mr. McCARRAN. And I objected to its being sent in as a message from the committee, because it was not anything to be said by the Committee on the Judiciary. It reduces the dignity of the Committee

on the Judiciary to a level with boys' play. That is all it is.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I am sorry that that last statement has been made by the distinguished Senator from Nevada. We ought to be men enough to be able to differ without calling names. We go to church on Sunday. The Senator goes to his church and I go to mine. We have gotten above the point where we quarrel about religion. But when there is an election approaching we refer to the other fellow's actions as "boys' play." I have not been one who has indulged in boys' play in the Senate, but when I sense an obligation I have the right at least to be told that I have an honest conviction on it, and it is not boys' play. I told the Senate that the Congress of the United States passed a law; and it is the function of the Congress, under the Constitution, to legislate; it is not the function of the Executive to legislate. The Executive followed the course which has been pursued for approximately 14 years of infringing upon the legislative branch. We had during that time a period of "must" legislation, when men marched like little school boys to the crack of the whip. But, by all the gods, it will not happen again. When we dare to rise and say that the Executive not only tells us what we mean, in a message, but his minions go into court to carry out that intent, I say the people of this country have a right to know what is going on, and we should let public opinion be the deciding factor as to who is "playing horse" or engaging in "boys' play."

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Lopez in the chair). Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, I simply want to keep the record straight, and in response to the explanation just made by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], I should like to review briefly how the issue arose and my position on it in the committee.

As the Senate will recall, the President of the United States sent a message here explaining his reasons why he saw fit to sign the Portal-to-Portal Act of 1947. In that message the President attempted to place certain interpretations upon what the law meant. I have no hesitation in saying, Mr. President, that I do not agree with the interpretations placed on the act in the message of the President. That is aside from the point, however. The message was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary for its consideration. The distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] and the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] undertook to draw up an answer to the Presidential statement. The reason they wanted the Committee on the Judiciary to approve of the answer was because they felt that the President's statement had become a part of the legislative history of the act, and that the courts would, within every right and reason, accept the Presidential interpretation as set forth in his message interpreting the act. Mr. President, I want it understood that I do not believe that any

statement by the President, when he either signs or vetoes an act of Congress, becomes any part of its legislative history. The last chapter of legislative history, so far as my belief goes, is written and closed when the bill leaves the Halls of the Legislature. Therefore I took the position in the committee that nothing was to be gained by the Senate's entering into a controversy with the President over what was the meaning of the language which it had written into the portal-to-portal legislation; that we should accept the President's message and place it in our files and allow the courts to make the interpretations. I stated to the committee that, so far as I was concerned, for the committee to issue its statement, which in effect told how far the portal-to-portal legislation went, how far beyond what even the President of the United States himself thought, would be more than justification for the position which those of us had taken who opposed the legislation.

I am personally happy that the majority sees fit now to place this statement in the Record, because I think labor is going to be amazed when it realizes fully what the Senate Committee on the Judiciary itself thought was the full intent and purpose of the legislation and how far it goes beyond what even the President of the United States thought. I am delighted that the statement is going to be printed in the Record so that all may read it.

The point which brings up this controversy and which upsets me no little is the fact that the consideration of this very important matter was before the committee in executive session. We were trying to determine the wisdom of our committee's entering into this controversy with the President of the United States. There were some suggestions that if it was thought necessary that a statement be issued it could be issued by those members of the committee who felt so strongly about it, without the committee's taking an official position. I was not one of those who made that suggestion. The Senator from Kentucky will recall that my position was that I did not particularly care whether the committee issued the statement or not. I saw some advantage to our side in its being issued. But I thought it was very unwise to issue the statement. However, I was willing to abide by the majority action. We discussed the matter at great length yesterday and finally decided that inasmuch as we did not have a quorum present the matter should go over until next Monday, and it was made, as I understood when I left the committee, the special order of business for our consideration next Monday.

I have been asked many questions by the press concerning this controversy, because they all know about it. The proposed statement was distributed to all members of the committee. Information has leaked out of our committee that we were considering such a matter. It seemed that we should have given it full consideration before the statement was placed in the Record.

I want to say to the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin, whom I call one of my best friends in this Chamber and

whom I admire greatly and under whom I am happy and pleased to serve on the committee, that I regret that the controversy has risen. I think it somewhat improper that the statement, which forms the root and basis of a serious matter now under consideration, should be placed upon the public record before it has been given the final consideration of the committee.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I am very grateful to the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island for his very friendly and conciliatory remarks, and I want to say that after consultation with the Senator from Kentucky I withdraw my request. Although the Senator from Rhode Island is perfectly willing that the statement go into the Record, I withdraw my request to have the statement placed in the Record. I hope the Senator from Rhode Island understands me in this regard. The purpose of my remarks was not primarily to have the statement put into the Record; it was in confirmation of my general thesis that the two distinguished Senators who worked so hard were correct in surmising that the President's message had something in it which I did not think was of consequence, and I was wrong. My real object in rising today was to bring to the attention of the country something that grew out of the President's message, which I never dreamed would grow out of it, and that is, that after he had made the statement we should see direct effects in the courts of our country involving millions, and in many instances it is claimed hundreds of millions of dollars, in suits.

Again I thank the Senator for his gracious remarks.

Mr. McGRATH. Let me say to the Senator that I do not intend to object to his placing the statement in the Record; and if he offers it for the Record, I shall make no objection. If he does not offer it for the Record, I shall be glad to consider it with him in committee next Monday.

Since the controversy has gone this far, I wish to assure the distinguished chairman of the committee that I shall assuredly vote that it be made a statement of our committee, because I think the issue now before the country requires that the committee make the statement.

EXHIBIT A

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, SOUTHERN DIVISION—CHARLES CARDINALE, ET AL., PLAINTIFFS, V. W. R. GRACE & CO., DEFENDANTS—NO. 280638

(Motion of defendant W. R. Grace & Co. to amend answer)

Defendant above named moves the court to amend the answer on file in the above action by adding thereto the following additional defenses:

Eighth defense

The acts or omissions, and each of them, of this defendant, complained of by plaintiffs, and each of them, in this action were in good faith in conformity with and in reliance on the administrative ruling, approval, and interpretation of the Wage and Hour Division, Department of Labor, made and given on or about December 1938, that the straight time rate of pay paid by defendant to plaintiffs herein was the regular rate

of pay within the meaning of the act and that overtime payments by defendant to plaintiffs were overtime compensation within the meaning of the act; and as a result thereof and pursuant to the provisions of section 9 of the Portal-to-Portal Act of 1947, this defendant is not liable to plaintiffs, or any of them, for any of the acts or omissions complained of in this action.

Ninth defense

The acts or omissions, and each of them, of this defendant, complained of by plaintiffs, and each of them, in this action were in good faith in conformity with and in reliance on that certain administrative ruling, approval, and interpretation known as Interpretative Bulletin No. 4 issued by the Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division, Department of Labor; and as a result thereof and pursuant to the provisions of section 9 of the Portal-to-Portal Act of 1947, this defendant is not liable to plaintiffs, or any of them, for any of the acts or omissions complained of in this action.

Tenth defense

The acts or omissions, and each of them, of this defendant, complained of by plaintiffs, and each of them, in this action were in good faith in conformity with and in reliance on the administrative practice and enforcement policy of the Wage and Hour Division, Department of Labor, with respect to the class of employers to which this defendant now belongs and has belonged for all times mentioned in this action; and as a result thereof and pursuant to the provisions of section 9 of the Portal-to-Portal Act of 1947, this defendant is not liable to plaintiffs, or any of them, for any of the acts or omissions complained of in this action.

Eleventh defense

Defendant refers to the allegations in the eighth, ninth, and tenth defense of this answer and incorporates said allegations in this defense by reference.

The acts or omissions, and each of them, by this defendant, giving rise to this action were in good faith, and this defendant at all of the times mentioned in this action had reasonable grounds for believing that the acts and omissions, and each of them, if any, of this defendant were not a violation or violations of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, and for this reason the court in the exercise of the discretion vested in it by the provisions of section 11 of the Portal to Portal Act of 1947 should award no liquidated damages to plaintiffs or either of them.

This motion is made upon the ground that the foregoing defenses are authorized by the Portal to Portal Act of 1947, approved May 14, 1947, and are part of this defendant's defense to this action.

Dated May 19, 1947.

FRANK J. HENNESSY,
JOHN F. SONNETT,
J. FRANCIS HAYDEN,
MARVIN C. TAYLOR,
Attorneys for This Defendant.

EXHIBIT B

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, SOUTHERN DIVISION—CASTAGNASSO, PLAINTIFFS, V. PARR RICHMOND, DEFENDANT, NO. 25302-H

(Motion of defendant, Parr Richmond, to amend answer)

Defendant above named moves the court to amend the answer on file in the above action by striking therefrom the amendments thereto allowed by the court on May 22, 1947, and substituting therefor the following:

Eighth defense

This defendant alleges, as a defense under section 9 of the Portal to Portal Act of 1947, that it believed that, in respect of all cargoes where the overtime rates established by the

collective bargaining contracts in effect during the period in suit were 1½ times the straight time rates established by the contracts for such cargoes, the contract straight time rates were the regular rates for handling such cargoes within the meaning of those words in the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, and that payments at such contract overtime rates for handling such cargoes fully discharged all its obligations under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 for handling such cargoes. This defendant paid the plaintiffs in accordance with this belief. This belief, and payment in accordance therewith, were in good faith in conformity with and in reliance on the administrative ruling, approval, and interpretation of the Wage and Hour Division through its administrator, its regional director, and its regional attorney in 1938 and in conformity with and in reliance on the regulations, rulings, and interpretations contained in the Wage and Hour Division's Interpretive Bulletin No. 4. Wherefore this defendant says that by virtue of the provisions of section 9 of the Portal to Portal Act of 1947 it is not subject to any liability under the Fair Labor Standards Act for failure to pay compensation for handling such cargoes on any other basis.

Ninth defense

This defendant says that it paid the plaintiffs in accordance with the terms of the collective-bargaining contracts in effect during the period in suit, except that in certain instances it paid the plaintiffs more overtime than the contracts called for—that is to say, whenever in any workweek a plaintiff had worked 40 straight-time hours and thereafter performed further work in periods which, under the contracts, called only for payment at straight-time rates, this defendant paid for such work at contract overtime rates because it believed that it was required to do so by the Fair Labor Standards Act. This defendant alleges that it believed in good faith and on reasonable grounds that payment as above stated was not a violation of the Fair Labor Standards Act, but on the contrary was a full compliance with its requirements. Wherefore this defendant prays that the court, in the exercise of the discretion vested in it by section 11 of the Portal-to-Portal Act of 1947, award no liquidated damages against this defendant in the event that it finds and rules that such payments fell short of full compliance with this defendant's obligations under the Fair Labor Standards Act.

This motion is made upon the ground that the foregoing defenses are authorized by the Portal-to-Portal Act of 1947, approved May 14, 1947, and are part of this defendant's defense to this action.

Dated May 27, 1947.

FRANK J. HENNESSY,
PEYTON FORD,
J. FRANCIS HAYDEN,
MARVIN C. TAYLOR,
Attorneys for This Defendant.

RECESS

Mr. WHITE. I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 51 minutes p. m.), as in executive session, the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 4, 1947, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 3 (legislative day of April 21), 1947:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Peyton Ford to be an Assistant Attorney General.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES

ROBERT EWING THOMASON to be United States district judge for the western district of Texas.

Albert V. Bryan to be United States district judge for the eastern district of Virginia.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JUNE 3, 1947

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. HALLECK.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, the wise may bring their learning and the wealthy their riches, but we would bring the gifts which the poorest may offer, an honest and a contrite heart. Lord God, help us each day to hold fast these richest of offerings.

As we approach our labor, may it find us renewed in vigor and unafraid. O put us in league with all that is excellent and which knows no compromise or expediency, turning from any truants who fall in the way of uprightness and honesty of purpose. Deeper than we have known and clearer than we have seen, do Thou reveal and impress us with our responsibility and social duty, which demands that a public office is a public trust. As guardians of truth, of honor, and human rights, may we ever protect the sanctity of liberty, of peace, and the right to work. Break down the walls that separate men and enable them to serve one another.

For our Master's sake, Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H. R. 2436. An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, 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. CORDON, Mr. REED, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. MCKELLAR, and Mr. HAYDEN to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

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

H. R. 3208. An act relative to maximum rents on housing accommodations; to repeal certain provisions of Public Law 388, Seventy-ninth Congress, 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. BUCK, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. CAIN, Mr. FULBRIGHT, and Mr. TAYLOR to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

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

S. J. Res. 117. Joint resolution providing for acceptance by the United States of America of the Constitution of the International Labor Organization Instrument of Amendment, and further authorizing an appropriation for payment of the United States share of the expenses of membership and for expenses of participation by the United States.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WILSON of Indiana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the Bedford Daily Times-Mail.

Mr. ROBERTSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include a syndicated article on the labor conference report by David Lawrence and in the other to include an article from Aviation News of May 12.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BUTLER asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

LABOR LEGISLATION

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, there have been various suggestions to the House as to what the President might do in respect to certain legislation. Last night I took occasion to read through the conference committee print on the labor bill which we will probably have up for consideration and action tomorrow.

I want to say just this: That if any political lieutenants of the President or any so-called leaders of labor brandish old hackneyed phrases about vicious or drastic labor legislation, and browbeat the President into vetoing this bill as it now comes to us, the American people will have witnessed a bunch of gangsters entering the White House and holding up the President with a wooden gun.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Then I would like to have the gentleman explain how they "browbeat" the House conferees into accepting the Senate version.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Well, I think the only reason that somebody suggested was that they had to do something like that to try to get it through the White House. The gentleman should remember that the conferees are accepting the bill, not vetoing it. The bill has

some values, but it definitely is not an antilabor bill and certainly he will be scared of a shadow who fears to accept it on that ground.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I trust that before the President acts on this bill he be allowed to see what it is. It is my understanding that the conference report is coming up in the House tomorrow, and if it has been printed yet, I cannot find a copy of it. It was not filed last night. It will probably be filed tonight, and we will get to our offices tomorrow at 7:30 or 9:30 or 10:30, and we may have a copy of the conference report then, which we are supposed to vote on soon after 12 o'clock. Frankly, I have been around here a good while, and I would like to know what is in this conference report before I vote upon it. Now, there is a committee print being circulated around here of what is supposed to be the bill, but no conference report is available to anybody. I would like to see what the statement of the managers on the part of the House and the Senate about this bill is before I vote on it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include the second broadcast by our late colleague, the Honorable Fred Bradley, dealing with the Panama Canal.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Washington Times-Herald.

Mr. BRADLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Long Beach Independent.

THE NATIONAL DEBT

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I, too, am like the minority leader. I do not know what is in this conference report yet. But this is not the first time that I have been placed in such a position. For the last 10 or 12 years we have been in the same position when he was Speaker of the House. Time after time after time the Democratic House committees brought in conference reports and we were supposed to vote on them without

any time at all for study. Now you have been notified the report will be ready tomorrow morning and you can look them over 4 hours before you have to vote on the conference report.

But, I want to call the attention of the minority leader to the Treasury statement of May 27, showing that the national debt at that time was \$258,304,565,000. Who is responsible for that condition? For 15 years the Democrats and New Dealers have been building this debt up until we have now the greatest national debt that this country has ever known. We are going to have the toughest time we ever had if we do not cut down expenses now and try to balance the budget and try to reduce this debt that they have built up.

In 1940 we appropriated for the Interior Department \$71,000,000—now it takes \$600,000,000. It cost \$18,000,000 to run the Department of Labor in 1940, for 1948 they want \$356,000,000 for the Labor Department. Other departments of Government are just as exorbitant in expenditures. Let us look at the personnel. The Department of State had 5,400 employees in 1939. They want money enough today to employ over 25,000 employees. The Department of Justice employed over 19,000 people in 1941. They now want to employ over 23,000 employees. The Department of Commerce employed 14,000 people before the war; now they want to employ over 40,000 employees. Is it any wonder we Republicans want to cut down expenses of Government and lay off employees. The taxpayers and voters gave us a mandate to do the job. Let us do it.

SERVICEMEN'S READJUSTMENT ACT OF 1944

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 1135) to extend for 1 year certain provisions of section 100 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, relating to the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to enter into leases for periods not exceeding 5 years, for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. HOFFMAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I would like to know what this is all about.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I may say to the gentleman that this simply extends for 1 year the provisions of section 100 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, relating to the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to enter into leases for periods not exceeding 5 years. The present bill expires at the end of this month. Under the decentralization plan there are 1,468 branch regional, sub-regional, and other offices. These field offices are quartered in 1,685 separate buildings.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Is this something General Bradley wants?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. He has asked for it by letter to the Speaker of the House. It has the approval of the Budget. Our Committee on Veterans' Affairs reported the bill out unanimously.

I have asked to take up the Senate bill as the Senate already has passed the bill unanimously, and time is so important.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, has this problem been taken up with the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds? Do not they have something to do with the providing of space in the District of Columbia?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I understand General Bradley has done everything possible along that line with all the various departments.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. I do not recall its having come up. I should like to know what they are using the space for that they already have, how much of that space is being utilized for concessions and being rented out to private enterprise, and how much money the Veterans' Administration is getting from the rental of space that the taxpayers are giving them, and using that to subsidize their cafeterias as they are doing in the Pentagon.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The general has assured us that this is not anything that is not necessary.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. I am afraid we should know more about this matter before it passes in this manner. I am going to have to object to the consideration of the bill at this time.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman not allow it to go through? It will be more expensive, probably, if this bill is not passed promptly. The present bill expires the end of the month.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. I think the bill may well be held over another day. We are receiving from Woodward & Lothrop and from Walgreen's drug store a million dollars. That is received by the War Department in the Pentagon. Yet they are occupying space in 17 other buildings, and that money is going to subsidize the employees over there to pay for their food, \$1,000,000.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. May I say to the gentleman that most of these facilities are not in the city of Washington. They are scattered all over the country.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Would the gentlewoman object to holding this up for one more day?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. If the gentleman wishes to object, that is his privilege.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. I should like to have one more day, until we can learn more about this.

Mr. PHILLIPS. If the gentleman will yield, may I ask the gentlewoman if she has a list of these facilities?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I do not have the list here.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Could that be inserted in the Record so that, if the gentleman objects and the bill is held over, the Members may have an opportunity to see that list?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am very sure that could be secured, and I shall be very glad to insert it.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Can the gentlewoman tell me why this bill did not

come before the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I do not think it has been the custom to bring these things before that committee. I know General Bradley has gone to all the various departments and asked what they could give him in the way of space. I know that from past experience.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Will the gentlewoman withdraw her request until tomorrow?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman has reserved the right to object. If he objects to it today, that settles it.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Then I am going to have to object, Mr. Speaker.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on tomorrow, Calendar Wednesday, be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. POULSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include an editorial.

Mr. EBERHARTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include an article by Mark Sullivan on the subject of the wool bill, which appeared in the Washington Post.

Mr. WILLIAMS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record.

Mr. PHILBIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include a speech he made on Memorial Day.

Mr. SMATHERS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record in two instances and include editorials.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and include an analysis of the Taft-Hartley bill as reported by the committee of conference. This may exceed the limit by a page or two, but I ask that despite that fact I may be permitted to include it in my remarks.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, whose analysis is it?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. It is by Mr. Lee Pressman, general counsel of the CIO.

Mr. RANKIN. Do you not think it would be better to insert the report of the conferees in the Record instead of having the CIO come in and insert its criticism at extra expense to the Government?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include a radio address.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. REDDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk

and the conclusion of special orders heretofore granted I may address the House for 5 minutes today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BATTLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record.

Mr. KEFAUVER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include a Memorial Day address.

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record in regard to a bill he is introducing today.

OLD-AGE SECURITY

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, one of the most inspiring parts of our Constitution is contained in the preamble which guarantees to all citizens the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Yet, when men and women, 9 out of 10 of them in this country, reach the age of 60, they are unable to pursue that happiness because of limited means or the lack of wherewithal.

Therefore, I am advocating immediate consideration and passage of a universal old-age pension plan such as the one outlined by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL] in his bill, H. R. 16. This is popularly known as the Townsend plan. Our hope is that not just one group or a few will be included in our social-security system, but all groups regardless of race, religion, or color, and regardless of occupation. All citizens of the land should have the opportunity to enjoy the fruits of a well-earned retirement and the results of all their productive years so that they can live happily in their old age.

We can successfully fight off communism by making our American system work. The most natural desire of everyone is to have security in his declining years. Reasonable retirement for all is the answer, especially when such retirement is actuarially sound.

The millions of Americans who have reached 60 or who are approaching this ripe age deserve consideration. They have the right to anticipate their brightest days to come.

With security guaranteed, they can emulate the experience of Rabbi Ben Ezra who in his wisdom said in Browning's poem:

Grow old along with me!
The best is yet to be,
The last of life, for which
The first was made.

THE SUGAR SITUATION

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

revise and extend my remarks and include therein a letter I have written to the Department of Agriculture regarding the sugar situation.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am working again trying to get the Secretary of Agriculture to make sugar available for the housewives so that they can do their canning.

I said in part of a letter which I wrote to the Secretary of Agriculture:

Unless action is taken immediately by your Department and permit the use of some of the sugar by releasing the rigid restrictions for the purchase of it, we soon will hear of the destruction of sugar similar to the recent destruction of tons of food potatoes because of foolish bungling. Housewives in angry, protesting letters are daily asking why sugar is not available to preserve surplus food in their homes and factories, as was always their custom before the restrictive regulations.

I will say that even with the regulations the housewives in the past have been allowed a certain amount of sugar with which they may can.

The letter reads further:

Your Department should immediately make additional sugar available for canning and preserving in order to save tons and tons of food now available.

The letter in full is as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., June 3, 1947.
Hon. CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am writing to you again asking that you make additional sugar available to persons, families, and industrial users in the United States. From daily reports throughout the world enormous supplies of sugar are available, warehouses are full and overflowing, sugar is piling up on the docks, and transportation will soon be unable to handle the tremendous supply. Unless action is taken immediately by your Department to permit the use of some of this sugar by releasing the rigid restrictions for the purchase of it, we soon will hear of destruction of the sugar similar to the recent destruction of tons of food potatoes because of foolish bungling.

The press in sensible, logical editorials, housewives in long, angry, protesting letters, daily ask why sugar is not available for preserving their surplus food in the homes and the factories, as was always their custom before these restrictive regulations. Your Department should immediately make additional sugar available for canning and preserving in order to save the tons and tons of food now available and becoming available in increasing amounts each day. To permit the waste of this crop of sugar with the hordes of starving peoples throughout the world is criminal. Unless action is taken immediately by your Department to grant additional sugar for canning and preserving surplus foods, I shall ask the Congress to take the necessary action.

Very sincerely yours,

(Mrs. John Jacob Rogers).

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, since today is the birthday of Jefferson Davis, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a speech by Bishop Galloway.

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

There was no objection.

FORMER SECRETARY BYRNES AND THE MOTION-PICTURE INDUSTRY

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I was very much surprised if not shocked to read a United Press report this morning that the film industry has employed former Secretary of State Byrnes to represent it before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

Mr. Eric Johnston, president of the film industry or the Motion Picture Producers Association, announces:

Byrnes' first assignment will be to champion the screen's freedom of expression before the House Committee on Un-American Activities which opens a public hearing on the film industry in Washington this month. We are determined—

Said Johnston—

that subversive propaganda, Government pressure, or political censorship will never undermine freedom of the screen.

Mr. Speaker, the American people today are beginning to learn where this Communist propaganda in our motion-picture industry comes from, and the House Committee on Un-American Activities is not going to be intimidated in its effort to expose the Communist propaganda in motion pictures and to bring out legislation to stop it.

The "freedom of the screen," as Mr. Johnston calls it, does not surpass in importance the protection of American institutions, or the protection of the children of this country against the insidious poisons carried by many of these pictures.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

THE PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is the day for the call of the Private Calendar. The Clerk will call the first bill.

DIXIE MARGARINE CO.

The Clerk called the first bill (H. R. 354) for the relief of the Dixie Margarine Co., a Tennessee corporation, of Memphis, Tenn.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin and Mr. POTTS objected, and the bill, under the rule, was recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary.

LT. COL. ORVILLE E. MCKIM

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 559) for the relief of Lt. Col. Orville E. McKim.

Mr. DOLLIVER and Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin objected, and the bill, under the rule, was recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MARY LOMAS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1742) for the relief of Mary Lomas.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 19 (a) of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (39 Stat. 889-890; 54 Stat. 1044; 8 U. S. C. 155), the Attorney General is authorized and directed to permit Mary Lomas, of Fairmont, W. Va., to remain permanently in the United States if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws other than quotas.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 9, after the period insert "Upon the enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the quota for Greece of the first year that the said quota is available."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. INGA PATTERSON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1152) for the relief of Mrs. Inga Patterson, widow of F. X. Patterson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$1,375 to Mrs. Inga Patterson, widow of F. X. Patterson, of Washington, D. C., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for expenses incurred as a result of condemnation proceedings involving property of the said F. X. Patterson, Anacostia Road SE., Washington, D. C.: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATURALIZATION OF CERTAIN UNITED STATES ARMY PERSONNEL—YUGOSLAV FLIERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1652) to provide for the naturalization of certain United States Army personnel—Yugoslav fliers.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

JAMES HARRY MARTIN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 617) for the relief of James Harry Martin.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That James Harry Martin, of Pontiac, Mich., be permitted to file an application with the Secretary of War for benefits under the World War Adjusted Com-

pensation Act, as amended, on or before January 1, 1948, any time limit in such act for filing such an application to the contrary notwithstanding.

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. POTTS: On page 1, line 6, after the words "on or before", strike out "January 1, 1948" and insert in lieu thereof "July 1, 1949."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALLIED AVIATION CORP.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 631) for the relief of the Allied Aviation Corp.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Allied Aviation Corp., of Cockeysville, Md., the sum of \$234,195.20 with interest thereon from November 1, 1943, to the date of payment, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for costs incurred and losses sustained in the creation and production of experimental amphibious gliders for the Navy Department in the prosecution of the war, the said costs and losses having been occasioned primarily by reason of the corporation's reliance upon representations, commitments, and assurances made in good faith by agents of and on behalf of the Government but which were not fulfilled: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with the prosecution and collection of this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$234,195.20 with interest thereon from November 1, 1943, to the date of payment" and insert in lieu thereof "\$108,753.13."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARVIN PETTUS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 637) for the relief of Marvin Pettus.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Marvin Pettus, of Mansfield, Ark., the sum of \$5,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for injuries sustained and damages suffered by him as result of being struck by an Army vehicle operated by Army personnel on the camp ground of Camp Chaffee, Ark., on the 15th

day of December 1944, and said injuries having been caused by the negligent operation of said Army vehicle so as to cause it to run into the vehicle in which the said Marvin Pettus was riding: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$5,000" and insert "\$1,536."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Speaker, I object.
Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair may say to the objectors that the question was put as to whether there was objection to the present consideration of the bill, and no objection was heard.

The question recurs on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

J. DON ALEXANDER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 813) for the relief of J. Don Alexander.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. DOLLIVER and Mr. POTTS objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ESTATE OF ABRAM BANTA BOGERT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 837) for the relief of the estate of Abram Banta Bogert.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the estate of the late Abram Banta Bogert the sum of \$8,217.65, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the personal injury, hospital and medical expenses, loss of earnings, property damage, and death of the said Abram Banta Bogert, as the result of an accident involving a United States Army truck driven by John G. Walter, Company D, One Hundred and Twenty-eighth Ordnance, Pine Camp, N. Y., on Route 9W in the town of Saugerties, Ulster County, N. Y., near pole No. 1515, about 4 miles north of the village of Saugerties, at about 4 o'clock on the afternoon of February 26, 1943: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment.

Page 1, line 6, after the name "Bogert", strike out the bill down to the colon in line 5, page 2, and insert in lieu thereof "deceased, the sum of \$6,117.65, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injury and death of the said Abram Banta Bogert, Saugerties, N. Y., the medical, hospital, and burial expenses incurred by reason of such injury and death, and the property damage sustained as a result of an accident involving an Army truck, which occurred on Route 9-W near Saugerties, N. Y., on February 26, 1943."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LORENZO H. FROMAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 987) for the relief of Lorenzo H. Froman.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Lorenzo H. Froman, former owner of a certain farm consisting of 165 acres of land, more or less, near Camp Knox, in Hardin County, Ky., is, as such former owner, hereby authorized to bring suit against the United States of America to recover damages, if any, for loys or losses which he may have sustained or suffered, as such owner, by reason of establishment, construction, or maintenance of Camp Knox in the State of Kentucky. Jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Kentucky to hear, consider, determine, and render judgment for the amount of any such damages, if any, as may be found to have been sustained or suffered by the said former owner of said farm, with the same right of appeal as in other cases, and notwithstanding any lapse of time or statute of limitations: *Provided,* That such action will be brought within 1 year from the date that this act shall become effective.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTATE OF NORMAN C. COBB ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 993) for the relief of the estate of Norman C. Cobb, Naomi R. Cobb, and Garland L. Cobb.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$25,000 to the estate of Norman C. Cobb, Naomi R. Cobb, and Garland L. Cobb, late of Topeka, Kans., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the deaths of the said Norman C. Cobb, Naomi R. Cobb, and Garland L. Cobb, sustained as the result of an accident involving a United States Army plane, when it crashed into the house in which they were located, in Memphis, Tenn., on April 29, 1944: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, after the dollar sign strike out "\$25,000, to the estate of Norman C. Cobb, Naomi R. Cobb, and Garland L. Cobb", and insert in lieu thereof "5,000 to the estate of Norman C. Cobb, the sum of \$5,000 to the estate of Naomi R. Cobb, and the sum of \$2,000 to the estate of Garland L. Cobb". Page 2, line 3, after the words "sustained as" strike out "the result of an accident involving a United States Army plane, when it crashed into the house in which they were located, in Memphis, Tenn., on April 29, 1944" and insert in lieu thereof "a result of the crash of a United States Army airplane into the house in which they resided, in Memphis, Tenn., on April 29, 1944."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SAMUEL W. DAVIS, JR., ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1144) for the relief of Samuel W. Davis, Jr.; Mrs. Samuel W. Davis, Jr.; and Betty Jane Davis.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to each of the following named persons, residents of Greensboro, N. C., the amount specified in the case of such person, in full satisfaction of his or her claim against the United States for the personal injury and other damage indicated in each case resulting from a collision between a United States Army vehicle and an automobile driven by the claimant, Samuel W. Davis, Jr., in which other claimants were passengers, near the town of Creedmoor, N. C., on December 26, 1944:

Samuel W. Davis, Jr., for personal injuries, medical expenses for his own injuries and those of his wife and daughter, and damage to automobile, in the total sum of \$55,518.88;

Mrs. Samuel W. Davis, Jr., for personal injuries in the sum of \$10,000;

Legal guardian of Betty Jane Davis, a minor, for personal injuries, in the sum of \$5,000: *Provided*, That no part of any sum appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with the claim satisfied by the payment of such sum, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, after the word "appropriated", strike out the bill down to the colon in line 11, page 2. Insert in lieu thereof "the sum of \$18,518 to Samuel W. Davis, Jr., of Greensboro, N. C., for personal injuries and loss of earnings sustained by him and for medical and hospital expenses incurred by him on account of his injuries and those of his wife, Mrs. Samuel W. Davis, Jr., and his minor daughter, Betty Jane Davis, and for future medical and hospital expenses for their treatment; the sum of \$4,000 to the said Mrs. Samuel W. Davis, Jr., for personal injuries sustained by her; and the sum of \$3,000 to the legal guardian of the said Betty Jane Davis, a minor, for the personal injuries sustained by said minor, in full settlement of all claims of the said Samuel W.

Davis, Jr., Mrs. Samuel W. Davis, Jr., and Betty Jane Davis, against the United States arising out of an accident which occurred on December 26, 1944, on United States Highway No. 15, near Creedmoor, N. C., involving an Army truck."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSIS M. NICHOLS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1162) for the relief of Persis M. Nichols.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

ESTATE OF GEORGE W. COOMBS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1497) for the relief of the estate of George W. Coombs.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the estate of George W. Coombs, deceased, the sum of \$600 as reimbursement of a like amount improperly collected from the said George W. Coombs while serving as postal superintendent of Inwood station, New York City: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. LULA WILSON NEVERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1508) for the relief of Mrs. Lula Wilson Nevers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

WILLIAM P. GILLINGHAM

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1531) for the relief of William P. Gillingham.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to William P. Gillingham, Big Bear Lake, Calif., the sum of \$5,321. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said William

P. Gillingham v. The United States on account of the death of his wife, Elizabeth S. Gillingham, resulting from personal injuries sustained on February 1, 1943, when an automobile in which she was riding collided with a United States Army truck on United States Highway No. 66 at Devore, Calif.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NORMAN THORESON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1658) for the relief of Norman Thoreson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Norman Thoreson, Pasco, Wash., the sum of \$7,472.20. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Norman Thoreson against the United States as the result of damage to grazing land, such damage being caused by fire, June 5, 1944, resulting from practice-bombing operations of Navy planes from the Pasco Naval Air Station: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$7,472.20" and insert "\$3,202.88."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EVA L. DUDLEY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1799) for the relief of Eva L. Dudley.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Eva L. Dudley, of St. Petersburg, Fla., the sum of \$2,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for property damage, personal injuries, hospital, and medical expenses sustained as a result of an automobile accident, on November 26, 1943, caused by a United States Veterans' Administration fire truck near the main gate of the Bay Pines Veterans' Administration Hospital, on United States Highway No. 19, Bay Pines, Fla.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection

with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Page 1, line 6, after the sum "\$2,000", insert "pay to Grace M. Collins, of Lima, Ohio, the sum of \$2,000, and pay to Guy B. Slater, of Ada, Ohio, the sum of \$2,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended to read as follows: "For the relief of Eva L. Dudley, Grace M. Collins, and Guy B. Slater."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A. J. DAVIS, ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1851) for the relief of A. J. Davis, Mrs. Lorene Griffin, Earle Griffin, and Harry Musgrove.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to A. J. Davis, the sum of \$575, for loss of automobile; to Mrs. Lorene Griffin, the sum of \$500, for personal injuries and the sum of \$42.75 for hospital and medical expenses; to Earle Griffin, the sum of \$500, for personal injuries and the sum of \$135.50 for hospital and medical expenses; and to Harry Musgrove, the sum of \$7,500, for personal injuries and the sum of \$475 for hospital and medical expenses, in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States on account of personal injuries received by them on November 25 or 26, 1944, when the car owned by A. J. Davis and operated by Harry Musgrove and occupied by Mrs. Lorene Griffin and Earle Griffin, was struck from the rear by a Government-owned car being operated by Cecil Coleman, an employee of the naval stores experiment station, Forestry Service, United States Department of Agriculture, Olusta, Fla.; said accident occurring approximately 1½ miles west of Sanderson, Fla., on United States Highway No. 90: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with these claims, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$575" and insert "\$275."

Page 1, line 7, strike out "\$500" and insert "\$542.75."

Page 1, line 7, after the word "injuries" strike out the words "and the sum of \$42.75 for."

Page 1, line 9, strike out "\$500" and insert "\$635.50."

Page 1, line 10, strike out the words "and the sum of \$135.50 for."

Page 2, line 1, strike out "\$7,500" and insert "\$2,821."

Page 2, line 2, strike out the words "and the sum of \$475 for."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NEW JERSEY, INDIANA & ILLINOIS RAILROAD

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2302) for the relief of New Jersey, Indiana & Illinois Railroad.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the New Jersey, Indiana & Illinois Railroad, the sum of \$3,114.34, in full and final satisfaction of all claims against the United States for property damage resulting from the explosions which occurred at the naval ammunition depot at Port Chicago, Calif., on July 17, 1944, and which has been approved and recommended for payment by the Secretary of the Navy in his report dated September 13, 1945, and entitled "Summary of Reports of the Secretary of the Navy to the Congress of the United States Pursuant to Public Law 423, Seventy-eighth Congress, Second Session, of Claims Resulting From the Explosion Which Occurred at the Naval Ammunition Depot at Port Chicago, Calif., on July 17, 1944."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BRUCE BROS. GRAIN CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3387) for the relief of Bruce Bros. Grain Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$279.90, to the Bruce Bros. Grain Co., in full settlement of all claims against the Government of the United States to cover loss sustained by said company on a car of wheat, car No. 96110, Chicago, Burlington & Quincy, shipped from St. Joseph, Mo., July 15, 1921, to Minneapolis, Minn.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

R. W. WOOD

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3170) for the relief of R. W. Wood.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the

sum of \$106.34 to R. W. Wood, of 1811 D Street NE., Washington, D. C., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for salary not paid while under suspension at Army air base, Key Field, Miss., from January 22, 1944, to January 31, 1944, inclusive, while serving as associate civil engineer and superintendent of construction: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRANK SCHINDLER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 135) to legalize the admission into the United States of Frank Schindler.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General is hereby directed to record the entry into the United States of Frank Schindler at New York City, N. Y., on June 11, 1939, as a lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws. The Secretary of State shall thereupon reduce by one the immigration quota for Czechoslovakia for the first year that such quota may be available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE LATE ROY STANLEY GEIGER

The Clerk called the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 96) authorizing the President to issue posthumously to the late Roy Stanley Geiger, lieutenant general, United States Marine Corps, a commission as general, United States Marine Corps, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the President is authorized to issue posthumously to the late Roy Stanley Geiger, late a lieutenant general, United States Marine Corps, a commission as general, United States Marine Corps, as of January 23, 1947.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Navy is authorized and directed to amend the records of the Navy Department so as to carry the said Roy Stanley Geiger as a general, United States Marine Corps, to rank from January 23, 1947.

The House 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.

SPENCER BURGESS DOYLE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1148) authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Spencer Burgess Doyle.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, the report on this bill did not get to me in time; therefore, I ask unanimous consent that it be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That concludes the call of bills on the Private Calendar.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House Committee on Banking and Currency may meet this afternoon notwithstanding that the House is in session.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. During general debate?

Mr. WOLCOTT. During general debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1948

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3678) making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; and pending that motion I ask unanimous consent that general debate continue for the remainder of the day or until such time as there are no further requests for time. I may say I have spoken about this with the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR], the ranking minority member, and he states there is no objection to the request.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as I understand the gentleman's request there will be no occasion to read the bill today?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. We will read the first paragraph today, and, if possible, we would like to pass it.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object if the gentleman will confine his request to general debate here today. The Members leave and they do not know whether the bill will be read for amendment or not.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, we will read the first paragraph anyway.

Mr. CANNON. If the reading is confined to the first paragraph there will be no objection to the gentleman's request from this side of the aisle.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 3678, with Mr. MICHENER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 50 minutes, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include certain tables compiled by me or under my direction.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I am presenting to the House of Representatives on behalf of the Appropriations Committee the military appropriation bill for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948.

The hearings on this bill were opened on February 17 and did not close until April 29, 1947. Four of the seven members of our subcommittee including the chairman are also members of the Deficiency Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee which held important meetings during much of the same period that the War Department Subcommittee held hearings on this bill. This delayed us somewhat. I want to express my personal appreciation to every member of my subcommittee for the splendid cooperation I received. It was the most difficult bill which came before this subcommittee during the 11 years during which I have been a Member. I want especially to express my appreciation to my very able and distinguished colleague and former chairman of this committee, the gentleman from North Carolina, Judge JOHN H. KERR. I shall never forget his sympathetic and statesmanlike support and cooperation.

In making savings the committee always had in mind that we were making adequate appropriations for an Army of 1,070,000 officers and men as authorized by law with an Air Corps as planned by the Commander in Chief and the Army. This is in full accord with the over-all request of the War Department and the authorization of the House Military Affairs Committee. The committee is firmly convinced that we should have such an Army. It is equally convinced, in view of the savings we propose, that this Army will be more efficient and effective than before. Inefficiency causes waste; waste causes inefficiency and when you cut off waste you make the Army more efficient. Surplus personnel affects all personnel and makes all personnel less efficient. It encourages a "let Joe do it" policy.

The bill carries a reduction of \$475,809,077 below the budget estimate and rescinds \$1,100,000,000 of 1946 and prior years' appropriations. It reduces civilian employees by 74,631, at a saving of \$184,086,216. It reduces Army officers from 146,000 to approximately 126,000, a reduction of 20,000, at a saving of \$106,250,000. It reduces flying pay \$3,600,000. In all, it takes 94,631 people off the pay roll, at a total saving of \$293,936,216. This, together with other savings, reduces the budget requests by \$475,809,077. The committee did not cut off one enlisted man. It did not take \$1 from the research and development program. It did not cut off 1 of the 18,201 civilian employees engaged in research and development. It did not cut off 1 of the 30,000 employees engaged in and paid out of industrial production funds in our ar-

senals, quartermaster depots, and so forth. It did not cut one Army nurse officer or dietitian from the Army pay roll. The committee did not take \$1 of the pay, clothing allowance, subsistence, rations of one enlisted man or of one necessary officer. The committee wants to be very specific in this phase of the savings made.

Decisions in making these cuts were not always unanimous, of course, the chairman himself being as often in the minority as on the majority side of the votes. Neither were they political. The gentlemen on the other side of the aisle, and especially the ranking member and former chairman, gave me much and valuable support.

I shall now consider the entire budget in detail as far as time will permit. I believe that if you read or listen to my remarks you will agree that the committee made these savings without sacrificing any feature or function necessary to a sound and effective national defense.

BIRD'S-EYE VIEW OF ENTIRE WAR DEPARTMENT 1948 APPROPRIATION REQUEST

The following is a bird's-eye view of the entire War Department budget picture as presented to the legislative Joint Budget Committee of the Senate and House of Representatives for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948:

Total appropriation requested	\$7,044,507,100
Total expenditure availability	10,038,327,755
Total estimated expenditures	8,254,658,654

While the amount of expenditure during any one year is limited by the length of time it takes to carry out a definite program and certain other factors, in the final analysis it is the President and not the Congress, the Executive and not the legislative branch of the Government, which determines the speed of the defense program and the actual amount of the expenditures. Witness the fact that it was the President through his Budget Bureau who stopped in a large part the 1947 research and development program of the Army Air Corps as well as the production of airplanes by ordering the Air Corps not to spend \$135,000,000 of the funds appropriated for the present fiscal year. Of this amount, \$75,000,000 was taken from research and development and \$30,000,000 for production of airplanes. In April of this year, when it was too late, according to the testimony, to carry out the program and obligate the money, the President sent a message to Congress asking Congress to transfer this money to "Pay of the Army." Congress did so in view of the testimony that it was too late to obligate it. The same was true with regard to the transfer of \$60,000,000 out of a total of \$100,000,000 Congress appropriated for the National Guard and \$30,000,000 out of \$60,000,000 appropriated for the Organized Reserves.

The testimony shows that the total estimated expenditures are so estimated because the President told the Army that was the amount it could spend during the fiscal year 1948. Summarizing: Total appropriation, \$7,044,507,100; total fixed by the President as amount to be spent,

\$8,254,658,654; total available for expenditure, \$10,038,327,755. Before I proceed further I want to emphasize that the Constitution intended Congress and not the President to control expenditures. This can only be done by having the appropriation budget and expenditure budget as nearly equal as possible and eliminating the tremendous backlog of money available for expenditure from prior years' appropriations.

BILL PROVIDES FOR A RESCISSION OF \$1,100,000,000—1946 AND PRIOR YEARS

The testimony before our committee shows that the War Department still has available \$5,270,883,360 of 1946 and prior years funds, including \$185,000,000 reserved for the possible payment of portal-to-portal pay. Maj. Gen. George T. Richards, War Department Budget Officer, estimated that it would require \$3,700,000,000 to liquidate the obligations still outstanding against these funds.

The Budget Bureau estimated it would require approximately \$3,000,000,000 to liquidate such obligations. On page 171 of the hearings is found the following testimony:

Mr. ENGEL. It has happened that you have \$2,270,000,000 more money than you thought you were going to have.

General RICHARDS. Yes, sir. That is the estimated amount and can be attributed to the aftermath of the war.

Mr. ENGEL. Would not that \$2,270,000,000 be considered as a backlog?

General RICHARDS. The majority would be; yes, sir.

Mr. TIBBOTT. Will you turn that back to the Treasury?

General RICHARDS. We will never draw it from the Treasury?

However the fact is these funds may be drawn from the Treasury. They can only be used for 1946 and prior years' obligations. Since the major part of all war claims against the United States Army, including claims of foreign governments, were incurred for those years and inasmuch as the appropriation bills for those years carried transfer clauses, these funds can and may be and are being used in the settlement of such claims by transferring them to the various services of the Army and they can be used by the State Department for bargaining without any action on the part of Congress. The fact is that if these funds are not rescinded they may be used for such purposes in part or in whole. If they are rescinded they cannot be used. The committee recommends the rescission of \$1,100,000,000 of 1946 and prior years' funds including the \$185,000,000 reserved by the Army for portal-to-portal pay. This will leave adequate funds to meet any legitimate claims that may be filed against the Army for those years.

BREAK-DOWN OF WAR DEPARTMENT MILITARY BUDGET

The War Department budget is broken down further into two parts—military and civil functions. Each of these is broken down into two appropriations. The military is broken down into the principal and supplemental estimate. The civil-functions budget is broken down into the regular civil functions, including rivers and harbors, flood control, Panama Canal, and other items usually

appearing in the budget, and in addition we have the item this year for government and relief in occupied areas. Following is a table of the break-down:

A. Military budget now being considered	\$5,717,791,500
B. Supplemental estimate to be considered if and when Armed Services Committee authorizes the expenditure further broken down as—	
(a) Engineer service, including construction in overseas possession	125,000,000
(b) Construction at military posts in United States	100,000,000
(c) Quartermaster Corps, cemeterial expenses	54,000,000
Total supplemental estimate	279,000,000
Total military budget estimate for fiscal year 1948	5,996,791,500
C. In addition to the above there is a contract authorization for the Air Corps in the amount of	280,000,000
Total estimates, including contract authorization	6,276,791,500
Civil-functions budget for 1948:	
A. Regular civil-functions estimate, including rivers and harbors, flood control, etc	297,691,100
B. Panama Canal	25,024,500
C. Relief in occupied areas	725,000,000
Total civil-functions budget, including relief in occupied areas	1,047,715,600
Total War Department 1948 budget, including contract authorization	7,324,507,100

ONLY \$5,717,791,500 OF TOTAL ULTIMATE BUDGET OF \$7,324,507,100 NOW BEFORE HOUSE

Of the total War Department budget of \$7,324,507,100 sent to the Joint Congressional Budget Committee by the President, we have before us only the military part amounting to \$5,717,791,500 plus the \$280,000,000 contract authorization, leaving the \$279,000,000 supplemental estimate to be considered later if and when authorized by Congress, and leaving further the \$1,047,715,600 civil functions and relief for occupied areas when that bill is considered, which it will be as soon as the present bill is disposed of.

THE PRESENT BILL WILL ONLY REPRESENT A PART OF THE TOTAL WAR DEPARTMENT CUT IN APPROPRIATIONS

The present bill will only represent a part of the total savings in War Department appropriations. Further savings will undoubtedly be made in rivers and harbors, flood control, Panama Canal, as well as other civil-function items which will come before this House later. Savings are also possible in the \$725,000,000 estimate for relief in occupied areas. It is only when these items have been considered and passed upon, that

total savings in the War Department appropriations will be determined.

SIXTY-ONE AND FIVE-TENTHS PERCENT OF ARMY BUDGET IS FOR PERSONNEL

In order to reduce a budget intelligently one should know what one is eliminating. A careful analysis of the Army budget shows that—

First. Three billion five hundred and twenty-three million five hundred and sixty-eight thousand two hundred and sixty-seven of the total appropriation of \$5,717,791,500 considered in this bill, or 61.5 percent is for Army personnel, civilian and military.

Second. Of this \$3,523,568,267 for total Army personnel, \$2,295,000,543 or 40 percent of the total budget is for military personnel and \$1,228,567,724, or 21.5 percent of the total budget is for civilian personnel.

Third. The remaining \$2,194,223,233 or 38.5 percent is for gas, oil, planes, maintenance, travel, rations, subsistence, equipment and other nonpersonnel items usually found in the budget.

PERSONNEL MUST BE CUT IF SUBSTANTIAL SAVINGS ARE TO BE MADE

It is obvious from the foregoing analysis that no substantial saving can be made without a cut in civilian and Army personnel, since they constitute 61.5 percent of that part of the War Department budget considered here. I shall first consider Army military personnel.

WE MUST HAVE AN EFFECTIVE ARMY OF 1,070,000 OFFICERS AND MEN

I have repeatedly stated that any action I took in cutting the War Department budget would be with a view of maintaining an effective army of the presently authorized 1,070,000 officers and men, including an effective Army Air Force of 400,000 officers and men and any cuts that I have advocated have been with that objective.

JUST WHAT KIND OF AN ARMY DID WE HAVE BEFORE AND DURING THE WAR AND WHAT WAS RELATIVE OFFICER STRENGTH?

Before we proceed further let us examine the Army record and see what the percentage of officer strength was before and during the war.

First. March 1940: In March 1940 the total military strength of the Army was 249,466 officers and men. We had 18,870 or 7.6 percent officers. Nurses were not then commissioned officers.

Second. September 1941: In September 1941 the total strength of the Army was 1,601,013, including 116,989 or 7.3 percent officers. Nurses were not commissioned officers.

Third. March 1945: In March 1945, at the height of hostilities, just before Germany surrendered, with thousands of officers engaged in the procurement and production of billions of dollars' worth of war supplies and equipment, with thousands more being trained and held to replace casualties on every front, we had a total Army strength of 8,167,387, including 869,094, or 10.7 percent, officers. Nurses were commissioned officers and are included.

Fourth. January 1947: In January 1947 the total strength of the Army was 1,253,619, including 151,914, or 12.1 percent, officers.

Fifth. The budget proposes an Army of 1,070,000 officers and men, with 146,000, or approximately 13.7 percent, officers, assuming they have the full number of enlisted men.

The Army is now asking nearly twice the percentage of officers it had in September 1941 and 3 percent more officers than it had in March 1945, at the height of hostilities. This in the face of the largest reservoir of wartime officers—480,000—in reserve we have ever had and in the face of thousands of National Guard officers and an extensive peacetime officer reserve training program.

JUST WHAT KIND OF AN ARMY DID THE WAR DEPARTMENT ASK FOR?

Just what kind of an Army did the War Department ask for when it appeared before the Military Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives a year ago in March and April 1946? What was the testimony given by the War Department before that committee at that time upon which the legislation was based authorizing an Army of 1,070,000 officers and men? Let us examine the record.

OFFICER STRENGTH

A. On March 22, 1946, Maj. Gen. Willard G. Paul, General Staff, G-1, United States Army, testified before the Military Affairs Committee as follows:

We figure, roughly, 10 percent officer strength of the total strength. That means we would have around 140,000 to 150,000 officers on the 1st of July of this year (1946) and about 100,000 on the 1st of July next year

Requirements and availables—24-month term of service for inductees

Date	Volunteer Army (enlisted men)	All officers	Total officers and enlisted men	Inducted men in service	Total availables	Requirements (officers and enlisted men)	Surplus or deficit
July 1, 1946.....	800,000	150,000	950,000	600,000	1,550,000	1,550,000	0
July 1, 1947.....	719,000	100,000	819,000	200,000	1,019,000	1,070,000	-51,000
Jan. 1, 1948.....	634,000	100,000	734,000	65,000	799,000	1,070,000	-271,000

NOTES.—No selective service after May 1946. 24-month term of service for inductees.

Requirements and availables—18-month term of service for inductees

Date	Volunteer Army (enlisted men)	All officers	Total officers and enlisted men	Inducted men in service	Total availables	Requirements (officers and enlisted men)	Surplus or deficit
July 1, 1946.....	800,000	150,000	950,000	600,000	1,550,000	1,550,000	0
July 1, 1947.....	719,000	100,000	819,000	30,000	849,000	1,070,000	-221,000
Jan. 1, 1948.....	634,000	100,000	734,000	0	734,000	1,070,000	-336,000

NOTES.—No selective service after May 1946. 18-month term of service for inductees.

In each case officers were computed at 10 percent of the total strength of the Army. The fact that in each instance they used the word "all officers" in the tables and then accounted for the remainder of the Army over and above the number of officers as enlisted or drafted men seems to be conclusive evidence that the plans of the War Department at that time were on the basis of 10 percent officer strength. In view of the fact that we have a Reserve officer strength of 480,000 plus a great number of National Guard officers and in view of our Reserve officers' training program for younger officers it appears that a 10-percent officer strength for a Regular Army was sound and adequate for our national defense.

(1947). (See p. 55 of hearings before Military Affairs Committee.)

The tables inserted in the record later show that they expected to have 1,550,000 officers and men on July 1, 1946—see page 151 of same hearings.

B. A statement by Brig. Gen. Gordon E. Textor was submitted by the War Department for the record in the hearings before the Military Affairs Committee on April 4, 1946. On page 161 of these hearings General Textor said, in part:

Thus, on January 1, 1948, when requirements are estimated to be 1,070,000 officers and men, total personnel available would consist of 634,000 volunteer enlisted men, 100,000 officers, and 65,000 inductees still in service—or a total of 799,000. We would thus be short 270,000 men.

He was arguing for a compulsory selective-service law. It will be noted that both General Paul and General Textor included 13,500 warrant officers and nurses in the total of 100,000 officers required for an Army of 1,070,000 officers and men, since all of the remaining 970,000 men over and above the 100,000 officers were accounted for as either enlisted or drafted men or men short and to be acquired either by draft or enlistment.

C. On April 4, 1946, Brig. Gen. Gordon B. Textor inserted in the record of the hearings—page 162—above referred to two tables of requirements and availables of an Army of 1,070,000 officers and men as of July 1, 1946, July 1, 1947, and January 1, 1948, which reads as follows:

E. While in April 1946 they asked for 10 percent officer strength, the first evidence that the Army had changed its mind came when it announced its plans for a reduced strength from January 1, 1947, and July 1, 1947. The record of the hearings on this bill shows—page 40—that on December 31, 1946, the Army had 162,515 officers and 1,156,968 enlisted men or a total of 1,319,583 officers and men and planned to have on July 1, 1947, 923,848 enlisted men and 146,152 officers for a total of 1,070,000 officers and enlisted men. They proposed to reduce enlisted men 20 percent and officers 10 percent during the last 6 months prior to July 1, 1947, when the limit was placed at and reduced to 1,070,000 officers and men. They increased the officer strength from 10 percent to approximately 13.7 percent of the total strength by adding 46,000 more officers than they told the Military Affairs Committee they required, thereby increasing the officer strength and reducing the enlisted strength by the same number, 46,000.

THIS CHANGE IN OFFICER STRENGTH COST THE TAXPAYERS \$253,000,000

The average cost of an Army officer is approximately \$5,500 a year. On this basis these 46,000 officers cost the taxpayers \$253,000,000, or more than a quarter of a billion dollars. The present budget as submitted to the Congress includes this \$253,000,000. Some of the members of our subcommittee felt that the War Department had broken faith with the Military Affairs Committee and with the Congress. In view of the fact we had more than 480,000 wartime Reserve officers, in addition to National Guard officers and Reserve officers being trained, and in view of the further fact that most of these 46,000 officers would probably join the Officers' Reserve if dropped from the Regular rolls, some of the members of our subcommittee felt that the first War Department estimate was right and that 100,000 officers were adequate. These members felt that these 46,000 surplus officers could be dropped and the \$253,000,000 saved for the hard-pressed taxpayers of America without impairing our national defense.

MAJORITY OF COMMITTEE DID NOT AGREE

The majority of the committee did not agree on dropping these 46,000 officers and saving this \$253,000,000. We went into the question further, called Secretary of War Patterson, Major General Richards, Army budget officer, and Major General Paul and several other officers before our committee for further evidence.

ARMY PROPOSED ONE OFFICER TO SIX OR SEVEN ENLISTED MEN FOR AIR CORPS AND ONE TO EIGHT OR NINE FOR OTHER THAN AIR

A. Maj. Gen. George Richards, budget officer, testified before our committee, that the ratio of officers to enlisted men should be one officer to eight or nine enlisted men in other than air. This would mean one-seventh or one-eighth officer strength for the Air Corps and one-eighth to one-ninth for other than Air Corps strength—pages 42 and 43 of hearings. The testimony further shows that the Secretary of War ordered the Air Corps cut temporarily for the fiscal year 1948 from 401,000 officers and men

There is no doubt but what the Military Affairs Committee and the House of Representatives in authorizing an Army of 1,070,000 officers and men had in mind 10 percent or 100,000 officer strength, as no other figure was at any time even suggested by anyone either inside or outside the Army.

D. During the hearings on this bill I asked the Army for a table of organization for an Army of 1,070,000 officers and men based upon 100,000 officers or 10 percent officer strength. This table was never furnished the committee. The Army had apparently changed its mind. Now let us examine the record of the hearings on this bill and see what they asked for.

as proposed to the Military Affairs Committee to 375,000 officers and men. On this basis of one-eighth officer strength if we gave the War Department all it asked for, the Air Corps would be entitled to 47,000 officers or one-eighth of 375,000. The other than air forces would have 695,000 officers and men and would on the basis of one officer to nine enlisted men be entitled to one-tenth officers or 69,500 officers. This would give them a total of 116,500. This is upon the assumption that they would have 100 percent authorized enlisted strength.

B. If we adopt this plan we could cut off 29,500 officers which at \$5,500 each would be a saving of \$162,250,000 for the taxpayers. Some of the members of the committee felt that this saving could be made without impairing national defense.

C. If we gave the Army these 116,500 officers in addition to 13,500 warrant officers and nurses making a total officer strength of 130,000 we would cut off 16,000 officers which at \$5,500 each would be a savings of \$88,000,000.

D. General Eisenhower's evidence was about the same as that of General Richards, that is, 10 percent other than air and 15.6 percent or approximately 6.5 enlisted men to one officer for the Air Corps. General Richards was undoubtedly and naturally giving General Eisenhower's views.

SUMMARY ON OFFICER PROPOSALS

The committee considered carefully the following three proposals:

First. Whether to cut off 46,000 officers and save \$253,000,000 for the taxpayers, giving the Army the total officer strength of 100,000 requested when they appeared before the Military Affairs Committee when that committee and the House determined the strength of the Army on April 1, 1946.

Second. Fix the ratio of one officer to seven enlisted men for air and one officer to nine enlisted men for other than Air Force, or a total officer strength of 116,500. We could save on this basis \$162,250,000 for the taxpayers.

Third. Give the Army the ratio of 1 officer to 7 enlisted men for air and 1 officer to 9 enlisted men in other than air forces in addition to 13,500 warrant officers and nurse officers for a total officer strength of 130,000, cutting off 16,000 officers at \$5,500 per officer, or a total saving of \$88,000,000.

Fourth. Give the Army what it asked for—146,000 officers, despite all testimony, and let the taxpayer foot the bill and save nothing.

The committee finally decided on the following:

First. Cut off 2,600 warrant officers at a saving of \$10,000,000.

Second. Cut off 17,500 officers at \$5,500 each at a saving of \$96,250,000.

Third. Make no reduction in officer nurses, dietitians, and so forth.

Fourth. No reduction of enlisted personnel was considered at any time.

This made a total reduction of 20,500 officers and warrant officers at a saving of \$106,250,000.

The committee believed that many officers were placed on a flying status and were given flying pay who were not en-

titled to such pay. I asked the Air Corps to screen the list of flying officers carefully and take off such officers as were not entitled to flying pay. They took off 696 officers at a saving of \$1,100,000. The committee considered that entirely inadequate and reduced flying pay by \$3,600,000. In view of the fact that the total flying pay aggregates \$68,000,000, I still consider the reduction inadequate.

CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES

In considering a reduction of civilian employees in the War Department one must first determine just how many civilian employees the Department planned on having during 1948 when the 1947—this year's—budget request was made and when an army of 1,070,000 officers and men was planned.

FIRST ASKED FOR 335,000 CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES IN THE ZONE OF INTERIOR OF UNITED STATES

In May 1946, when the hearings were held on the 1947 military appropriations bill for the War Department, Fletcher C. Waller, then Director of Civilian Personnel and Training, testified before our subcommittee as follows:

Mr. ENGEL. Can you give us the maximum and minimum or the number (of civilian employees) on July 1, 1947?

Mr. WALLER. It is anticipated that the number will be down to 335,000 on July 1, 1947.

Mr. ENGEL. How many of these will be in Washington?

Mr. WALLER. The average throughout the fiscal year will be about 21,000.

He later testified that on July 1, 1947, 19,000 civilian employees would be in Washington—see page 92 of hearings on 1947 military appropriations bill.

Again:

Mr. ENGEL. These civilian employees, of course, include employees in the armories, those engaged in war production, and so forth?

Mr. WALLER. Those are all employees with military functions; it does not include the civil functions of the War Department.

The above testimony referred, of course, to the number of civilian employees in the zone of interior of the United States.

TESTIMONY ON PRESENT BILL SHOWS 40 CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES FOR EVERY 100 SOLDIERS

Mr. A. H. Onthank, the present and also the prewar Director of Civilian Personnel, testified on February 17, 1947, before our subcommittee that the War Department required 35 to 40 civilians for every 100 soldiers. His specific testimony appears on page 156 of the hearings and is as follows:

Mr. ONTHANK. If you give the War Department a job to do which requires 1,000,000 soldiers it means roughly 35 to 40 percent civilians to back this up.

We have 500,000 officers and enlisted men in the zone of interior of the United States now and on the basis of 40 civilians for every 100 soldiers the War Department requirements would be met for the zone of interior by giving them 200,000 civilians.

Mr. Onthank testified further that there were 85,000 civilians in the zone of interior supporting overseas garrisons—see pages 133 and 134 of War Department hearings.

On this basis the total requirement for War Department civilian personnel in the zone of interior of the United States is 285,000.

HOW MANY CIVILIANS DOES THE WAR DEPARTMENT NOW WANT IN ZONE OF INTERIOR?

Brig. Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau, Acting Deputy Director of Personnel, testified before our subcommittee that they required 365,000 civilian employees not including 30,000 employees engaged in various types of production in our arsenals and elsewhere. This would place the total requirement for the zone of interior of the United States at 395,000 or 60,000 more than Mr. Waller testified they needed on July 1, 1947, and 75,000 more than Mr. Onthank testified they required.

THE 1948 BUDGET PROVIDES MONEY FOR 414,613 CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES FOR ZONE OF INTERIOR

Your committee went over the budget carefully, analyzed and computed the number of civilian employees provided for in the budget for each department or branch of service, as shown in six tables inserted. These tables will be referred to again. They show the following:

Table I: That the budget provided for 344,644 civilian employees in military establishments in the zone of interior of the United States. This table, of course, does not include the employees in tables II, III, and IV. Neither does it include overseas employees in No. V. Neither does it include the 30,000 civilian employees engaged in industrial production in our arsenals, quartermaster depots, and elsewhere. The budget has \$868,240,343 to pay these 344,644 employees.

Table II: That the budget provided \$52,498,690 to pay 16,583 departmental civilian employees.

Table III: That the budget provided \$16,431,655 to pay 5,186 employees engaged or who will be engaged in industrial mobilization and planning.

Table IV: That the budget provided \$59,426,290 to pay 18,201 civilian employees engaged in research and development. These are in addition to some who will be paid out of industrial production funds.

The above four tables do not include 30,000 employees engaged in industrial production of war supplies and equipment within the zone of interior. The total civilian employees in the zone of interior of the United States, including the 30,000 industrial employees provided for in the budget, are 414,613.

Table V: This table shows that the budget provided for 110,420 civilian employees of the War Department employed overseas in our possessions and occupied areas who will be paid \$215,050,527.

Table VI: This is a summary of all civilian employees both overseas and in the zone of interior, but does not include the 30,000 industrial production employees. When we add these 30,000 we find that the budget provides for an over-all total of 525,034 civilian employees for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948. Of these employees, 495,034 will be paid a total of \$1,212,087,505. The other 30,000 will be paid out of production money. As was stated, industrial employees are paid out of production funds. For example, the

ordnance may have a certain amount of money to purchase Garand rifles or some other item. It may let a contract to a private corporation for a part of this amount and another contract to Springfield Armory, owned and operated by the Army Ordnance. The employees engaged in the production of this item at the Armory or Arsenal are paid out of the contract price, the Armory or Arsenal being in the same position as a private contractor. The amount paid these employees is not included in "Pay of the Army," but in the amount allowed for the production and purchase of supplies and equipment. The same is true with regard to the production of clothing by the Quartermaster General at the Philadelphia Quartermaster Depot and other similar production items.

THE BILL BEFORE THE HOUSE PROVIDES FOR A REDUCTION OF 74,648 CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES AND A SAVING OF \$184,086,212

The tables above referred to and inserted in the RECORD as a part of my remarks show that if the bill is passed in its present form, it will provide for a reduction of 74,631 civilian employees at a saving of \$184,086,216. The purpose of itemizing the proposed savings in personnel was not to tie down the War Department to exactly the number of employees named for each service but to give the committee's idea as to where cuts might and should be made.

COMMITTEE OPPOSED TO REDUCING CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES ENGAGED IN RESEARCH AND INDUSTRIAL PRODUCTION

The committee, however, had a firm conviction and was strongly opposed to cutting any civilian personnel engaged in research and development.

TABLES CAREFULLY WORKED OUT

These reduction tables were very carefully worked out. Each item was considered carefully and separately before the reduction was decided upon. The savings were made with the record of present and past War Department hearings in mind. It will be noted that reductions in personnel range from no reduction up to 25 percent. The over-all reduction averages approximately 15 percent both in number of employees and in the total dollar reduction. It was the intention of the committee that the percentage of reduction should be as uniform as possible in employees of all grades, unless it appeared that a service was top-heavy on higher grade employees.

ZONE OF INTERIOR REDUCTION

The total reduction of employees recommended in the zone of interior is 63,590 out of a total of 414,614 employees, including the 30,000 industrial employees.

A. This leaves a total for the zone of interior of 351,024 employees, or 16,024 more than Mr. Waller testified the Army planned to carry over on July 1, 1947, and 66,024 more than Mr. Onthank's testimony showed the Army required.

B. If we take the entire number of 74,631 out of the 414,613 employees in the zone of interior, including the 11,041 reduced in overseas personnel, then the Army would still have 339,983 employees in the zone of interior, or 4,983 more than Mr. Waller said they expected to have on July 1, 1947, and 54,983 more than Mr. Onthank thought they required.

C. In view of the constant reports which came to the committee from various sources of the large number of civilian employees in the armies of occupation and in our overseas theaters, including our island possessions, the committee felt that a 10-percent cut could be made in those theaters without hampering operations or national defense, and the committee so recommends. This 10-percent cut in overseas personnel would, of course, be a part of the total reduction made herein. The total figures are shown in table VI inserted at the conclusion of my remarks.

SUMMARY OF CUTS IN ARMY AND CIVILIAN PERSONNEL AND PAY

Reduction of 17,500 officers at a saving of \$96,250,000.

Reduction of 2,600 warrant officers, \$10,000,000.

Reduction in flying pay, \$3,600,000.

Reduction of 74,631 civilian employees, as per tables attached, \$184,086,216.

Savings on personnel by the total reduction of 20,100 officers and 74,631 civilians, \$293,916,216.

GENERAL REMARKS ON REDUCTION OF ITEMS OF EQUIPMENT, SUPPLIES, ETC.

In considering a reduction of any appropriation for clothing, supplies, matériel, equipment, weapons, and other items, one must take into consideration the following facts:

A. What was the inventory on hand in terms of dollars and, whenever practical, in terms of weapons or items requested?

B. The amount available for expenditure from prior years' appropriations and the unliquidated obligations, and whether those unliquidated obligations were in part for obligations represented by unpaid invoices of goods carried in the inventory.

C. The amount of the appropriation for the preceding year, 1947 in this case, and the amount expended to the latest date.

D. The amount of the appropriation asked for in the current 1948 budget, including contract authorization.

E. The total amount available for expenditure if the amount requested is appropriated.

I. ARMY AIR FORCES 56 PERCENT OF TOTAL MILITARY BUDGET; TOTAL MILITARY BUDGET SUBMITTED IS \$5,997,791,000

The total military budget of the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, is \$5,717,791,000. This does not include the \$279,000,000 supplemental appropriation not yet submitted. Neither does it include the \$280,000,000 contract authorization given the Air Corps for planes, and so forth, which has been submitted. If we add this last amount to the \$5,717,791,000 submitted it gives us a total of \$5,997,791,000 for the Army which is here being considered.

II. ARMY AIR CORPS 1948 BUDGET REQUESTS

A. The total requests or cost of the Army Air Forces if all requests are granted for 1948 will aggregate \$3,372,330,000, or 56 percent of the total War Department military budget of \$5,997,791,000 submitted. Other than Air Forces will receive the remaining 44 percent, or \$2,625,461,000.

B. Of this \$3,372,330,000 for the Army Air Forces for 1948, should all amounts

be available, only (a) \$1,130,000,000, or one-third of this total, is appropriated directly to the Army Air Corps. This is for pay of civilians, planes, equipment, and so forth. Of the remaining sum, (b) \$1,351,000,000 will be appropriated to the pay of the Army for pay, including \$68,000,000 flying pay, subsistence, rent, and other allowances coming under this head; (c) \$346,000,000 will be appropriated to the Quartermaster Corps for clothing, rations, and other similar items; (d) for engineers service to Air Corps, \$169,000,000; transportation for Air Corps, \$135,000,000; services, equipment, and miscellaneous items furnished by other services, \$241,330,000.

III. HOW MUCH WILL THE ARMY AIR CORPS HAVE AVAILABLE FOR PLANES IF AMOUNT IS ALLOWED AND WHAT KIND OF AN AIR FORCE WILL WE HAVE?

Before we can determine what kind of an Air Force we will have, we must determine, first, the inventory value of usable planes and equipment on hand; second, the amount available and obligated for prior years for planes and equipment not yet delivered; third, the 1947 and 1948 appropriations.

INVENTORY OF AIRPLANES, SPARE PARTS, ENGINES, ETC.

Inventory: The dollar value of the items on hand on January 31, 1947, is as follows:

Thirty thousand five hundred and sixty-six complete aircraft usable for next 5 years, \$4,675,000,000.

Spare engines: Domestic, 52,187, \$773,000,000; overseas, 8,163, \$114,000,000.

Aircraft parts and accessories, \$1,158,000,000.

Equipment, \$462,000,000.

Total inventory on hand, \$7,182,000,000.

AMOUNT AVAILABLE FOR EXPENDITURES FOR AIRPLANES, SPARE ENGINES AND PARTS, EQUIPMENT AFTER JANUARY 1, 1947

The amount available for expenditure for airplanes after January 1, 1947, spare engines, parts, equipment is as follows:

A. Out of 1945 and prior years' funds:

1. For 733 planes, \$257,603,559.
2. For spare engines and spare parts, \$94,354,488.

3. For Government-furnished equipment, \$90,607,460.

Total available from 1945 and prior-year funds, \$342,565,507.

B. Out of 1946 year's funds:

1. For 635 airplanes, \$139,485,547.
2. For spare engines, \$35,805,056.
3. For Government-furnished equipment and maintenance, spare parts, \$85,159,805.

4. Radar and radio equipment, \$23,003,613.

5. Training equipment, \$5,142,645.

Total available for expenditure from 1946 funds, \$288,596,666.

C. Out of 1947 funds: The total appropriation for planes, spare parts, allowed by Congress for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, was \$401,870,900. In September 1946 the President through his Budget Director impounded \$30,000,000 of this amount and in April 1947 sent a message to Congress asking that \$135,000,000 Air Corps money, including this \$30,000,000 be transferred from the Air Corps to pay of the Army and it was so transferred. This left a balance of \$371,870,900 available for expenditure for this

purpose. Congress further appropriated \$52,781,800 for radar and radio equipment bringing the total available for these two purposes to \$424,652,700, \$8,246,037 of which has been expended for these purposes up to January 1, 1947, leaving a balance available for expenditure of \$416,406,663 from 1947 funds. This will allow the production of 681 planes at present prices in addition to spare engines, spare parts, and so forth.

D. Out of 1948 funds if allowed: The total appropriation and contract authorization for planes, spare parts, and engines requested for 1948 is as follows:

Appropriation requested for 838 planes at present prices, \$400,000,000.

For spare engines and parts, \$40,000,000.

For radio and radar, \$40,000,000.

Total 1948 appropriation requested for planes, spare parts, spare engines, radar and radio, \$480,000,000.

SUMMARY

Inventory on hand:

Thirty thousand five hundred and sixty-six complete aircraft, latest used in war and usable for average of 5 years, \$4,675,000,000.

Sixty thousand three hundred and fifty spare engines, \$887,000,000.

Aircraft parts, accessories, and equipment, \$1,620,000,000.

Total inventory on hand, \$7,182,000,000.

AVAILABLE FOR EXPENDITURE AFTER JANUARY 1, 1947, FOR PLANES AND EQUIPMENT

From 1945 and prior years appropriation, including 733 planes, \$342,565,507.

From 1946 funds including 635 planes, \$288,596,666.

Balance 1947 appropriation including 681 planes, \$416,406,663.

From 1948 appropriation including 838 planes, radio and radar, \$480,000,000.

Total available after January 1, 1947, for planes, spare parts, engines, equipment, including radio and radar, \$1,527,568,836.

Inventory of planes, engines, and spare parts, \$7,182,000,000.

Total inventory and expenditure available if all requests are granted, \$8,709,568,836.

DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF PLANES, ETC.

The committee considered and reconsidered the question of whether or not a reduction in the appropriation for planes, spare parts, and engines could be made. Our decision was made more difficult by the fact that the President had reduced our 1947 appropriation for planes from \$401,870,900 to \$371,870,900 and at the same time had asked Congress to appropriate \$480,000,000 more for planes, spare engines or spare parts, radio and radar equipment.

DECISION OF COMMITTEE

The decision was finally made that a reduction of 10 percent of the \$440,000,000 appropriation for planes, spare engines, and so forth, could and should be made. This will reduce this appropriation by \$44,000,000 or to \$396,000,000. It will give the Army Air Corps \$25,000,000 more cash appropriation for 1948 for this purpose than the President left them in 1947 after transferring \$30,000,000 plane money to the pay-of-the-Army fund.

The Army Air Corps will have available for expenditure after January 1, 1947, for planes, spare parts, engines, equipment, including radio and radar, the sum of \$1,483,558,836.

AIR FORCE EQUIPMENT IF PROGRAM IS CARRIED OUT

If this program is carried out our inventory of airplanes, spare engines, and other usable equipment will be as follows:

First. Inventory of 30,566 complete usable aircraft, 60,350 spare engines, spare parts, radio, radar, and other equipment as of January 1, 1947, \$7,182,000,000.

Second. Value and cost of 2,683 of the latest planes of every type to be paid out of 1945, 1946, 1947, and 1948 money. This includes a large number of heavy bombers, transport and fast fighter planes, also including adequate spare engines, parts, radio, radar, and other equipment, \$1,483,558,836.

Total inventory of planes and equipment if and when this program is carried out will be \$8,665,558,836.

We would, of course, have to deduct from this sum the number of planes that would be lost, damaged beyond repair, or destroyed after January 1, 1947.

MUST NOT BE OVEROPTIMISTIC

It must be noted that while the picture looks good now and perhaps for a year or two more, it will become increasingly worse because of the large number of planes which will become obsolete during the next 1 to 5 years. It is hoped that the plane production program can and will be increased materially as and in proportion to the reduction of Federal expenses. We hope for a reduction in expenditures in United States aid to foreign countries as well as a reduction of occupational and other costs as peace treaties are made. My purpose in giving the present-day picture is not to be misconstrued. This picture does not warrant the note of pessimism that has been current in the Nation regarding our relative air strength on the one hand. Neither does it warrant a note of overoptimism. In fact the real danger to our national defense lies in a possible overoptimism as to our military and of course our air strength.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT FOR AIR

The amount available for expenditure for research and development for the Air Corps from 1948 and prior years' appropriations if the total 1948 requests are granted are as follows:

From 1945 and prior years appropriations, \$105,597,949.

From 1946 appropriation, \$206,576,849.

From 1947 appropriation: The Congress appropriated \$185,000,000 for research and development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947. In September 1946 the President impounded \$75,000,000 of this amount and in April 1947 sent a message to Congress asking that this sum be transferred to "Pay of the Army." In view of the fact that it was then too late to obligate this sum efficiently according to the testimony, the committee granted the request for the transfer leaving the net sum of \$110,000,000 available for that purpose. Fourteen million one hundred and thirty thousand four hundred and seventeen dollars had been expended prior to January 1, 1947, leaving

as available for expenditure after that date the sum of \$95,869,583.

From 1948 appropriation, \$145,000,000.

The committee made no reduction in this appropriation.

TOTAL AMOUNT AVAILABLE FOR RESEARCH AFTER JANUARY 1, 1947

The total amount available for research and development after January 1, 1947, out of 1945, 1946, 1947, and 1948 appropriations, if this bill is passed in its present form, will be \$553,044,391.

In concluding my remarks on this part of the bill I want to point out the irregularity of the past program on research and development. In order to obtain the maximum results with the minimum expenditure a research program must be planned over a term of years and the money, whatever the amount determined upon, must flow evenly and with the long-term program in mind constantly. The system of appropriating money, planning, then reducing the appropriation made and appropriating a larger sum again will bring a minimum result with a maximum expenditure instead of a maximum result with a minimum expenditure.

TRANSPORTATION CORPS

The budget estimate for the Transportation Corps aggregated \$400,000,000, or 7 percent of the entire military budget of \$5,717,000,000. This does not include the cost of the Air Transport Command. If we were to include this item it would run close to 10 percent. This in the opinion of the committee is entirely too high. This service had \$374,062,232 unexpended balance of 1946 and prior years funds, including according to figures furnished me \$101,320,203 overseas funds called triple-O funds and \$137,529,935 unallotted funds. The budget provides for a total pay roll of \$127,355,442 to pay 54,622 civilian employees. The committee after careful consideration recommends a reduction of \$52,422,773 below the budget estimate. This includes a reduction of 9,139 civilian employees and a \$22,422,773 reduction in the transportation pay roll, or a nonpersonnel reduction of \$30,000,000.

AIR CORPS SUPPLIES, ETC.

In addition to the reduction in personnel and the 10-percent reduction on airplanes, spare engines, and parts which has been fully discussed, the following reductions were made:

Supplies and equipment, \$300,000.

Transportation, \$6,143,075.

Fuel and oil, \$10,041,444.

Procurement of air-borne and ground communications equipment, \$9,479,026.

Miscellaneous, \$971,000.

Total, Air Corps, not including personnel and airplanes, \$26,934,525.

ENGINEER CORPS

The budget estimate of the Engineer Corps was \$365,000,000. The committee allowed \$299,214,506, with a reduction of \$65,785,494, including \$32,204,640 reduction in personnel pay roll. The remainder of \$33,580,854 was a reduction in matériel, supplies, and equipment, including \$20,000,000 reduction in barracks and quarters. As high as 14.75 percent administrative overhead charge was added

to some of these items. A total of \$14,798,278 was so added, which the committee thought excessive.

OTHER REDUCTIONS IN SUPPLIES, EQUIPMENT, ETC.

A reduction of \$16,303,401, in addition to personnel reduction, was made in the

Quartermaster appropriation request for clothing and other items. No reductions were made in the Medical Corps outside of a 10-percent cut in personnel. A non-personnel reduction of \$5,360,905 was made in the Signal Corps. A non-personnel reduction of \$8,525,510 was made

in the Ordnance Department. The remaining \$17,167,666 nonpersonnel reduction which makes up the total reduction of \$475,809,077, was made in other services not mentioned in this paragraph. All items including the above are included in the committee report.

TABLE I.—Civilian employees, Military Establishment appropriation, 1948, zone of the interior only

Appropriation title	Number	Reduction		Budget estimate	Reduction in dollars
		Percent	Number		
National War College.....	101			\$292,500	
Command and Staff College.....	153			370,500	
Finance Department:					
Pay of the Army.....	18,774	20	3,755	45,795,854	\$9,159,171
Finance Service.....	9,375	20	1,875	23,467,186	4,693,437
Quartermaster Corps:					
Welfare of enlisted men.....	700	20	140	1,942,907	388,581
Clothing and equipage.....	13,284	20	2,657	27,056,561	5,411,312
Incidental expenses.....	27,337	25	6,834	65,352,390	16,338,097
Transportation Service.....	135,007	20	27,001	94,150,283	18,830,057
Signal Corps.....	10,346	15	1,552	27,952,924	4,192,937
Air Corps.....	198,380	15	29,757	257,101,350	38,565,202
Medical and Hospital Department.....	19,567	10	1,957	49,505,424	4,950,542
Engineer Corps:					
Engineer Service.....	5,120	20	1,024	14,475,200	2,895,040
Barracks and quarters.....	47,994	20	9,599	121,489,498	24,297,899
Ordnance Department:					
Ordnance Service.....	50,370	15	7,555	116,829,394	17,524,409
Rock Island Bridge.....	13			36,143	
Chemical Corps.....	2,050	20	410	5,196,696	1,039,359
Army Ground Forces, training and operation.....	1,337			3,668,070	
U. S. Military Academy, maintenance.....	1,256			3,252,543	162,627
Organized Reserves.....	3,455			10,241,840	1,024,184
National Board for Promotion of Rifle Practice.....	25			63,080	
Total, military activities.....	344,644		59,524	868,240,343	149,472,834

¹ Does not include "Research and development" personnel.

² Does not include either "Research and development" or "Industrial mobilization" personnel.

TABLE II.—Civilian employees, Military Establishment appropriation, 1948, departmental employees only

Appropriation title	Number	Reduction		Budget estimate	Reduction in dollars
		Percent	Number		
Office, Secretary of War.....	1,097	25	274	\$3,475,000	\$868,750
Office, Chief of Staff.....	2,264	25	566	8,550,000	2,137,500
Adjutant General's Office.....	4,300	20	860	11,088,000	2,217,600
Office, Inspector General.....	74	20	15	181,000	36,200
Office, Judge Advocate General.....	160			506,000	
Office, Chief of Finance.....	565	20	113	1,685,000	337,000
Office, Quartermaster General.....	1,805	20	361	5,462,000	1,092,400
Office, Chief of Transportation.....	820	26	164	2,767,000	553,400
Office, Chief Signal Officer.....	625	20	125	2,091,000	418,200
Office, Commanding General, Army Air Forces.....	1,705	25	426	5,250,300	1,312,575
Office, Surgeon General.....	695	10	69	2,229,350	222,939
Office, Chief of Engineers.....	1,079	25	270	4,252,000	1,063,000
Office, Chief of Ordnance.....	1,040	25	260	3,763,000	940,750
Office, Chief of Chemical Corps.....	129	25	32	625,000	131,250
Office, Chief of Chaplains.....	35			95,000	
National Guard Bureau.....	125			351,000	
Provost Marshal General's Office.....	50	20	10	176,000	35,200
Special Service Division.....	15	20	3	52,000	10,400
Total, departmental.....	16,583		3,548	52,498,690	11,377,164

TABLE III.—Civilian employees, Military Establishment appropriation, 1948, industrial mobilization

Appropriation title	Number	Reduction		Budget estimate	Reduction in dollars
		Percent	Number		
Quartermaster Corps, regular supplies.....	131	10	13	\$440,000	\$44,000
Signal Service.....	42	10	4	165,847	16,585
Engineer Service.....	43	10	4	140,000	14,000
Ordnance Service and supplies.....	3,953	10	395	12,955,000	1,295,500
Chemical Corps.....	1,017	10	102	2,730,708	273,071
Total, industrial mobilization.....	5,186		518	16,431,655	1,643,166

NOTE.—In addition to the above reductions in cost of personnel there is a reduction of \$1,002,334 in industrial mobilization funds other than personnel.

TABLE IV.—Civilian employees, Military Establishment appropriation, 1948, research and development

Appropriation title	Number	Reduction		Budget estimate	Reduction in dollars
		Percent	Number		
Transportation Service.....	103			\$410,000	
Signal Corps.....	2,678			10,048,080	
Air Corps.....	7,970			25,316,400	
Medical and Hospital Department.....	258			1,011,810	
Engineer Service.....	860			2,400,000	
Ordnance Service.....	5,089			15,800,000	
Chemical Corps.....	1,243			4,440,000	
Total, research and development.....	18,201			59,426,290	

NOTE.—The total estimate for research and development, including the personnel costs shown above, is \$222,216,400.

TABLE V.—Civilian employees, Military Establishment appropriation, 1948, overseas only

Appropriation title	Number	Reduction		Budget estimate	Reduction in dollars
		Percent	Number		
Finance service:					
Pay of the Army.....	15,242	10	1,524	\$33,900,000	\$3,390,000
Finance Service.....	562	10	56	1,459,132	145,913
Quartermaster Corps:					
Welfare of enlisted men.....	840	10	84	2,334,785	233,478
Clothing and equipage.....	4,144	10	414	4,963,517	496,352
Incidental expenses of the Army.....	11,110	10	1,111	18,075,843	1,807,584
Transportation Service.....	18,600	10	1,860	30,028,159	3,002,816
Signal Service.....	3,721	10	372	7,729,680	772,968
Air Corps.....	23,900	10	2,390	53,471,700	5,347,170
Medical and Hospital Department.....	3,171	10	317	6,732,521	673,252
Engineer Service.....	15,910	10	1,591	39,137,108	3,913,711
Ordnance Service and supplies.....	13,038	10	1,304	17,015,200	1,701,520
Chemical Corps.....	92	10	9	202,882	20,288
Total, overseas.....	110,420		11,041	215,050,527	21,505,052

TABLE VI.—Total reduction of all employees appropriated for in the bill

Appropriation title	Number	Reduction		Budget estimate	Reduction in dollars
		Percent	Number		
Zone of the interior.....	244,644		59,524	\$868,680,343	\$149,560,834
Departmental.....	16,583		3,548	52,498,690	11,377,164
Industrial mobilization.....	5,186		518	16,431,655	1,643,166
Research and development.....	18,201			59,426,290	
Overseas.....	110,420		11,041	215,050,527	21,505,052
Total.....	495,034		74,631	1,212,087,505	184,086,216

Number of employees as shown above provided for in bill (495,034—74,631), 420,403. Funds appropriated for employees as shown above (\$1,212,087,505—\$184,086,216), \$1,028,601,289.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan has consumed 50 minutes.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman referred to getting behind the iron curtain. Can the gentleman tell us how many Russian agents are in the United States getting in behind our curtain so as to find out what we are producing?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I do not know anything about that; I am not a sleuth.

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

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I have only about 5 minutes remaining and I do not want to go over the hour unless, of course, the membership wishes to grant me more than an hour.

I would like to know; the United States Army, I am sure, would like to know, how they get military information out of Russia.

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

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I would like to ask the chairman this question: The Air Corps Material Division has indicated it would like to maintain 10 depots throughout continental United States. I understand there is organic law that creates arbitrarily only seven depots. Are there sufficient funds in the present bill for the Material Division of the Air Corps to operate 10 depots if it so desires?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. No. We gave them the money the Budget asked for, the amount the Budget asked for for those depots.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Am I to interpret the chairman's answer that that would be only seven depots?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Seven depots; yes.

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

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. O'KONSKI. In reference to the gentleman's statement regarding the difficulties of knowing the number of airplanes Russia has, it is very easy to figure that out. We can figure out what we gave them and that is what they have.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. The reports I get state that they are outproducing us. It was not the planes we gave them. We know what we gave them, so we are not worried about that. The story was as to the number of planes they are producing. Press reports stated that Russia was producing more planes than we were producing and that they were producing better planes.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I am convinced that 90 percent of the taxpayers of this Nation demand that governmental expenses be cut. There are some expenses which have priority over others, and these taxpayers themselves realize this. The responsibility of being the wealthiest nation on the earth, and one which in normal times did one-half of the business of the world, places obligations on us, both morally and politically, which we must meet. Cutting our expenses and meeting our obligations is the most serious duty that ever confronted us.

We pyramided a debt of \$400,000,000,000 in World War II, and since the war we have given or loaned to our allies and

enemies of this war about \$22,000,000,000, and have made private investments in these countries of approximately \$14,500,000,000.

It is obvious that demands will be made upon this Nation to stabilize the affairs of the world for years to come, and it will require patience, knowledge, and wisdom to bring back a normal world. We doubtless have the patience and we have the physical attainment and knowledge which surpasses all other ages, but it is quite evident that what mankind lacks is wisdom. Knowledge is information gathered; wisdom is knowledge applied; and nations are like men—they know enough to do right, but, lacking wisdom, they do wrong. The trouble with the United Nations organization to promote peace upon the earth is that selfishness abounds and wisdom is lacking.

It is estimated that 19,000,000 men are today under arms and that 40 nations are spending at least \$27,000,000,000 on armaments, and the smoke of war still smothers some portions of the world. More than 16,000,000 of the total men in uniform constitute the ground armies, 6,000,000 of whom are in China, 4,000,000 in Russia, a million and two hundred and fifty thousand in Great Britain, and in the United States more than 670,000. This Nation has incomparably the greatest sea power, the tonnage and striking power of our Navy outranking all others in the world combined.

Crushing taxation burdens all the world, and outside the United States peacetime conscription is well-nigh universal, and more money is being spent today on indirect military objectives in the development of atomic force, bacteriological warfare, guided missiles, jet planes, and new weapons than was ever spent before in the history of the world.

The chairman of our subcommittee has informed you that the subcommittee charged with the responsibility to hear and determine the justifications for appropriations for the Military Establishments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, has spent many days in hearing testimony in support of the justifications and has discharged its responsibility to the best of its ability in appraising the needs of our Army and has reported its findings and recommendations to the full Committee on Appropriations, and now submits the approval of these findings to the House of Representatives for further determination.

Last year, when I as chairman of the Military Establishments Appropriations Subcommittee reported this annual bill, I was moved to mention the splendid cooperation on the part of every member of the subcommittee in our endeavor to bring to the House a bill that was adequate to meet the needs of a peacetime Army. With one exception, every member of the present subcommittee is the same as last year's subcommittee, and without exception, each member has discharged his responsibility with the same degree of care and patriotism that moved us in the performance of our prior duties.

The course of political events has relieved me of the responsibilities placed upon the chairman of the subcommittee and these responsibilities now rest upon the shoulders of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL]. Mr. ENGEL is one of the most industrious men in Congress. In the performance of the duties placed upon him by reason of his position as chairman of the subcommittee, he has spent many long and tedious hours in performing the duties incident to preparing a bill of the magnitude of the one now before us. He cannot be commended too highly for the physical and mental energy and the conscientious service he has put into this bill. His work has inspired each member of this committee, and, in my opinion, this Congress and this Nation owes him a debt of deepest gratitude.

Hearings on the bill now before the House were quite extensive and in view of the heavy duties imposed upon each individual member by other activities, and especially in the heavy work in our offices, the constant attendance of each member reflected his patriotic desire to perform a task of the highest importance. There are items in this bill which do not have the full endorsement of each member, but the conclusions arrived at represent the cooperative and combined judgment of the membership of this entire subcommittee.

The present world situation is such that an appropriation for national defense must be viewed in the light of international relations. There is at the present moment no firm basis for peace. I am convinced that our Nation is making every effort to secure an honorable, valid, and lasting peace, and it is now apparent that even if such a desired achievement will be accomplished, it does not appear to be possible in the near future. Of course, when these accomplishments are brought about and the world becomes friendly and stable

again, it will relieve this Nation from the necessity of maintaining a great standing army and providing funds to support it.

You will note that the largest single reduction made in the budget estimate is in the cost of the civilian personnel of the Army. This budget estimate approximated \$1,200,000,000. The committee, after thorough consideration, has recommended a reduction of \$184,086,216 in the budget estimate and the distribution of this reduction is shown in the tables in the report.

In the consideration of the estimates the committee developed the facts that just prior to Pearl Harbor, with an Army of 1,700,000, the supporting services of 380,000 civilian employees were utilized. At the peak of the wartime production, with an Army of 7,000,000 men and officers, there were 1,349,000 civilian employees; as of December 1946, the middle of the present fiscal year, with an Army of 1,319,000 men, there were employed in this country 411,000 civilians and in overseas areas 141,000, at an estimated cost of \$1,000,337,000. For the fiscal year 1948, the budget estimate called for 384,614 civilian employees in the zone of the interior plus 30,000 to be employed on approved projects and paid from funds made available on a project basis, and 110,420 for overseas services, totaling 525,034. And from this total number the committee recommends a reduction of 74,631, of which 63,590 are in the zone of the interior and 11,041 overseas. No reduction whatever was made in the civilian employee estimate for research and development, and no reduction is proposed in the 30,000 to be employed on approved projects. After careful consideration, it is the opinion of the subcommittee that a reduction of \$184,086,216 from this large item will in no way impair the program of our military service.

The next largest reduction made in the recommendation of the budget is in the appropriation entitled "Pay of the Army," and is brought about by a recommended substantial reduction in the number of officers and warrant officers. The justification for this is clearly supported by the fact that the Army has been reduced to 1,070,000 men, with a total of 132,500 officers and 13,500 warrant officers, nurses, dietitians, and physiotherapists. It was the opinion of the committee that this number of officers was excessive, and the committee suggests that one officer for each nine enlisted men is a proper proportion, and experience has indicated this rule to be correct. With the advance of science and technical equipment used by present-day armed forces, it is conceivable that a slightly higher percentage of officers might be required and might be desirable. With this thought in mind, a majority of the committee recommended that a reduction of 17,500 officers and 2,600 warrant officers be made, and in its recommendation has reduced this appropriation, on account of the reduction of officers, \$96,250,000, and, on account of the reduction of warrant officers, \$10,000,000. You will note that on a percentage basis this will provide for an Army of 1,070,000 men, supported by approxi-

mately 30 percent of that number of civilian personnel, and 12 percent office personnel, not including warrant officers.

QUARTERMASTER CORPS

Further suggested reductions are made by the committee in the Quartermaster Corps under the appropriation title "Regular Supplies of the Army." The budget request for \$82,000,000 has been reduced to a recommended amount of \$70,059,860—a reduction of \$11,940,140—and the reduction, as shown in the report, is distributed throughout the quartermaster items. The committee was informed that the four items bearing the greater portion of the recommended reductions have in their depots supplies in excess of \$53,000,000. I have no doubt that additional supplies are required in these items to supply the needs for the next fiscal year, but by proper management the supplies now on hand will be used first, insofar as possible, and with the additional funds provided in this bill the additional items required for the next year can be acquired.

I was impressed with the efficiency of the officers presenting the budget requirements for the Quartermaster Corps and believe in their ability to adjust their needs to the action taken by the committee. They are keenly aware of the requirements to keep members of the armed forces in good health, well-being, and high morale.

TRANSPORTATION CORPS

The Transportation Corps is primarily a service organization and its functions are to provide for the movement of Army personnel, supplies, equipment, and material. It has performed such duties in an admirable manner. It is not a policy-making organization and for that reason does not exercise control over the size, location, deployment, movement, or mission of the Army.

During recent years it is the general opinion that Army movements have been excessive; personnel has been moved many more times than would appear to be necessary, and each movement of personnel has required a corresponding movement of supplies, equipment, and material. This presents a difficult problem since the Transportation Corps is not directly responsible for the orders directing movement of troops, and so forth, but must provide the instrumentalities for the movement from funds appropriated to it. On the other hand, the administrative function responsible for the orders requiring transportation does not have the cost of that transportation taken from its appropriation. Therefore when the committee concludes that excessive funds are being spent for transportation it is not necessarily a reflection upon the Transportation Corps, but upon some other branch of the Department responsible for the orders requiring transportation. However, the only way an appropriating committee can attempt to remedy the situation is by reducing the funds requested for transportation and point out that the agencies of the Department responsible for directing excessive transportation should reconsider and be more conservative in requirements. On this basis, the budget request for the

Transportation Corps of \$400,000,000 has been reduced by \$30,000,000 in addition to the proposed reduction of \$21,832,873 in the civilian personnel items, \$553,400 in departmental personnel, and \$36,500 in industrial mobilization, leaving a total recommended appropriation for the Transportation Service of \$347,577,227.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

The importance of scientific development cannot be overemphasized. Events which hastened the end of World War II make this crystal clear. Not only in the field of atomic energy is scientific development most important. On VJ-day our Nation excelled in this particular field; but in other scientific fields such as guided missiles, jet and rocket propulsion, and electronics, we now know that, in certain phases at least, we were not in the forefront. It is known, however, that in all these scientific fields only the surface has been scratched and that further utilization of benefits depends upon further research, discoveries, and developments.

The objective of all War Department research and development will be to apply the results of scientific analysis and research to the development of the most advanced weapons, techniques, material, and counter measures for the use of the Army in the execution of the military policy of the United States. This objective must envision the economic, political, industrial, and sociological implications with respect to the production of these weapons.

To implement such a broad objective, definite missions of research and development were presented to the committee as necessary. In brief, they are:

First. To create weapons which will be ahead of those of our competitors both in time and design.

Second. To create counter measures to the weapons of our competitors.

Third. To minimize the effect of climatic extremes on both men and weapons.

Fourth. To obtain the new scientific facts necessary to accomplish the foregoing objectives.

During the war, research facilities and programs were developed with haste to make up for our deficiencies. The accomplishments were without parallel in human history, but at the same time they were achieved at too great an expense both in time, money, and materials. If we profit from this expensive experience, we will develop a well-rounded program to explore all reasonable avenues of research and development; one which will insure our troops the most efficient, the lightest, the most durable, and the most climatic-resisting equipment possible to produce. The weapons will be the most accurate and the most mobile in the world. Clothing will provide the greatest protection for troops under all conditions; will be comfortable, yet efficient and durable. Our advance in all matériel will keep us in the forefront and enable us to do our part toward maintaining a peace which all desire.

The committee has been assured that every effort is being, and will be made, to coordinate the efforts of the several development agencies to utilizing in the

most efficient manner, both time and money in the accomplishment of the research and development goal above set forth. The committee has not reduced the funds requested for this activity; its only admonition is that the expenditure be administered carefully with the purpose of accomplishing maximum results.

The committee recognizes that the research and development program will not and should not fluctuate with the size of the Army. In order to maintain progress and secure maximum results consistent with economy and efficiency, a relatively constant level of funds must be made available year by year for this activity. Otherwise, projects of great potentiality might have to be abandoned after only getting well under way. This would be waste. The funds recommended are, in the committee's opinion, the least which can insure economical continuance of the research and development program.

ARMY AIR FORCES

Events of the past few years have made it clear that the Army Air Forces have kept pace with other branches of our Army to produce the most powerful offensive fighting force the world has ever known. Many components go into a complete and rounded-out Air Force—not the least of which is the industrial capacity of our Nation to produce and place at the disposal of the trained Army personnel planes in large numbers which are unsurpassed in quality.

It was clearly pointed out by officials of the Army Air Forces, and I wish to call it to the attention of the Members of this body, that the mission of this branch of the Army is to provide the Air Force elements of national security. In recent years it has frequently been referred to as the "first line of defense," thus displacing claims made on behalf of the Navy for many years. But whether or not it is the "first line of defense," it is the force in our Army that can bring the policy of one of the great generals of our Nation to fruition. I refer to Gen. Nathan Bedford Forrest and his memorable statement that has become a classic, that he won his battles by getting "there fustest with the mostest." The Army Air Forces places our Nation in that position.

It is not my purpose here, however, to eulogize the Air Forces. All of you are familiar with their accomplishments. I do wish to point out some of the problems that confront this component of our Army, and as their problems become the problems of this body, it devolves upon us to provide the directorship and means of coping with the questions presented to the Army Air Forces.

From the time of Pearl Harbor to VJ-day there was an ever increasing production of Air Forces needs. That production, of course, came from the industrial capacity of our Nation. Since VJ-day the demand for the type of production required in wartime has slackened because the civilian economy does not require the same type of equipment and supplies used for war purposes. The question then arises as to how it will be possible to keep a sufficiency of the war-

time type of capacity to meet an emergency should one arise. This is not a question solely with the Air Forces, it reaches into many other components of the armed forces, especially Ordnance. Insofar as the Air Corps is concerned the committee has approved in large part the requests for funds needed to keep industrial capacity in a position to quickly expand to meet required needs. It is necessary to keep abreast of scientific developments by producing new designs and prototypes of planes that may be used for testing purposes. It is necessary also to keep the aircraft industry sufficiently occupied that its capacity to produce the planes and other equipment and supplies needed will not be lost. There must be an even flow of work for the aircraft industry year after year to keep it current on required needs and to have a skeleton force which may quickly be expanded and built up to a place where emergency requirements can be met.

The present budget estimates for new aircraft is \$440,000,000. A majority of the committee having ever in mind the need to reduce expenditures as much as possible have agreed on a reduction of 10 percent or \$44,000,000. This will reduce the number of new aircraft from the requested 932 to approximately 800. A reduction of approximately 11 percent is recommended in the item for fuel and oil for aircraft as with fewer planes these requirements should not be as great.

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

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. MAHON. The latest figures from the Air Force, which were not available earlier in the hearings, show that 932 airplanes could not be produced with that money, but that only 749 could be produced and that the cut made by the committee would reduce the airplane-procurement program from the highest estimate of 932 down to 561 planes. That is brought about by the reduction of the committee and the increase in the cost of airplanes. It is brought about by several factors.

Mr. KERR. I think, of course, that the gentlemen's statement is correct. But you know what the information of the committee is. We now have 30,000 airplanes.

Mr. MAHON. To all intents and purposes, some of our planes might just as well be denominated as cracker boxes, because in modern warfare they would not be first-line aircraft. Our number of first-line aircraft is certainly nothing like approaching what it should be.

Mr. KERR. Has the gentleman any idea of what our number of first-class aircraft is?

Mr. MAHON. I might make a guess, but I do not have any definite figures from the War Department. But it remains to be seen how these old stored aircraft will work if we should happen to need them in time of an emergency.

Mr. KERR. Well, you ought to complain to the War Department which has charge of the development of the Air Forces. They have told us how many planes which this money we have appropriated will make. It looks like you

could have gotten from them the information as to how many we have available for fighting purposes now. There is no question but that we have got 30,000 of them distributed all over this Nation.

Mr. MAHON. Many of those 30,000 are out in the weather deteriorating and will probably never be used. The War Department will tell the members of this committee how many first-class aircraft we have—bombers and fighters—but I doubt that we would want to make public the intimate details of that. I know the most intimate details do not appear in our hearings and I would not take the responsibility of making it public on the floor.

Mr. KERR. I regret that the gentleman did not get that information and tell this committee about it if it was so important.

Small reductions in other items are recommended which in addition to reductions recommended in civilian personnel bring the total reductions recommended to \$116,667,492, or approximately 13.8 percent reduction from the budget estimate.

I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think the gentleman handled the situation very well. I was going to make a comment on the observations of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON]. I think the gentleman from North Carolina made appropriate answer. I might say more about it later. I thank the gentleman.

CONTRACT AUTHORITY

Mr. KERR. The bill provides for contract authorization of \$280,000,000 for the procurement of aircraft, equipment, spare parts and accessories which will carry the program into future years and provide an even flow of orders for the aircraft industry.

I wish to point out if the Congress agrees to handling the additional authority for \$280,000,000 on a contractual authority basis, it is obligating the Government to appropriate in the future the funds required to pay for the aircraft, equipment, and so forth, procured under the authority exercised during the fiscal year 1948. The policy of granting contractual authority has not always been looked upon with favor as it may increase the cost of governmental operations and administration. This is especially true if the authorization includes numerous contracts. In the instant case, however, there should be relatively few contracts.

It has always given me pleasure to speak kindly of my fellowmen, and especially of those with whom I have worked in the performance of life's duties.

The clerks assigned to duty in the Appropriation Subcommittees of the House of Representatives have been men of highest character and outstanding intellect, and the responsibility placed upon them is rarely appraised as it should be.

Robert E. Lambert, the efficient clerk of the War Appropriations Subcommittee, deserves the highest meed of praise for the service he has rendered our subcommittee, and I know that each member joins with me in an expression of our deep appreciation for the splendid serv-

ice he has rendered in the preparation of the bill now before the House. Mr. Lambert has the highest ideals in respect to his work, and there is always indescribable superiority added to the character and fiber of the man who, always and everywhere, puts quality and efficiency into his work—this Mr. Lambert does.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR] has again expired.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I will discuss the pending bill briefly, and I shall devote part of my remarks under general debate to the conference report of the conferees on the labor bill.

ARMY APPROPRIATIONS

First, however, I do want to say something about the Army appropriation bill. At the outset I should like to say that every member of the subcommittee who has worked under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL], will agree with me, I am sure, in saying that we think we have the hardest working chairman in the House of Representatives. We have a chairman who puts in more detailed study on the hard plugging work of the preparation of a bill than any chairman that I know anything about, at least. And he gets results.

Last fall I had the feeling that the Congress would be called upon to make some reductions in appropriations, perhaps for the armed services, both the Army and the Navy. I wrote the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] when it was apparent that he would be chairman of the Appropriations Committee following the election, and I said that I felt if it became possible for the subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations which dealt with budgets for the armed services to be merged or to coordinate their activities much as the Committees on Naval Affairs and Military Affairs are doing in the Armed Services Committee, this was a fitting time for the country to avail itself of the services of a man like AL ENGEL to take the leadership in coordinating expenditure for the two services. The Chairman has been diligent. We had longer hearings on the Army bill this year than we have had in the 8 years I have been a member of the subcommittee. We examined the estimates more in detail. The printed hearings, I think, are the longest we have ever had. Following the hearings on the bill itself we spent more days in actually marking up the bill and examining the individual items than has been done in the 8 years I have been on the committee. That is a sample of the thoroughness with which the bill has been prepared under the leadership of the gentleman from Michigan.

The country, I believe, wants to know that the Army bill and the Navy bill provide for security; at the same time they do want some reduction in the general expenditures of the Federal Government. I was interested in the way in which headlines told of the reporting of the Army appropriation bill the other day. They talked about the total of the

bill and then said that the reductions proposed amounted to something over 8 percent. They said that was a modest percentage in comparison with the percentage cuts on many of the other bills. Whether they said it critically or approvingly varied with different papers; but it should be pointed out that in dealing with the Army first of all you must consider the size of the Army.

If the size of the Army is once determined then you have automatically fixed a certain amount of money required for pay and subsistence, and other allowances of the members of the Army. The pay of the Army is fixed by statute. Subsistence, of course, reflects the cost of living.

It is estimated that every enlisted man in the Army costs the Federal Government \$3,150 for his pay, his clothing, his subsistence, and other allowances. The figures for officers are approximately \$5,500; that is the average for the officers of various ranks. Both of these figures go higher if part of the Army is overseas, and about half of our Army is overseas. Taking these figures just as an average, if you have an Army of 1,070,000 men, with approximately 130,000 officers and warrant officers you can readily figure out what money is untouchable. Multiply the 130,000 by \$5,000 for even figures and you have \$650,000,000 required for the officers. Take the remaining number of men, 950,000 enlisted men and multiply that by \$3,100, the average, you have something over \$2,900,000,000.

If you add the \$2,900,000,000 to the \$650,000,000 you have \$3,500,000,000 to start with as the amount required for pay, subsistence, and allowances in which no cuts can be made. The only way to reduce that would be to reduce the number of officers or men.

The military budget came to this subcommittee with budget estimates amounting to about \$5,700,000,000. When you subtract the \$3,500,000,000 required for, say, subsistence and allowance, you have left about \$2,100,000,000 where you can operate for the purpose of making reductions. The reductions proposed by the committee total \$475,000,000. It is obvious that \$475,000,000 is more than 20 percent of the \$2,100,000,000 that you have in the field where you can operate for the cuts.

Then, you add to that the principle that the committee took, namely, that we were not going to cut funds for research and development, and you take off another quarter of a billion dollars. You then have a 25-percent cut in items, exclusive of pay, subsistence, and allowances and funds for research and development.

This bill carries approximately \$222,000,000 for research and development. It also carries approximately \$23,000,000 for industrial mobilization, almost equally important.

The committee, and rightfully in my judgment, took the position that research and development should not be curtailed. We were aware of the fact that last year after we appropriated funds for research and development the President and the Bureau of the Budget proposed to impound around \$100,000,000 that the Con-

gress had appropriated for research and development. There apparently was some protest in Army circles on that figure, and as a result of a reexamination and a visit to Wright Field, where the Air Forces have their research division, the \$100,000,000 that was to be cut back was reduced to \$75,000,000. The \$75,000,000 of the Air Forces' research and development money was frozen or impounded, and subsequently it was transferred to other purposes of the War Department. It was used in part to take care of the pay of the Army, the pay of the civilian employees; so that last year \$75,000,000 that the Air Force should have had for research and development was used for other purposes.

Gen. Curtis Le May, who was head of the Twentieth Air Force, the B-29's in the Pacific, in response to questioning testified before our committee that that cut-back had delayed the research program anywhere from 8 months to a year and a half. He explained to us that a research program was not something that you could pick up now and accomplish in a few months' time but that research requires advance planning if you are going to carry it forward and use the different new devices in planes. You have to do your technical work on these devices, you have to put them on the planes. Sometimes you have to redesign the planes in order to accommodate the new instruments that you propose to put in them.

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

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. PLOESER. Would it be the gentleman's judgment that such action on the part of the Executive was damaging to the national defense program?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. We did not think it helped at all and that is why the committee took the position we would not cut this \$222,000,000 which was requested by the budget for research and development at this time. We wanted to give the Air Corps an opportunity to get caught up.

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

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I am in thorough accord with the committee's action in not cutting down the appropriation for research. Is there any way in which we can prevent similar action being taken next year by the Executive?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I wish I knew. We asked that question during the hearings. I do not know whether it shows on the record or not. It may have been asked off the record. There was some division of opinion as to how the Congress, if it wanted to prevent appropriated funds from being impounded by the executive branch of the Government, could accomplish it. That has been raised in connection with other appropriation bills.

I think I can say that we made it perfectly clear to those who were before us that we expected them to go ahead with the program for which we were appropriating funds. At the same time it must be recognized that the President is Com-

mander in Chief of the Army and Navy, and that as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, if he directs officers in the Military or Naval Establishments to do certain things, as a matter of discipline and obedience they will follow his directives.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I think it is probably very clear that it would be impossible, certainly most difficult, for the Congress to compel the Army to spend a certain amount of this fund on research. At the same time, I think it is within our power and our province to prevent the transfer of this fund to any other purpose.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. And this bill, I may say, comes to you without a transfer clause in it. They are not going to transfer this money to some purpose other than that to which it is appropriated.

Mr. PLOESER. I think that is tremendously beneficial, in view of the fact that we have known that they transferred it to keep more unnecessary civilian employees cluttering up the War Department.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Perhaps we have taken care of that, too. On pages 5, 6, and 7 of the committee report you will find tables showing various divisions of the War Department, the number of requested positions for civilian employees, the reduction proposed by the committee, the percentage reduction, the number of the reductions, the estimated cost for the full number requested and the reduction in dollars applied.

Thus, the committee has made perfectly clear where the reductions in the number of civilian personnel are to take place, both in percentage as well as in dollars.

Now, there is one other branch of the War Department's activities where we proposed that no cuts be made, and that is in the National Guard. With some of the members of the committee I felt at different times that the National Guard had been overlooked. There is a little tendency, I think, on the part of some career men in the Army to look down a bit at the National Guard. Yet the fact remains that when we get into an emergency we always call upon the guard. Under any logical interpretation of the kind of attack that might come to this country, we can expect attacks at various parts of the country if war should come again. We cannot expect to escape attack here. We can expect that these attacks will come with suddenness; they will be surprise attacks. That to me, and I think to the members of the committee, means we should have in all parts of the country a good organized group of trained people who can be called together quickly, who will know how to respond to discipline to take charge of any situation that might arise. So, the committee proposed that no cuts should be made in the funds requested for the National Guard.

We also looked with a friendly eye toward the Organized Reserves. There was some slight cut of their civilian personnel, but for the Organized Reserves proper we did not propose any cut. If further cuts are to be made in the bill,

or if cuts are to be made in military appropriations, I think you would have to turn to cutting the size of the Army itself. That involves a broad question of national policy which ought not really to be handled in this bill. If it could not be handled any other way, that question should be raised here, perhaps, but it is not the normal place to do it.

A very distinguished gentleman, a former President of the United States, who appeared before the subcommittee in connection with certain estimates which we considered, said to the members of the committee that he thinks that our Army in Germany is either too large or too little; too little to stop the advance of any enemy forces if they were to be attacked, and too large for a purely police job. That is a point of view which has some justification, I think. However, a decision as to whether or not we should reduce our armed forces overseas is a matter of broad policy.

I recall that the morning after General Marshall returned from Moscow, in a review article written by Frederick Kuhn, I believe, which appeared in the press services of the country, it was stated that the one tangible result of the Moscow Conference was an agreement that the several occupying powers should by the 1st of June report a proposed reduction of the number of troops in the occupying forces, to become effective not later than the 1st of September. On the 1st of June, or thereabouts, a report appeared in the press that the various representatives of the several occupying powers had been unable to get together on an agreement as to what that reduction should be.

I personally feel that if we are going to achieve further economies in our military budget, we must turn more and more of the job of military government and of preserving order in the occupied countries upon the native people themselves. Very substantial reductions can be made when we decide to do that. Whether or not the United States would want to do it in advance of an agreement with other powers is a question of policy that I hardly think can appropriately be determined in the consideration of the military bill. If I thought it could, I would be in favor of proposing, of course, to reduce the total number of the armed forces overseas.

So much for the military bill. If the Members of the Committee during this period of general debate will indulge me, I should like to turn now to a little discussion of the so-called Taft-Hartley bill, the labor bill, as it appears now in the form of this committee print of the conferees, which some of the Members have seen and on which the House will probably vote tomorrow.

It will be recalled that the House passed a labor bill by an overwhelming vote, about 3 to 1, or better; that it passed the other body; and the bill went to a conference committee. It will, of course, be recalled that last year we came to about the same position. We passed in the House of Representatives a bill dealing with labor problems. It was changed somewhat in the other body. We did not send that bill to conference. Some of us who were interested in it were successful in working with Members of the other

body so that amendments were incorporated in it so that when it came from the other body it was in about the same position as the bill had been when it passed the House. The House concurred in the Senate amendments, and the bill went to the White House and was vetoed.

The question arises now as to what is going to happen to the present labor bill. Having had some definite connection with the bill a year ago, I felt it at least a privilege if not a personal responsibility to form some opinion upon the content of the bill which will come from the conference committee today or tomorrow.

VETO OF LABOR BILL INCONCEIVABLE

As I have gone through that conference committee report I have come to the conclusion that it is inconceivable that President Truman will veto the Taft-Hartley labor bill as it has come from the conferees of the House and Senate. It is inconceivable that the President should veto the bill, that is, if he is to do it on the ground that this bill carries any wallop against organized labor.

The new labor bill as written by the conferees does many things, but it certainly does not destroy organized labor. On the contrary, it says that if a majority of the employees of a given employer eligible to vote authorize it, a union may bargain with the employer to require that every employee and all new employees shall join the union within 30 days. That is, by a simple majority vote, all workers may be required to pay initiation fees and dues.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 16 additional minutes.

If anything, this statutory recognition will strengthen organized labor and bring unions into many plants which heretofore have been open shops. In the face of that one provision alone, I do not see how organized labor can even ask the President to veto the bill.

The new labor bill as it comes from the conferees is weakest, in my personal opinion, in the approach it makes to the \$64 question of the strikes that tie up the Nation, the strikes that affect the general welfare, health, and safety. All that the bill proposes is a 60-day cooling-off period, enforceable by power for the Attorney General to get an injunction while a committee of inquiry reports on the facts, but is forbidden even to make recommendations for settlement. At the end of 60 days, the Mediation Service reports to the President on the progress toward settlement, if any, and the injunction is dissolved.

The only affirmative step is that within 15 days after the board of inquiry reports, the National Labor Relations Board is required to take a secret ballot of the employees on the latest offer of settlement made by the employer. There is not the slightest compulsion in the bill upon either party to seek a settlement. I have been unable to find any device in the bill which would seek to bring the play of any

persuasion, natural or legal, upon either party. In fact, the bill expressly says:

Neither party shall be under any duty to accept, in whole or in part, any proposal of settlement made by the Service.

That is about the nearest to a feather-duster solution I have ever seen proposed for national paralysis strikes. Certainly the man who came before Congress and asked for a draft of the railway workers to end the railroad strike can never veto this bill on the ground that it is too tough. As a matter of fact, the bill bows itself away from even the feather-duster approach to final strikes in railway disputes by expressly providing that—

The provisions of this title shall not be applicable with respect to any matter which is subject to the provisions of the Railway Labor Act.

In other words, if a situation develops again as developed with the railroads there will be nothing more to deal with the situation than we had the last time.

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

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If John L. Lewis were to call a strike in the coal industry, what remedy would there be under this bill other than the 60-day postponement?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I do not find any.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I do not either.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Under the provisions of this bill, John L. Lewis could not by his own act call a strike. Is that not true? In other words, there must be a vote by secret ballot. Is that not correct?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Well, it might be a secret ballot. If John L. Lewis continues as he has, I imagine he would be able to get the secret verdict he wants.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. That would depend on how the miners voted.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. In any event, when the strike is called, what does this bill offer? It offers a chance to ask the Attorney General to get a 60-day injunction and when those 60 days have expired and the report is made of whatever steps have been taken, and the report may not bring in recommendations, the injunction is dissolved. The bill says:

The Attorney General shall move for a dissolution of the injunction.

There you are.

The bill offers only one further step in the matter of strikes which the President thinks affect the national health or safety. When the injunction is dissolved the President is required to submit to the Congress a report of the proceedings with recommendations if he has any to make. What is then to happen if Congress is not in session, the bill does not say.

So, it is my personal opinion that the bill does not come to grips with the problem of the national welfare strike in the way that problem must be faced and met.

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

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. HALE. Does not the gentleman think that ad hoc legislation offered in an emergency is almost certain to be bad?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The recommendation which the President asked in that certain emergency, I think, was bad. That is the kind of situation we are left with, even if the Congress were in session and the President came up with some emergency legislation which would be as the gentleman has described it, written hurriedly and poorly checked. The ad hoc bill which the President sent up in the railroad emergency last year, as I recall, proposed to give him the right to draft railroad workers by declaring an emergency which he alone could end. That was the form of the bill as it came up to Congress. So I do not like this feature of the conference bill which leaves an answer to general strikes to be found when the emergency arises.

On the other hand, the bill does provide many salutary improvements in existing law. None of these changes afford a ground for veto; on the contrary, they constitute the positive reasons why the Congress should send the bill to the White House and why the President should sign it into law.

First of all, the bill rewrites the Wagner Act in the light of the 12 years of experience we have had in its operation. Any law of a general character, pioneering in a field as temperamental as industrial relations, can well afford examination and revision in the light of its actual workings.

The Taft-Hartley bill establishes a list of unfair labor practices for labor organizations or their agents corresponding to the unfair labor practices established in the original Wagner Act for employers. In this respect, the bill is similar to the revised bill which I introduced at the opening of this session of Congress, H. R. 725.

Among the matters dealt with by this device are featherbedding, jurisdictional disputes and secondary boycotts, refusals to bargain with employers, coercion of workers, discrimination in employment, and freedom of speech for the employer. I may say, however, that the language on freedom of speech leaves much to be desired, in my opinion.

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

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. When you go out and talk to your constituents you tell them if they elect you Congressman they will get benefits. They will get a good Congressman. If they elect the other fellow they will not get quite so good a Congressman.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I do not say much about the other fellow.

Mr. HOFFMAN. At least you lead them to believe that if they elect you they will get a good Congressman. Otherwise you would not be a candidate. This provision about free speech provides that he can give a speech if he does not make any threats or offer any benefits. How can you make a speech unless your heart is in it and you can offer benefits?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The gentleman answers his own question.

Only time will tell how effectively these problems are treated, but at least a definite legal ground work is laid for dealing with these matters.

In my judgment, this is progress. The measure of the progress will rest to a large extent with the National Labor Relations Board which is to be enlarged from three to five members, and its functions made more clearly policy making and less administrative. This change in the composition of the Board, and its field, incidentally, is one which I endorse and was first proposed, I believe in the bill, H. R. 725, which I introduced early in January, as previously mentioned.

Also, in the first title of the bill, the procedural provisions of the old National Labor Relations Act have been improved and made to conform more nearly to approved equity practice. These are matters of detail, but important and worth while in any comprehensive approach to the field of labor legislation.

Certainly there is nothing in this general revision of the Wagner Act which would afford the President any consolation for a veto, much less justification. He might pick out a phrase here or there of a picayunish character that he would rewrite, but surely he would find many more objectionable phrases in the original Wagner Act as it now stands on the statute books.

Title II of the bill established a Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service as an independent agency of the Government, merging with it the Conciliation Service now located in the Department of Labor. Although the President objected to the provisions in the vetoed Case bill of last year which took the Conciliation Service out of the Department of Labor, there is good reason to believe that he would not veto a bill this year on that ground.

Certainly those who have followed the course of labor legislation will be impressed by the number of people, both those known as radical and as conservative, who believe the Conciliation or Mediation Service should be independent and utterly above suspicion of bias or control.

The bill introduces a new and generally well recommended device in the form of a National Labor-Management Panel to assist the Mediation Service in its efforts to avoid industrial controversies and to achieve voluntary adjustments of controversies that do arise.

The principle of mediation and conciliation is well established. It is recognized in the present Conciliation Service. The changes proposed here by statute correspond in a general way to procedures that have been more or less formalized by administrative orders in present practice. Certainly, nothing in this part of the bill affords any ground for a Presidential veto on that score. Indeed, this portion of the bill the President may welcome if grapevine rumors of his displeasure with some operations of the present Conciliation Service have any foundation.

The Taft-Hartley bill incorporates some other provisions which were in the Case bill of last year and which are pretty

much accepted as proper subjects of legislation.

For instance, the bill establishes suitability for and by labor organizations as entities. The bill last year did that. The objection to suits against labor organizations has stemmed from a proper resentment against the travesty that took place in the old Danbury Hatters case where individual members of a union were harried and their property attached to satisfy a judgment for action taken by officers whom they did not control. It was as bad as such action would be against minority and individual stockholders of a corporation for acts they could not control. Both in the bill last year, and in this Taft-Hartley bill, the language while making labor organizations responsible under their contracts and for the acts of their agents, limits judgments to the assets of the organization itself.

The bill, as did the bill vetoed last year, requires that welfare funds be administered on a trust basis if the employer contributes to them. In this respect, the conference bill, in my opinion, is an improvement over the House bill which forbade welfare funds altogether and did not even permit employer payment or contribution to the mutual-aid or benefit-insurance funds many well-established and well-respected labor organizations and craft lodges have maintained for many years. Certainly this feature will not invite a Presidential veto. It should be welcomed by organized labor.

The bill incorporates other features which are generally accepted as appropriate items in any modern labor legislation.

The ban on political contributions which has been the law as a part of the Smith-Connally Act now expiring, is picked up and extended to primaries and conventions as well as general elections.

There is a ban on strikes by Government employees which is in keeping with stated governmental policy and certainly will not prompt a veto.

There is a provision to protect labor organizations from having officers who are members of the Communist Party. It relieves the National Labor Relations Board from investigating matters raised by labor organizations unless the organization has on file an affidavit that its officers are not members of the Communist Party and have not been within the preceding 12 months. Surely the rank and file of sturdy American workers will welcome that protection and the President will hardly deny it to them by vetoing the bill because that is offered.

There is one significant portion of the bill, title IV, which definitely bids for Presidential support. It proposes to create a joint committee from the Senate and House Committees on Labor to study basic problems affecting friendly labor relations and productivity and report by March 15, 1948, with recommendations. Since the President made such a recommendation on the subject in a special message to the Congress a year ago, he certainly will not veto the bill on the ground that it carries such a provision.

Taken in a broad way, then, the Taft-Hartley bill offers some improvements in existing law, writes into law some gen-

erally approved practices, and offers one method, gentle though it be, of recognizing that a national emergency may exist in case of a strike affecting national health or safety.

If political lieutenants or so-called leaders of labor brandish old, hackneyed phrases about vicious or drastic antilabor legislation, and browbeat the President into veto of this bill, America will have witnessed gangsters entering the White House and holding up the President with a wooden gun.

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

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. McDONOUGH. In other words, summarizing the bill—and I appreciate the fine statement the gentleman has just made—is there anything, in the gentleman's opinion, in the bill that would do any harm to any legitimate organized labor union that is organized for the benefit of its membership?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Absolutely not.

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

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Is it the gentleman's opinion that the prosecutive and judicial functions of the National Labor Relations Board are separated far enough that they will be performed equitably?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think there is an improvement in the bill in that respect. I did not mention that feature. I do think that improves the present Wagner Act. The new National Labor Relations Board will become more of a policy-making board, more of a quasi-judicial board. The investigatory functions are separated from the duties of the individual board members. This is a change from the way they operated in the past.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. The gentleman has made a splendid analysis of the conference report. I wish to compliment him. Does not the gentleman believe that this bill can be designated as neither pro-labor nor pro-management but as a middle of the road bill fair to both parties?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It certainly is a fair bill. It is not either pro-labor or pro-management. As I stated in the first part of my remarks I do not think it goes as far as it should in dealing with national welfare strikes. I think it goes farther than it should in encouraging the establishment of union shops with compulsory membership by a simple majority vote of the employees of a given employer. I think it should have done something more to regulate mass picketing activities. The gentleman is probably warranted in describing it as a middle-of-the-road bill.

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

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Speaking in generalities, may I ask the gentleman whether in his opinion this bill by its terms even approaches in severity the bill which the

President stood in this House and advocated last year?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Certainly not.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, the members of the subcommittee have already been complimented, including our able and efficient clerk, Mr. Robert Lambert, who has been working with intelligence and energy on a day-and-night basis for weeks trying to whip this bill into shape for presentation to the House. The virtues of our chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL], have not been overestimated. I have observed in my service here that occasionally a member will arise and extol the virtues of a colleague, his statesmanship, his capacity, but finally makes some reservations which take away the spirit of the compliment. Well, I have no reservations with respect to my chairman. I yield to no one in my admiration for his energy and effort. He is an able and diligent servant of the American people. Of course, I do not always agree with him, and I am sure he would not expect me to.

I want to say at the outset that this bill—the appropriation bill for the War Department for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1947—is to me very unacceptable in some particulars and I want to make reference now to one particular in which it is most unacceptable from my standpoint. I shall offer an amendment, not as a token amendment, not merely for the record, but with the hope of getting results, an amendment which will restore the airplane-production program requested by General Spaatz, Chief of the Army Air Forces, who plead with this Committee almost on bended knees to give him this money for what he called an already greatly impoverished air force. I think that the money requested for aircraft procurement ought to be restored and I think when the President of the United States affixes his signature to this bill it will have been restored. I make that prediction now for the record.

The bill provides for a reduction below the estimates of the President's budget in the sum of \$475,000,000. I am not now going to offer amendments to restore more than \$40,000,000 of that sum. I do think that some of the cuts were too deep and that we cannot save the amounts that we undertook to save here. I think we can probably save several hundred million dollars but I feel that we should proceed with caution. It would be difficult to exaggerate the importance of a strong national defense program in these days of uncertainty.

Let no one mistake the position of the members of this committee. We are all favorable toward economy and good government. No one in America of either political party has a monopoly upon that virtue. When the able chairman of our committee early in the session stood athwart the path of Government spending he expressed the fervent hope that appropriations in this bill could be cut by \$1,000,000,000. It has been my hope

and belief that substantial savings could safely be made. In my opinion further study by the War Department of the present bill will reveal that additional changes will be in the public interest.

Now, we marked up this bill after several days of deliberation and we put our pencils down, and I, for one, thought that we had agreed in subcommittee on the final draft of the measure, having begun consideration of the bill on February 17. But, after we had marked up the bill the subcommittee was called back into session. That was about the time that the Navy bill was to be reported out, and it was then stated that an effort would be made to cut the funds in the bill for the aviation-procurement program. I protested then, as I protest now, the action of the committee in reducing the airplane-procurement program for the United States Army Air Forces.

In the committee report which was originally prepared I protested the fact that in the report as then written there was only one line in the whole report which made reference to the procurement of airplanes, and that was over in a table in the latter part of the document.

Following my protestations, which must have been considered valid, the chairman of our committee has written now on pages 8 and 9 of the report a statement in considerable detail regarding the aviation program. I thought that the committee should be forthright with the country and the Congress and say exactly what was being done by way of reducing the aircraft procurement program. If any justification existed for such action it should have been plainly set forth. But the original report did not give to the Congress and the press of the country an accurate statement as to that situation, and as a result, on Thursday, May 29, the Evening Star, of Washington, which is one of the most reputable papers in the Nation, came out with a three-column headline making reference to the Army military budget cut of 8 percent and in a subheadline the Evening Star said the following:

"\$5,240,982,423 fund includes full plane, research requests."

Well, the bill did nothing of the kind, and of course, nobody now maintains that it did do anything of the kind. But it was unfortunate that this sort of information was at first accepted as the correct statement of the situation by the press.

Now, we do have 30,000 planes, but as I said earlier in the discussion today, some of them are little more than cracker boxes. Many of them, many thousands, in fact, are out in the open. It remains to be seen how well they will weather the ravages of time. Certainly by the thousands they are becoming unusable year by year. No one would say that we have more than 9,000 first line aircraft. I do not have the exact figures before me. No one would say that all of them would be readily usable.

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

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES. With respect to the airplanes, what excuse is there for having

destroyed quite a number of B-29 airplanes that were in the process of being built and almost completed at the close of hostilities? Quite a number of B-29 airplanes were in the process of construction at that time, a great many of them almost completed. They made junk out of them, destroyed them. In view of the gentleman's statement, what excuse could there be for that sort of policy?

Mr. MAHON. I think there could be no excuse any time for the destruction of first-rate B-29 aircraft. I have no information indicating that completed B-29 aircraft may have been destroyed. If the gentleman wishes to pursue that question, I wish he would get his own time, because I am not familiar with the facts about which he is now speaking. Undoubtedly there was a cut-back in plane production when the war ended and production stopped on B-29's just starting down the assembly line.

Mr. REES. I shall be glad to furnish the gentleman information on that subject.

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

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

Mr. KILDAY. Does not the gentleman take the position that whatever may have been done in the past which was wrong or unjustified, the idea now is, as the possessor of atomic energy, and with the necessity for building up experimental planes to utilize jet propulsion, that the small number of planes, some 900, asked for by the War Department is certainly a minimum for us to proceed with experimentation on planes that would be essential in the event of another emergency?

Mr. MAHON. Yes, the gentleman makes a very fine point. I am not one who is willing to look backward when it comes to the matter of aviation, nor am I one who is willing to be other than very enthusiastic for the expansion of our aviation program. The fact that in the committee report as it was originally drafted there was only one line about the airplane procurement program, which looms as one of the large items in the bill, \$440,000,000, would leave the implication that those who had written the report were not air-minded. I cannot feel that this is true, but that is the logical deduction.

The gentleman will remember that following World War I some of the nations tried to hold onto their old equipment, and looked to that equipment for security. That fact contributed somewhat to disastrous consequences later. If America today spends a lot of time looking for security to old, antiquated aircraft that we have on hand, America will be inviting trouble in the battle for post-war supremacy. I, for one, am not as much concerned about what we have or what we had, as I am with the possibilities for the future. It is in the future that the hope of our country lies.

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

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. Would not the gentleman feel it would be only fair to say

that when the war ended even the B-29 was not the latest, most efficient, and most effective type of heavy aircraft being produced?

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is correct. Of course, that would not justify the discarding of first-rate B-29 aircraft.

Mr. KILDAY. If the gentleman will yield further, I believe the gentleman would agree with me that neither of us would support an appropriation to build any large number of the conventional-type airplanes or the type that we used during the last war. Admitting that the B-29 is the best that any nation has at this time, still I would not be willing to go ahead and build a large number of B-29's certainly not B-17's, P-51's, or P-47's, but I would be willing to go along with experimentation and development so that we can properly utilize jet propulsion and perhaps atomic propulsion, and certainly the type of airplane that would be in a position to utilize the atomic bomb.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is correct. Other nations of the world are interested in aircraft. Since I came on the floor the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WORLEY] has shown me a newspaper clipping to the effect that one of the great nations of the world is contemplating a 100,000-airplane-procurement program. I doubt that such a statement as that is entirely authentic, but to me it is unthinkable at this time before the peace has been written and when there are perils on every side and when the streamer headline of one of the papers in Washington, D. C., said yesterday, "The United States warned to get set for atomic warfare," I say it is unthinkable that we would refuse to give the Army Air Forces, the queen of the skies up to this day and forever the queen of the skies so far as I am concerned, that we would deny General Spaatz's plea and the earnest appeal of our President for 749 planes as carried in the budget.

I say, Mr. President, and I say, General Spaatz, and I know that the General would agree with me, "You have not asked for enough planes for the Army Air Forces." Certainly, I shall not take the responsibility for reducing the number of the planes requested.

On all these controversial and complicated issues that come before the Congress, it is never quite possible to tell just how certain members feel about different questions. Here, however, the point is easily discernible, the point is well drawn and very simple. We will have a chance to vote on it, and every man can record his position and write it in the RECORD as to whether or not he is for a first-rate aircraft program as requested by the Chief of the Air Forces and the President of the United States. If Members vote for my amendment to restore 188 tactical aircraft—jet propulsion bombers and fighters and planes of that type—then they are voting for the kind of air force I believe we need. If Members want to record themselves as voting to the contrary, that is the privilege of a Member of the House of Representatives.

I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] who, in my opinion, will probably be willing to support this

amendment before this bill goes to the White House.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. As the gentleman knows, because he was in the committee, I was not enthusiastic about this particular reduction at this time.

Mr. MAHON. That is right.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. But there is something to be said for the point of view which was expressed by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY], and that was that the B-29 was more or less obsolete when we came through the war, and the viewpoint that finally prevailed with the majority of the committee was that we did not want to load the Air Force up with some obsolete planes. We wanted to say to the President that we want to save some money so that we would have it to spend on buying some modern aircraft after we get the benefit of the renewed research and development program which he had set back to the tune of \$75,000,000 last year.

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. The research and development program is, of course, important, but, mind you, that nation is marked for trouble which waits until it has a perfect aircraft before it starts working on the production line. The gentleman from South Dakota knows, as I do, through long months of service on the committee, that every airplane that comes off the assembly line is at that moment to some degree obsolescent. We have appropriated and vouchsafed appropriations of money time and again for modification centers to take that new aircraft just off the assembly and put in the latest improvements that had been subsequently developed. So we cannot wait to get the last word in research before aircraft construction is begun. To do so would mean that no planes would ever be constructed.

If we did lose some time on research and development last year we cannot make it up now. We can only go on from here. It is like General Spaatz said on page 615 of the hearings:

We are not trying to make up that loss in 1948 appropriation. But we have taken the loss in time, so instead of the 5-year research and development program that would be finished in 1952, that project will now end in 1953 or 1954.

Please note this fact as to research and development: You can spend a billion dollars in research and development and it may not get results. We might have spent \$2,000,000,000 on the atomic bomb, as we did, and then it might not have worked. Research and development does not always work as planned, but I would not minimize the great importance of such activity.

So, what we will do with our future program is to use the best information we have in devising the best aircraft that can be produced.

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

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. KILDAY. With reference to the remarks made by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] does the gentleman feel we should be concerned, if the Army Air Force got the 932 planes it originally hoped to get from the money

they asked for, or the 749 planes which it would actually buy because of the increase in price by the time the bill came here, or if it should get 561 which this bill would permit them to acquire, that there would be any danger of overloading the Army Air Force with antique types of planes?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] has again expired.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Texas 10 additional minutes.

Mr. MAHON. It is unthinkable to me that any thoughtful person would say that with an air force of more than 300,000 men, 749 new planes would be too much for the air forces for training and for national security. At least we need a little nucleus of an air force of the most modern design if we are to train air personnel and if we are in the test tube of experience, to develop all the bugs and defects to the end that we may have better planes, more efficient, powerful, and safer for air force personnel.

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

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. There is one other factor that I think the committee should be aware of in its consideration of this procurement proposition. Some committee which has studied our airplane picture thinks that there should be about 3,000 planes a year produced, of a military character, for the Army and Navy.

Mr. MAHON. Yes. Will the gentleman permit me to say that the Army program as now written of 561 planes, plus the Navy program of 575 planes, would give us something less than 1,500 planes, and something like 1,500 planes short of what might be necessary for us to maintain the aircraft industry.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is the picture as far as current funds are concerned. Of course, that is not quite the entire picture. I know there are many Members on the floor who are really and sincerely trying to get at the bottom of this situation. I would like to have the Members refer to page 8, where you will find a listing, not merely of the new funds carried in this bill but of the items that are on order, the money unobligated, that was available for this purpose, and the contract authority in the bill. You will note there is a little table there which shows that on February 8, 1947, we had on order for the Air Corps \$616,523,000. There was also unobligated \$50,417,564 on that date. The bill provides \$396,000,000. Then the bill carries contract authority for \$280,000,000, making a new procurement total of \$1,342,940,571. It is a question on which experts could honestly disagree.

Mr. MAHON. But the experts in aviation do not disagree.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The question is how much you want to put into procurement until you have your research and development program brought up to date. I recall we had a somewhat similar occasion that arose before the war when General Arnold suggested to some members of the subcommittee that we ought not to go too strong

on the purchase of certain planes because he thought they would be obsolete by the time he got them and he wanted to get the benefit of some new research incorporated into the planes and did not want to get loaded up.

We do not want to get some more cracker boxes. The gentleman referred to cracker boxes.

Mr. MAHON. Will the gentleman now let me proceed?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I will agree that men well may vary in their opinions as to how much we can appropriate to establish a certain policy. If we find that the domestic aircraft industry may not be able to turn out what we ought to have I will be inclined to go along with the gentleman if it comes to that point; but at the same time I do not think the country or the Congress ought to have an impression other than what is the truth, and that is that there is over \$1,342,000,000 for Air Force procurement.

Mr. MAHON. That is correct. Mr. Chairman, I must decline to yield further until I have proceeded with my statement.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman has quoted with approval the warning words of General Arnold as the yardstick which we should follow. Following out the same line of argument I have quoted the statement of General Spaatz, his successor; and I hope the gentleman will be willing, as I think he eventually will, to vote for my amendment. I think the Congress is for an adequate aircraft program and I know the people are for such a program. I think the Members of Congress will hesitate to say that they want fewer planes than the very minimum requested by the Chief of the Air Forces and the President of the United States.

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

Mr. MAHON. I yield briefly to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. I am one of those who is not on this committee and who is not on the Military Affairs Committee. I do not know much of the details, but as the matter strikes me what we have here is a question of whether we are going to defend America with outmoded equipment, second-rate or obsolete equipment, or whether we are going to carry out the promise that has been made to the American people of keeping American aviation second to none in the world.

Mr. MAHON. I know what the people I represent want—what the people of the Nation want. They want an air force second to none. They want economy, but they do not want it taken out of the Army Air Forces. They do not want Congress to proclaim to the world that America is weakening in her aviation program, that America is slipping, that America is cutting down the number of aircraft required for national security. I do not want to send that word to the capitals of the world and I do not propose to do so; and I do not think the Congress ought to do it. That is the reason I propose to offer this amendment later in the proceedings on this bill.

I should like to make this statement: Commercial aircraft are different from military aircraft. Commercial aviation companies cannot very well make combat planes. Combat airplane factories are required. I want you to hear what General Spaatz says with respect to the airplane industry. You will find it at page 603 of the hearings. He says a number of important things with respect to that matter, which I now quote:

General SPAATZ. I am gravely concerned that we are today rapidly losing one of our principal elements of national security. Our aircraft industry increased to a size where it was able to turn out 80,000 planes in a year in the last year of the last Great War. It was not able to arrive at that status until more than 5 years had elapsed after initial mobilization. We will not be given 5 years in which to prepare and build up to maximum output the next time. In 1948 our aircraft industry faces a prospect of building less than 1,500 planes. That means that the industry will practically disappear. In this unhappy event, the Nation will lose one of its prime resources for defensive and offensive strength. One of the essential elements of its war-making potential will have disappeared. I urge the Congress to realize the gravity of this situation and work out sound measures for maintaining the aircraft industry at the minimum level which, in my opinion, requires an annual production of about 3,000 planes.

The aviation industry cannot produce a few planes this year, fewer next year, and a great number the third year. There must be an even flow.

As the gentleman has so well pointed out the Air Forces already have hundreds of millions of dollars for the construction of aircraft that are coming off the assembly lines now and will continue to come off the assembly lines for 2 years. The planes that we are providing for in this bill will come off the assembly lines in about 2 years. We must project that production line forward.

I am advised that the military aviation industry is threatened by reason of the following conditions:

There is not enough business to keep the industry at a high tempo. The aviation plants are too large for the small amount of business which they have, but we cannot permit the junking and dismemberment of plant capacity because this capacity will be of the greatest importance if trouble comes. We have to be ready for it in our industrial mobilization program.

Our combat plane industry had a lot of foreign orders prior to and during the war. They no longer have that business. So it is up to us to be watchful, alert, and ready if we are to meet the difficulties which may befall us in the future.

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

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

Mr. THOMASON. Our colleague is making a very able argument in support of his position. The thing that is almost past understanding with me is that the very able gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] made a fine argument in behalf of the item for research and development, yet I do not know what we need with so much money for research and development if we are not going

to put some of it into practical use. The committee seems to have done a good job in practicing economy in connection with a good many items. However, I belong to that school which believes that the very last thing we ought to cut in an appropriation bill such as this is the matter of airplanes and atomic energy. Forty million dollars, the amount that will be in the gentleman's amendment when he offers it, is not a drop in the bucket compared to the total in this appropriation bill. In view of present world conditions and also the advance in scientific development, there are two things that under no condition ought to be cut below what the experts tell us, experts such as, General Spaatz, General Arnold, and General Vandenberg, and I challenge anybody who is opposed to the gentleman's amendment to find a single man in a high place in the Air Corps who will not say that the last thing that ought to be cut in this bill is the matter of airplane production.

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

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Texas for his timely comment. The argument is correct, it is unanswerable. It is in the heart of the American people to follow the philosophy which the gentleman has expressed and it is up to us in the Congress to follow it.

I should like to point out that we seem to have been conscious of the importance of aviation when we passed the Navy bill, because we did not reduce the procurement for the Navy. The Navy procurement program of 575 planes is greater in numbers than the procurement program in this bill for the Army. I have no jealousy as between the services, but if aviation was essential for national defense a week before last, why is it not a good thing now?

Mr. THOMASON. I am one of those who believes that under present world conditions we ought to have the best air force in the world. In view of this report and what the report says about the appropriation for air activities, I feel certain that we will soon be a second-rate power from an air force standpoint unless we take the necessary precautions. Drastic reduction in aircraft is a danger and a gamble we cannot afford to take under present world conditions.

Mr. MAHON. That is right, and it is up to us to furnish the leadership in this contest.

Mr. THOMASON. The very able chairman of this subcommittee who has contributed much, especially in the line of economy and economical government, could surely find some other places in this bill to dig out this \$40,000,000 and let this item be restored. There are plenty of us who are going along and will join the gentleman in his fight to restore the item for aircraft procurement.

Mr. MAHON. Let me say for the gentleman from Michigan that it was only

as a last resort and after the bill had been tentatively agreed to that this unwise reduction was made. One of the old-time hymns admonishes us to "yield not to temptation." At first the committee pushed aside the proposal to reduce the aircraft program but later yielded to the temptation to cut out the \$40,000,000. Yielding in this matter endangers our future security.

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

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

Mr. POAGE. Will it not have an adverse effect? If I understood the gentleman's argument correctly, it seems to me he makes a very logical case that if we do not appropriate this money and keep a constant stream of money going into the military aircraft program we are going to put the military aircraft business out of being. If we do that, then seek to bring it back, each time we bring it back we increase greatly the cost of each individual plane. The cost of these planes is going to increase if we do not build them at a more or less level rate.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman has made a very fine point. The committee cut the procurement program from 749 planes to 561 planes. The cut in the funds was only 10 percent, but that cut is about 20 percent in aircraft. Going into the cost of the first planes is your engineering costs, and many such expenditures, but as you increase the number of units you bring down the per unit cost, and we can get so much more for our money if we will spend this additional \$40,000,000 which my amendment provides. In other words, we will get more for the \$40,000,000, which I include in my amendment, than we will probably get for much larger funds included in the bill, by reason of the fact so well pointed out by the gentleman from Texas.

Now, the bill does not cut research and development directly, except to this extent, that it reduces the number of officer personnel, some of whom are engaged in research and development. The Army of the future has got to be a smart Army. You cannot get men on low salaries to afford the leadership in research and development. You must have men of experience and capacity, and you must have top flight officers for much of that work, and this bill reduces rather drastically the officer personnel. The civilian personnel in the Department, having to do with research and development, has been to some extent reduced, if I understand correctly the implications of the bill before us as it applies to departmental personnel here in Washington.

I should like, if I have time, to make reference to the cut in the warrant officers. There are at present only about 5,200. The number is cut approximately in half. Now, a warrant officer position is something to which the enlisted man may look forward. He may become a warrant officer, and it has many advantages. It is something to stimulate his ambition for a life in the service. But, the bill reduces the warrant officers almost in half. It is like coming along and saying, "Reduce the

number of master sergeants." I say we ought to do everything in our power to encourage the enlisted men, and those who favor more opportunity for incentive for the enlisted man, I think, should deplore the action of the committee in reducing the warrant officers to the extent they were reduced.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, can the gentleman tell us how many warrant officers we will have under this bill?

Mr. MAHON. I think we have about 5,200 now, and the committee cut out something like 2,600, which leaves about 2,600. It is a very disturbing bombshell in the laps of the warrant officers of the Nation and a deterrent to incentive among the enlisted men.

Mr. THOMASON. In that connection, can the gentleman also tell us how many majors there are now in the Army?

Mr. MAHON. There are some very interesting facts in the hearings in regard to the military officer personnel. Page 1591 of the hearings indicates that we probably have about 18,000 majors.

Mr. THOMASON. I agree with the gentleman that we ought to provide an incentive for the enlisted men, even though we have to cut the officer personnel in some branches.

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

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. MAHON. I would like to say by way of further compliment to the able chairman of the committee, that this hearing is the most understandable and valuable hearing that this subcommittee has ever held in its entire history, in my judgment. It contains more than 1,600 pages. It gives the answers to a lot of our questions, and if Members are interested enough, as I know they are, to know more about this aviation problem, and the amendment I expect to offer, I hope they will avail themselves of the opportunity to read those hearings.

Before I conclude I want to say that General Richards, the budget officer of the War Department, who has worked day and night in his job, and who has an amazing capacity for an understanding of the War Department program, and whose integrity and capacity have never been questioned, has given us every assistance. I am sure that all the members of the committee will be glad for me to express the high esteem in which we hold the able budget officer of the War Department, General Richards.

Mr. THOMASON. I am sure every Member of this House is interested in efficient and honest Government, but during the course of this very interesting debate the chairman of the committee alluded to the fact that he had tried to get two competent auditors to audit the War Department. Can the gentleman tell us whether or not the hearings have disclosed anything that is irregular or illegal or out of line in the activities of General Richards or anybody else in high authority in the War Department?

Mr. MAHON. May I say to the gentleman that the committee has no information which would give any implication at all of irregularity in the War Department. As a member of the Gov-

ernment Corporations subcommittee, I may say that we find that many of the Government corporations have different bookkeeping systems and the various departments of the Government have different bookkeeping systems. The procedure used varies with the department. As the gentleman knows, the accounts of the War Department are kept by the Chief of Finance and the responsibility for the accounting system rests with the Chief of Finance. No doubt he would welcome a complete audit by the General Accounting Office if Congress should desire that such be done.

For one, I feel that General Richards and General Eisenhower and Secretary of War Patterson have been very faithful in undertaking to perform the duties assigned to them.

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

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

Mr. LYLE. Here is a matter that bothers me in the consideration of appropriation bills for both the Army and the Navy. Do you arrive at what the Army needs in the interest of the country by what gentlemen like General Spaatz and General Eisenhower and men of that nature tell you, or do you take what they tell you and fit it to the demands of, let us say, the chairman of the committee, who says, "We can spare only so much next year in the defense of our country, and we are going to take what you say and cut it down to fit that." Tell me how you arrive at these things. There seems to be some misunderstanding about how you arrive at them.

Mr. MAHON. If the gentleman will permit, my idea of proper procedure—

Mr. LYLE. Not "proper procedure"; how did you get at it? I know the gentleman's ideas of what is proper and I think they are right, but how did you get at it?

Mr. MAHON. Of course, there is and has been a great urgency to cut Government spending, and some suggestion had been made that a billion dollars could be cut off the War Department appropriation bill.

Mr. LYLE. Were you trying to fit it to the pattern, were you trying to fit it to the budget set out by Congress, or were you trying to fit it to the needs of defense of this Government in the face of its responsibilities, on the advice of men who know?

Mr. MAHON. I, myself, was trying to fit it to our American responsibility and our commitments of 1947 and 1948 and the years that are to come.

Mr. LYLE. I congratulate the gentleman. I believe that the principle he advocates is sound and is worth fighting for.

I can remember so well in 1944 on the beachhead of Anzio when we did not have enough airplanes, and men had to sit up 24 hours a day with their guns turned up into the air, cocked and ready to shoot because we did not have American planes to fly over and give those boys a moment to get any rest. I can remember too well when enemy air superiority gave us all sorts of bloodshed and white crosses. This Nation owes it to the people who fought and died and to unborn

generations never to get caught like that again.

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman for his fine contribution. I have taken the time of the House to discuss this matter because I feel deeply what I am sure the gentleman from Texas, who served so valiantly during the war, feels even more deeply, that we cannot take the risk entailed in diminishing the strength of our Air Forces in the light of present world conditions.

Under leave granted, I wish to insert the following letter from the Secretary of War, which was addressed to the ranking minority member of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] in response to our request for information as to the effect of the committee action in reducing funds requested for the Air Forces:

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF WAR,
June 2, 1947.

Hon. CLARENCE CANNON,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CANNON: This is in response to your inquiry as to the effect upon the program of the Army Air Forces of a possible reduction in the estimates of funds for fiscal year 1948, for the procurement of new complete aircraft.

The budget estimate for the Army Air Forces for fiscal year 1948, as presented to the Congress, contains an item of \$440,000,000 which includes \$400,000,000 for the procurement of complete aircraft and \$40,000,000 for maintenance spare parts. This estimate, prepared in September 1946, contemplated the procurement of a total of 932 complete aircraft with related spare engines and spare parts based upon prices as of September 1, 1946. Since September 1, 1946, higher labor and material costs and essential equipment improvements have increased the total costs of aircraft to such an extent that, at current prices, the \$400,000,000 contained in the estimate for complete aircraft would now enable the procurement of approximately 749 complete aircraft, a reduction of 183, or 20 percent from that originally contemplated.

A reduction of \$40,000,000 in the budget estimate for this item would cause a further reduction in the number of aircraft which could be procured to approximately 561 aircraft or a total reduction of 371 aircraft, or 40 percent from that originally contemplated. This additional reduction of approximately 188 aircraft would eliminate the procurement of approximately 63 bomber and fighter aircraft and all of the scheduled 125 liaison aircraft. The application of the reduction would be made to those aircraft of lowest priority; the nonavailability of which would be least detrimental to the Air Forces.

Having in mind the need for utmost economy consistent with the minimum requirements of the Army Air Forces for our national defense, the estimate as submitted to the Congress did not provide for any training aircraft or other models of aircraft, the procurement of which could be deferred through the use of less modern and older aircraft. The estimate, except for 125 liaison aircraft of new design at a cost of approximately \$5,500,000, was almost wholly for the procurement of the most modern bombers, and jet fighters in quantities barely sufficient to sustain a relatively small efficient modern air force. Any dollar reduction would necessarily have to be taken practically entirely in the procurement of the latest models of bomber and fighter aircraft. This would be extremely detrimental to an already impoverished air force, one that is already short of the essential modern equipment required to maintain an air force of

the quality and efficiency which is critically essential in the event of an emergency.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT P. PATTERSON,
Secretary of War.

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

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. TIBBOTT] be permitted to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Chairman, at the outset I want to pay tribute to the chairman of our subcommittee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL], who for the past 4 months has worked hard, diligently, and accurately in holding hearings on this appropriation bill. At all times he was fair with and considerate of the witnesses appearing before us. I am greatly indebted to him personally for his many courtesies.

While the committee did not agree on everything, yet it is my opinion that the bill, as a whole, is for the best interest of the country today. I regret that illness prevented our very able colleague the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL] from attending all our meetings.

The fiscal stability is a searching problem facing the American people now.

The huge Federal debt is of great concern to me. I presume it is of great concern to everyone here. As we know when a government cannot make both ends meet, it pays its bills by manufacturing the money needed. There are those who insist that it is all for good economy to place a back-breaking national mortgage on the children of the Nation yet unborn. Those of us who oppose that kind of reasoning are referred to as alarmists, even though we recite the facts and come in with the proof that our staggering national debt and continued large drains on the Federal Treasury mean bankruptcy. Very few individuals want to think that this great Nation of ours is headed for bankruptcy.

We, the representatives of the people, are charged with estimating as accurately as possible the revenue requirements. We are responsible for passing the controlling laws of expenditures. Our estimates of fiscal requirements for a fiscal year are based upon months and months of hearings and study. It is obvious that our estimates cannot be exact. There are too many factors entering into the plans and justifications of the Government departments to assume that our estimates could be exact.

What we think our fiscal requirements should be is one thing. What our judgment is on these requirements is another thing. For my part, and this is particularly true when considering the bill before us, I will follow the latter course.

I have reached this conclusion after sitting for weeks during our subcommittee hearings and helping to write the bill now under discussion. My decision has been reached as a result of careful consideration and deliberation. I pro-

pose to go into the estimates as to what is before us in a so-called general manner. I realize it would be irksome, if I were to analyze each item.

At this point I want to make it clear that I have never supported a measure which would weaken our national defense. I will not now become a party directly or indirectly whereby I could be charged with reducing the effects of our national defense. My position is that of helping the interests of the American people. I believe those interests are a demand for a moderate army here and abroad with extinction of waste, inefficiency, and duplication. These factors ought to receive the support of this Congress.

By reading the bill you will observe that nothing has been taken from the Medical Department, from the National Guard, and from the Reserve Corps. I also believe that these divisions deserve the strong support of Congress. Also, nothing has been deducted from research and development.

A reading of the hearings will convince anyone that a little less hedging is in order by the quartermaster service of the Army when testifying before the subcommittee on war appropriations.

The testimony before our committee shows that there has been great waste of food in the Army. This was admitted. Food which was wasted was deposited in the garbage can. The waste occurred here and abroad even while there was a great shortage of food.

On pages 295 and 296 of the hearings there is evidence that the Army is making every possible effort to remedy this situation. Food service schools, under the supervision of trained officers, have been set up, the purpose of which is to eliminate waste. We understand that the large turn-over in personnel has taken from the Army many good cooks and service officers, reasons which are somewhat accountable for the waste of food stuffs. Assurances were given us that trained men on food service would devote 100 percent of their time to work and study of this kind. This kind of training should promote food conservation.

On pages 321 to 325, inclusive, of the hearings there will be found testimony on the purchase of supplies and equipment for handling fuels and lubricants.

It is interesting to observe that 5-gallon drums and blitz cans are the same and not a new type can. There are 2 types of 5-gallon cans, some of which are used as water cans and others for lubricants. It seems that the Army had a surplus of these cans which were declared. After the surplus declaration was made to meet civilian demands the cans were advertised for as low as \$1.78 a piece. The original cost of these cans was over \$4 a piece.

We understand that the War Assets has 179,000 of these cans which the Army is trying to retrieve.

The testimony reveals that the surplus was declared on determination by a committee formed in the War Department, composed of War Department representatives and advisers who were members of

the Civilian Production Administration and the Office of Production Administration.

The officers of the War Department were ordered to declare the cans in question as surplus under instructions to dispose of a quantity of these items to meet civilian demands. A total of 1,577,856 cans were declared surplus, of which number 168,516 were recovered. This kind of practice clearly shows that those responsible for it have no regard for economy.

The War Department came before us and requested appropriations to purchase 703,000 cans at \$4.43 a piece. We could not be sold on their appeal of necessity in this case.

We reduced their over-all estimate for purchase of supplies and equipment for handling fuels and lubricants from seven million to five million.

On pages 326-328, inclusive, of the hearings there will be found testimony dealing with the purchase of fuels and lubricants. Estimated amount for fiscal year 1948 was \$35,124,000. The committee reduced this amount by five million.

It seems that several methods are used by the Army in the purchase of gasoline. In the interior zone—for posts, camps, and stations—the Treasury Department procures on sealed bids and open-end contracts. Then each post is given so much money, after which it is paid to a local contractor who hauls the gas. The methods of overseas purchases are to buy the gasoline and oil here and ship overseas; and from the Navy. There is a joint supply system with the Navy in overseas theaters.

Of this item requested by the War Department about 15,000,000 gallons of oil are used annually. The tax on these purchases amounts to about \$900,000, which flows from the War Department to the Treasury Department.

CLOTHING AND EQUIPAGE

On pages 292-294 of the hearings inclusive the testimony refers to the strength of Army and industrial mobilization. The 1948 estimated strength of the Army is 1,070,000. That means effectives and ineffectives. Ineffectives are those in hospitals, on terminal leave and so forth.

As to clothing and equipage one of the witnesses, General Middleswart, testified that the Quartermaster Service is going to get together with industry and determine where they will place the contracts. This scheme was used prior to the war when the Army actually placed tentative agreements with specific factories to purchase shoes, or clothing, or whatever else was contemplated in this line. It is their purpose to buy their requirements for the first year for 5,000,000 shoes from these factories and work in a specific manner, and beyond that they will go back into raw materials, and say this shoe program requires so many nails, thread and so forth. In other words, it is their position to work out a complete industrial plan. Better materials and more economy should be in the offing under this plan.

The committee in dealing with the estimated cost of \$27,056,561 by the Army

for clothing and equipage took into consideration a general increase in price of textiles, and clothing items. We reduced their estimates by \$3,383,000.

Pages 361-364, inclusive, of the hearings deal almost exclusively with the proposed removal of research and development of the Quartermaster Service from Philadelphia to Boston. If the plans for a laboratory some 400 miles from the present site at Philadelphia are entertained then the taxpayers have an additional burden to think about. The testimony on the pages to which I have made reference does not in any particular show that it is in the interests of our National Defense and our economy to have the proposed laboratory in the East other than Philadelphia. Materials, equipment, colleges of great learning, and personnel are present in or easily accessible to Philadelphia, all of which are the means whereby the Quartermaster Service can and will make progress in their research and development by remaining where presently situated. The testimony before our committee on this subject clearly shows that a little more candor is the procedure for General Middleswart to follow if and when this subject is again approached and developed.

Taking into consideration all the facts and circumstances surrounding the hearings on the Quartermaster Service phase of appropriations on Military Establishment, it is my judgment that the committee has been careful and fair; careful of protecting our national defense in accord with the evidence presented to us by the mighty fine and conscientious high Army officials that testified before us. I have nothing but the highest praise for their alertness and their willingness to cooperate with us. And fair, with the American people who look to us to represent their interests according to the American way of doing things.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER].

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, at the outset may I say to the gentleman from Texas who just questioned Mr. MAHON about the committee activities that there was never any question in the mind of any member of the committee as to the attitude, the honest effort and endeavor, and the undying loyalty of every member of that committee as they pursued this particular problem. The Nation's future was our paramount thought; economy was secondary.

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

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield.

Mr. PLUMLEY. I am getting somewhat sick and tired of the suggestion that somebody told your committee that there must be a certain percentage of cut made. Did you ever hear that?

Mr. SCRIVNER. No; I never heard that from the chairman of the subcommittee or the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations or any other Member of the House. Every man on this committee served diligently and according to the dictates of his conscience. As far as General Richards is concerned,

I do not know him as well perhaps as the gentleman from Texas, but I will make this observation that any time you got information out of him you had to drag it out of him. I can show you in the hearings where the committee made requests for various pieces of information, and as far as I can find out, they still are not there. One particular report related to the President's stop-spend order and its effect on the Army. It is still not forthcoming. Perhaps by the time I get to know the general as well as the other gentlemen of the committee I will have as high a regard for him as they have. These hearings have been difficult and tedious. I wish some of those same gentlemen who have talked about the need for funds for the Army had been able to prevail upon the President that their position was right. If you will look over the report, you will find one thing that was cut by the President's freeze order was aviation and research. It seems more than passing strange that when a committee of Congress honestly and conscientiously scrutinizes the entire situation and tries to make some minor saving that a howl goes up to high heaven when we cut a few million dollars, whereas when the President does it there is nothing said, even when his cut is more drastic than the one proposed by the House. Read the hearings and learn what some of these men said when they appeared before us; how the President's cuts affected the plane program.

Where the gentleman from Texas gets this cut from 932 down to 700 planes is something that I cannot find out. I have read every page of the hearings, and I cannot find it.

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

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield.

Mr. MAHON. I got that from a letter from the Secretary of War which I hope to place in my remarks.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I certainly have not seen any such letter from the Secretary of War.

Mr. MAHON. I also get that from the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL], chairman of our subcommittee, who, in the full committee, as you may remember, said that the funds requested, even if they were all granted, would probably provide for no more than about 600 airplanes. The gentleman has asked for information. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield briefly to the gentleman. I was astonished to hear you make that statement because I have never seen the letter from the Secretary of War. If the gentleman has one, I think the other members should also have received a copy. If you look at the hearings on page 654 you will read the testimony of the War Department's own representatives.

I am not an aviation expert. I do not know about the cost of planes. But General Powers, who is supposed to be the authority so far as the Air Corps is concerned, said that \$281,000,000 is for the procurement of 932 new airplanes. The total sum of \$440,000,000 is not for the

procurement of new plants, and everybody knows that. Not only that, but the newest type which the gentleman mentioned—your jet-propelled planes and supersonics which come as a result of research and development—is not in new procurement at all. They come from research money. And yet it was the taking of \$75,000,000 out of research and development, General LeMay said, was the straw that broke the camel's back.

I am concerned about these things too. I have been for more years than I can remember. As a matter of fact, when I came to the House almost half of my adult life had been in or closely related to the military. It was almost a religion with me. It still is. I have advocated the two-ocean Navy, an Air Force second to none, and an Army of a million men, for almost a quarter of a century. It is not just a line with me. I believed it. I have lived it. I have breathed it. My greatest regret was that when this war came, a service-connected disability prevented me from service.

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

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. I do not impugn the gentleman's sincerity or honesty or motive or desire to give this Nation what the Nation is entitled to in the way of an Air Force, but as a matter of fact, a reduction of \$44,000,000 will give us less than 600 new airplanes. I am sure the gentleman, when he carefully investigates the matter, will find that that is the case.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I appreciate those words of approbation. However, there has been some suggestion that perhaps some other considerations entered into this; but here is what I am trying to get at. You talk about \$44,000,000. After all these figures the chairman has given you, go back to what General Powers said in the hearings. He said this: "The \$281,000,000 calls for 932 planes."

He did say that maybe this price per pound might be low—and that is the way they figure them—in other words, you build bigger planes and you get a fewer number; you build the smaller planes and you get more in number; but these are his figures. I have not seen anything yet to change the whole picture one single bit. They are his figures. They presented them—and ample time elapsed for them to submit any necessary changes.

Remember, as you sit here discussing this you are trying, as these men tried and we tried, to project yourselves into the future, not only 3 months or 6 months but a year or 2 years or 5 years, and if anyone can tell me what the costs are going to be then, he has certainly got a big job waiting for him, because there are a lot of questions I and many others would like to ask him.

Coming back to the new planes, look on page 13 and see what General Rawlings said about the \$30,000,000 reduction in new aircraft production, because of the President's cut. Where the President gets the authority for such action I do not know. I am trying to get an answer to that question, where he can superimpose upon the Army and the Congress his opinions. Where he got his in-

formation as to the airplane program, which disagrees with the gentleman from Texas I just do not know. But I cannot help thinking how terrible some people think it is for us to do anything like this but when the President does it, it is perfectly all right. If he can do it I do not know why it is so terrifically outlandish for us to do it ourselves.

There was comment made about there being nothing in the report about aviation and the number of planes. I was not consulted, but right now in the bottom of my heart I think one of the things that causes much trouble is that we Americans like to brag too much. We like to tell what we are going to do and what we have. We would be far better off if we said less about it and then started doing it and let accomplished facts speak for themselves. The question was asked a while ago, What do we know about what is going on behind the iron curtain and how many of their agents are over here? Well, they do not have to have very many. All they need is one or two who can sit down and read the newspapers. They can find out with the greatest ease just exactly what we are doing every day in the year, from the latest bomber down to the Banshee, which is supposed to be the last thing in plane production. When it was presented to us it was absolutely hush hush. You could not talk about this at all. Yet before the hearings are over, before the bill has been passed, you have it on the pages of the newspapers and anybody who can read can find out with the greatest of ease just exactly what we have.

I want to join, too, in the tribute to the ability, the energy, the honesty, the integrity, and the loyalty of the chairman of this committee. That goes for the rest of them. In these few short weeks in which I have worked with this committee, I have come to know and respect and admire every member of the committee.

That includes not only Republicans like HARVEY TIBBOTT, CASE, and ENGEL, but Democrats like Judge KERR, MAHON, and NORRELL, who has not been able to be with us as much as we would like to have had him.

The committee instead of being scolded, as it has been, should be commended on having done an exceptionally fine job under exceedingly difficult circumstances. This experience on this committee convinces me that one thing in the reorganization bill has great merit, and I hope we have an opportunity to exercise it before the hearings are over next year; that is, to give each of these committees a staff and corps of capable investigators who can go out and find out things that we of the committee do not have the opportunity to. If you sit there in these committees as we have you see generals in charge of each one of these operations of the War Department flanked and buttressed on each side with innumerable aides and experts ranking from generals down. Whenever any one of them needed any information at all he turned to one side or the other or to the rear and asked Jones, Smith, or Brown what the answer was. We had no one to whom we could turn. The committee needs that kind of

help, and certain it is that if all of these hundreds can be provided for the other agencies of the Government, then these committees can be given a few men and it will be money very well spent.

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

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield.

Mr. SPRINGER. I desire to compliment the gentleman for the fine presentation he is making. I recall in particular the statement he just made regarding the publicity which was given in respect to what we are doing, the type of planes we are perfecting, the nature, the amount, and character. Do we get any such information from Russia so that we know just what she is doing at this particular time?

Mr. SCRIVNER. As far as I know we get no information of any kind from Russia that is reliable, or from many other parts of the world. As a matter of fact I will go even further, we are making it even easier than I stated before because the Army periodically gets out these summary sheets so that they do not even have to read the daily papers to know what we are doing in the field of aviation, they can just pick up this outline.

I spoke of the men who appear before our committee. I have known some of these men for many many years, fine gentlemen every one of them. Sometimes I feel just a little sorry for them; I think they would like to have been more helpful, yet they were faced with a limitation. The President—and you will find the letter on page 631—told them in substance that they could do nothing else but support the figures in the President's budget, and he said "only." This is not Webster's definition of "only" but the only definition I know of the word "only" is "nothing else but." That does not say "higher than" or "lower than" but "only those figures." And yet these men with all the help they have are not infallible. No human being is infallible. I want to call your attention to one situation in connection with the budget and the justifications. The work of preparing this budget began last May, June, July, and August, just as they are now working on the 1949 budget; but even so, when this budget came to us the justification for pay and allowances of officers bore the date of January 20, 1947—whether you were in the service in World War I, in peacetime, or in World War II—I do not think you have to have a great deal of explanation to understand just how absurd some of the figures were that were given to this committee. For instance, here is what we find in Pay and Allowances for other than air forces: 4,023 second lieutenants, 6,719 first lieutenants, 21,177 captains, 20,706 majors, 12,637 lieutenant-colonels and 6,000 colonels.

Ask any soldier, ask any man who was in the Navy how ridiculous that distribution is. Of course, they came in and at a later date made a change and said, as my recollection is, that they were going to have 11,000 second lieutenants, 16,000 first lieutenants, and 21,000 captains, that they were going to cut down the majors, the lieutenant-colonels, and the colonels.

Mr. SPRINGER. Of course, that distribution is out of step with their needs.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Yes. Finally they admitted that was out of step and that it was top heavy and undertook to submit the new table.

There were other things. I can understand the difficulty with which they labored and I hope, too, that the House, this committee and those officers can understand some of the difficulties under which we have to labor at times.

Mr. SPRINGER. Another question, and referring back to the investigations that have been made. We have had a large number of people traveling through Europe, especially in Russia. May I ask the gentleman to state if it is not a fact that of all the inquiry that has been made we have been unable to secure any definite or positive information with regard to what Russia is doing with reference to preparation for war?

Mr. SCRIVNER. As far as any inquiry is concerned we know practically nothing. There was one report that during the May Day celebration in Moscow on the 1st of May two or three planes which were possibly B-29's did fly over the parade. They may have been some of the B-29's which were interned by Russia when the crews had to land in Russia.

Inasmuch as General Richards has been mentioned I want to refer to one comment he made, and I think it was properly made. He said that we can always do without our cake. When you analyze this whole bill about all we have done is to take a little bit of cake away from our military forces. Whether or not more appropriation would do more good. I do not know. You have been shown that the President limited the amount that the Army could spend in 1947. He has also limited the amount which can be spent by the Army in 1948. That amount by Presidential order is \$6,700,000,000. He says that is all the Army can spend in fiscal 1948. If that is so, it stands to reason we could probably appropriate many, many billions, and still it might not have a very salutary effect as far as the Army's procurement program is concerned, in view of the limit fixed by the President.

We tried as best we could in our limited way to find the facts. Many things, as I say, puzzled us. Remember this budget was in preparation in May, June, July and August of last year. We found, for instance, that as late as February 1946, only 5 or 6 months earlier, the War Department had declared as surplus 1,577,856 gallon blitz cans. You will also see in hearings that the top price received for blitz cans at surplus sale was 55 cents per can.

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

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 10 additional minutes.

Mr. SCRIVNER. The Army is now asking to buy 703,000 of these cans at \$4.40. You will find that on page 324 of the hearings. It gives the whole story. So, as I say, they are prone to err just the same as the rest of us.

One thing that has been mentioned but not thoroughly discussed is the matter of the National Guard. If you read the hearings you will find a statement by

Secretary Patterson in which he evaluates the National Guard. You will also find a statement there by General Eisenhower in which he praises the service of the National Guard most highly. But some place between the Secretary and General Eisenhower there seems to come a little barricade so that those good wishes and good feelings do not trickle down. A reading of the hearings will disclose statements made by the representatives of the National Guard from various States relating to the treatment that is now being accorded them as relates to equipment, and particularly as to uniforms. It is a tragic story. There has been complaint that the National Guard has not proceeded as rapidly as possible. Of course not, but as far back as last September the President took away from them \$65,000,000 of the \$110,000,000 that Congress said they should have to carry on the program.

The Reserve, too, is having some difficulty. There, too, the President took away \$30,000,000 from the Reserve activities, and you will see in this bill that this committee—and I feel quite sure the House will go along with us on that whole thing—has given the National Guard and the Reserve the full amount of the suggested appropriations to give these civilian groups a chance to do their stuff.

For years we have talked about the necessity for an Army of a million men. Incidentally, if we had had such an Army in 1917 and in 1939, we might not have been in either one of these two great wars. But, we have talked about it. It probably cannot be a Regular Army of that size, because this is not the type of a Nation that anticipates a Regular Army that large, but we do anticipate that the great bulk, 50 to 60 percent, will be from civilian components with your National Guard as a part of your D-day program, ready to go whenever the emergency arises. They should be and must be prepared, and while we questioned many of the witnesses quite thoroughly as to the prospects for any immediate emergency arising, there seems to be no feeling of fear on the part of any of them that there is anything of that sort in the immediate offing. But, it might develop, and I think the public might as well realize that as the years go by, 2, 3, or 4 years hence, particularly as it relates to air, as more and more of these planes are worn out, the more we must appropriate to keep the air force up and that, I am sure, Congress will do.

I could go on and discuss many of these things, but you will find them all in the hearings. Take, for instance, the type of uniform. Even though \$27,000,000 was in the hands of the quartermaster for uniforms for the National Guard, they were issued second-rate uniforms that the men were ashamed to put on and wear home. Any man that has ever been in any kind of military service knows that the first step toward making a good soldier or sailor is pride in himself and pride in his uniform, and when that pride is not there neither is the morale. When that man has to walk home through a back alley because he is ashamed to meet his friends, you are not going to have any morale, and all of your vast recruiting campaigns, spending millions upon

millions of dollars, will never develop morale so that you will ever have a reserve force of civilian components that will be worthy of the word.

In these hearings you will find the report of the Judge Advocate General as to the effect of the Tort Claims Act as carried in the reorganization bill. I am not going into it in detail, but by reading that report—and I am sure their statements will be later supplemented—you will find that one of the most advisable things this Congress can do before it adjourns is to repeal that Tort Claims Act and restore the practice we have had in times past of equitably satisfying claims against the Government through your claims committee, and not through the tort actions in the courts.

Mr. Chairman, I have spoken longer than I had intended, and I close with this comment. I have made it in committee and I have made it out of committee. If I felt down in my heart that this reduction of approximately 10 percent in the aviation procurement program—in view of the fact that we have not decreased research and development, which is the building of brand-new and experimental models, and in view of the fact that there is \$280,000,000 contract authorization over and above that of last year even with this decrease down to the budget figure of last year—if I thought for just 1 minute that that decrease would endanger the welfare and the future of this Nation in even the slightest degree, I would not hesitate to vote to restore the figure. If the gentleman from Texas has any other figures, even though the figures have not been presented to the committee—and I think, in all fairness, they should have been—I would like to study them. I have an open mind. I am open to conviction, if the gentleman from Texas can convince me this Nation's future is endangered by this reduction.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, may I say in starting that I do not impugn the motives of any member of the committee or, for that matter, Members of Congress at this hour. I have known the members of this subcommittee for many years, and I know them to be good, hard-working, conscientious men, eager and desirous of doing their duty by the country. Anybody who has obtained a copy of these hearings and gone through them in even a cursory manner is bound to realize that this committee spent many painstaking, long, weary hours in attempting to get to the bottom of the needed appropriations. On the contrary, rather than attempt to impugn the motives of anyone who has had anything to do with this bill, I have praise for the committee's work on it in presenting us a bill. But that does not mean, Mr. Chairman, that I am hog-tied to every figure and every appropriation in the bill. On the contrary, the Appropriations Committee has a monopoly of the appropriations in the House. You cannot get an appropriation of any sort unless you go to that committee. In all deference to the members of the committee, and recognizing their ability,

their courage, and their leadership, I still at times differ with them on appropriations and sometimes fundamental figures in a bill. I think today that is the situation with reference to the figures on the Air Force. I am going to use the time allotted to me today in analyzing some of the figures in this bill in special reference to the Air Force.

Mr. Chairman, the comparative statement in the committee report is composed of huge items. It is difficult, to say the least, to get behind these items in an effort to find out just where the reductions in expenditures will cut heavily upon the War Department. It is apparent, however, that the expenditures for last year were \$1,199,500,000 as against appropriations in the current bill of \$733,332,508. It is apparent that the current appropriations as contained in this bill are \$116,000,000 below Budget estimates and far below last year's expenditures. The report does not disclose just how this figure was arrived at; and I have given considerable thought and study in an effort to work out the figures and to apply the cuts where this committee evidently intended that they should be applied.

Mr. Chairman, I want to comment on certain items in this appropriations bill and, for the present at least, I want to confine my remarks to the Army Air Forces. To my mind, the needs of the Air Forces are particularly urgent. It is upon this branch of the service that we must rely for the repulse of a sudden and surprise attack from the enemy, in the event of another war. It is this branch of the service upon which the burden of the first blow will fall; and it is upon this branch of the service we must continue to depend until the country has had the opportunity to mobilize for war. It is therefore particularly important that needed moneys for these purposes shall be given without crippling economies and arbitrary reductions.

The appropriations for civilian personnel of the Air Forces have been drastically cut. This reduction will eliminate 17,573 employees who are now engaged largely in supplying the logistical support essential to air operations. This reduction will have a particularly damaging effect in the continuity of Headquarters, Army Air Forces, where strategical planning, mobilization plans and operational controls are carried on. Failure to replace these cuts will have a marked effect in undermining an already weakened Air Force.

Another item which concerns me very much is the reduction of \$10,000,000 for fuel and oil for airplanes. This reduction will result, of course, in less training and less flying in the combat flights and problems. Required flying hours are necessary to keep our Air Forces in readiness as an effective combat force to meet an instant emergency.

The cut in the item for transportation is also very heavy. It will make it necessary to completely eliminate all commercial air lift now being furnished under contract by commercial carriers. The Air Transport Command will not have sufficient strength to supply the total overseas air lift required to maintain occupation garrisons in 1948. It is

estimated that 50 percent of the present air lift to the Pacific theater will have to be eliminated, thereby further isolating our already isolated forces from their homeland.

The reduction of \$44,000,000 in funds necessary for the purchase of new airplanes is something to consider in the long-range plans of the Air Forces. Initially, the Air Forces estimated that it needed 932 airplanes as the irreducible minimum for the proper maintenance and operation of its 55 manned combat groups. The cost estimates were drawn up last September 1946 and were based upon figures available and considered accurate at that time. By the time the requirements had run the gamut of the Department and the Budget and were submitted to the Appropriations Committee, the costs of building airplanes had risen to the point where funds requested would purchase only 838 airplanes instead of the minimum estimated as needed—932 airplanes. By the time the committee had reported, prices had increased further and the committee had taken \$44,000,000 from Budget requirements. This means, therefore, fewer airplanes for the Army Air Forces. It means, in fact, less than 600 new planes and spare parts as against the original estimate of 932 with the \$396,000,000 recommended by the Appropriations Committee. This reduction will be further aggravated by the serious situation existing in the airplane industry caused by lack of production orders. It will be further aggravated by the confusion and the lack of war-time efficiency in industry caused by the release of skilled workers and the breaking up of most efficient work teams. The outlook is, therefore, certainly not pleasing from the standpoint of national defense.

One of the other reductions which is most difficult to explain is the cut of \$9,500,000 from which it was intended that electronic equipment be purchased. This cut will undoubtedly reduce the scope and delay the completion of proposed radar protective screen for the continental United States. This screen is considered vital for giving adequate warning of the approach of hostile aircraft or guided missiles, and it is deemed highly essential to the security of the entire country. You will recall that the radar screen had not been completed for Hawaii at the time of Pearl Harbor; and it has been warmly debated whether or not there would have been a Pearl Harbor had this work been completed at the time of the dastardly Jap attack. The amount of this appropriation is not large; but its importance to our people could easily be measured in the difference between success and failure, victory and defeat.

Mr. Chairman, the Army Air Forces have a mission which is closely akin to the destiny of this country. I do not think that the President's Advisory Commission on Universal Military Training added one whit when it referred to the mission of the Air Forces as follows:

A striking air force: Spearhead of our professional armed services, this force would be charged with the crucial mission of defense by attack. Its job would be to stop the

enemy's first onslaught and to hit back at him with crushing force. We believe that an aggressor's reluctance to start a war, and his handicap in prosecuting it successfully if he did start, would be in direct proportion to the power and readiness of our mobile striking force. Its personnel would have to be highly trained and its equipment would have to be the most advanced in the world.

The statement of the President's Advisory Commission as given above is entirely in harmony with the estimate which the Air Forces themselves place upon the immediate and primary task of this great organization. According to their own statements, the two immediate tasks are:

(a) To provide a long-range striking force in instant readiness and with the power and capacity to destroy the storehouse of enemy weapons and thereafter to reduce the enemy's industrial capacity and war-making potential.

(b) To provide in peacetime the minimum establishment for prompt and rapid expansion from peace to war.

Mr. Chairman, I agree fully with the estimate which has been made of the mission of our Army Air Forces. I frankly feel the reductions in appropriations made by this bill will impair and hurt the Air Forces to the extent that they cannot fulfill these two primary missions. I frankly feel that these heavy reductions in our Air Forces will reduce them to a state of impotence and inability to measure up to their full usefulness in the face of a sudden and surprise enemy attack. Those who urge these reductions in appropriations of our Air Forces assume a tremendous burden of responsibility should their insistence on these cuts bring about a reduction in the state of efficiency and power of the Air Forces. I certainly hope that this House will pause before it is too late and, in the light of the vital responsibility which falls upon the Army Air Forces in defending this country from sudden attack, restore the funds taken from the bill by these drastic reductions.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I think the reduction of \$44,000,000 which reduces the number of new planes to be purchased and the number of parts needed to condition and maintain the airplanes presently in use, is vital. I feel that the time that has been given to this in debate on the floor is justified by the seriousness of the reduction of this appropriation. I hope the House will consider this long and well, and when it comes to a vote, with committee acceptance, we will be able to place back in the bill that item of some \$40,000,000, the \$9,500,000 for the radar defense of the Nation and the other items mentioned by me.

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

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

RFC WITH AID OF LOCAL BANKS PERFORMING WONDERFUL SERVICE FOR SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, it is important that Members of Congress realize the importance of the activities of the RFC in view of the fact that the Corporation's powers expire June 30 if not extended.

SMALL BUSINESS PRIORITY UNDER SECTION 18 (e) OF THE SURPLUS PROPERTY ACT AS FUNCTIONED BY RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

Pursuant to Executive order, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, on January 28, 1946, was made responsible for functioning the priority given small business under section 18 (e) of the Surplus Property Act. From that date until April 30, 1947, the Corporation received 82,131 inquiries for assistance in the acquisition of surplus property which resulted in its purchasing for small business \$48,062,838 worth of such property. The Corporation discontinued this function by reason of a ruling by the Comptroller General.

TECHNICAL AND BUSINESS ADVISORY SERVICES AVAILABLE TO SMALL BUSINESS

The Reconstruction Finance Corporation's assistance to small business has not been limited to the making of loans or the securing of surplus property. For the 11-month period ended April 30, 1947, the Corporation received approximately 260,000 requests for assistance from business enterprises, of which 142,000, more than half, did not request loans nor surplus property assistance. Applicants requested the advice and counsel of the Corporation's trained staff in connection with a wide range of problems, including management, engineering, accounting, and financial. Small businesses seldom have among their personnel trained experts covering such a wide variety of problems but which nonetheless are often vital to successful operations. By using its trained personnel, the Corporation is often able to render valuable services to small businesses in the solution of their problems in locating an applicant's difficulties, suggesting various possible solutions, and indicating private sources from which expert technical and consulting assistance can be secured as may be needed for detailed application.

It frequently occurs that, after preliminary discussion, an applicant for a loan becomes convinced that the solution of his problem does not lie in securing a loan in the amount, kind, term, or for the purposes sought.

The following brief histories of actual cases are illustrative of what can be accomplished through these services:

A bank had been approached by a borrower seeking a loan, the proceeds of which were to be used in the construction of an alfalfa dehydration plant. The president of the bank called upon the local RFC office requesting advice and information concerning such a plant. It so happened that the local RFC office had considerable experience in this particular field, and those of the staff familiar with such an operation discussed in detail with the banker the many difficult problems surrounding such a plant, as well as production costs, profit possibilities, and prospects for present and future markets. A few days later, the banker called the local RFC office, expressed his appreciation, and reported that the promoters as well as the bank had abandoned the idea of seeking a loan for such a purpose.

A veteran, while discussing the possibilities of an RFC loan with which to purchase a truck, happened to indicate the trouble he was having in producing

magnetic tack hammers at a cost which would permit their sale at a profit. Certain simple changes in design were suggested by an RFC engineer, who also indicated a probable better source of supply of castings necessary for the hammers. The suggestions were carried out with the result that the business was re-established on a profitable basis.

The principal officer of a research laboratory, a veteran of World War II, called at his local RFC office requesting assistance in connection with certain difficulties he was having in manufacturing a small gas engine for use in flying model airplanes. He reported that his company had suffered a substantial loss resulting primarily from this difficulty. An RFC engineer considered his problem and suggested certain changes in the manufacturing process for one of the parts in the engine and recommended that he secure the services of an experienced designing engineer until the process could be corrected. The RFC engineer's recommendation was followed with the result that the difficulty was eliminated and the company operated profitably.

CASE HISTORIES ILLUSTRATIVE OF RFC LOAN ACTIVITIES IN CONNECTION WITH SMALL BUSINESS—RFC MAKES LOAN AFTER BANK DECLINES

The following is a typical illustration of how a direct loan by the RFC assisted in the creation of a successful small business after credit had been refused by banks: A native of an eastern State desired to establish a wool-combing plant in a Southwestern State. After a thorough survey a location was selected in a small town located in a wool-producing area in that State. The business was established in 1941 through the investment by the owner of a small amount of money in a minimum of necessary equipment. After a few months' operations, it became apparent that two additional pieces of machinery were necessary in order to meet the growing demand for washing, scouring, and combing wool. The owner applied to his bank of account for a loan of \$7,500 for that purpose. The bank declined to make the loan. The local office of RFC was then contacted, an application filed, and loan granted. Subsequently additional loans were granted for further plant expansion. Today the plant is enjoying successful operations with a total value of facilities estimated at \$400,000 and affords substantial employment to the community in which it is located.

BANK MAKES LOAN AFTER RFC INVESTIGATION INDICATES SOUNDNESS

In mid 1946 an applicant in a Southern State contacted the local RFC office and discussed plans for the organization and installation of a canning plant. Applicant, at RFC examiner's suggestion, discussed the possibilities of securing a loan from his local bank, which declined to make the loan. Further discussions between the applicant, RFC examiner and the local bank were conducted with the result that local financing was arranged without RFC assistance. The plant was opened and operated successfully and is serving an economic need in the small community in which it is located.

BANK PARTICIPATES WITH RFC AFTER FIRST DECLINING LOAN

A manufacturing plant located in a small community in a Southern State, with approximately 250 employees, was unable to meet its weekly pay roll of about \$17,000. The day before the pay roll was to have been met the situation was called to the attention of the RFC office serving that territory. Within an hour after notice had reached the office an RFC examiner was on his way to the plant. Banks were contacted, refusing to make the loan for pay-roll purposes but after negotiations running well into the evening the banks made a loan in participation with the RFC and the pay roll was met the next day and the business saved. The loan was subsequently repaid in full.

GI GIRLS START HOSPITAL WITH PFC ASSISTANCE

Early in 1946 two GI girls were referred to the RFC by a bank located in a small town in a Western State. The girls wished a loan for the purpose of purchasing real property for the establishment of a hospital badly needed in that community. The loan was granted and, with the assistance of the RFC staff, property was secured, irregularities in titles were corrected, and the hospital opened and is being operated successfully. It has the complete backing of the community and is the only hospital there.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH].

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to say that in the time I have served in Congress I have supported all the appropriation measures which have been before the House to strengthen and keep strong our Nation. It pleases me to be able to say that I was not one of those Members who waited until after Pearl Harbor to support the legislation to strengthen and keep strong our country. We have sustained great loss of life and costly delays by not remaining strong at times in the past. Surely we should have learned our lesson in the past and should never again take a chance insofar as the strength of our country is concerned.

I say we should not weaken the influence of our Nation, particularly in a serious time like this, by weakening our Army or our Navy.

Although I recognize there has been some waste, great emphasis should be placed on the representations of those on whose shoulders rests the responsibility of being as sure as we can be that our country's welfare is secure and properly protected.

A few minutes ago I heard my able and distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], a member of the subcommittee which brought in the bill now before the House, discuss the provisions of the bill; I feel he is correct in what he says about the reductions which have been made in the funds of the Army Air Force. It is my purpose to support his amendment to provide additional funds for this division of the War Department.

As a member of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, the committee which deals with civil aviation

legislation, I personally feel civil aviation will gain much as a result of any progress and advancements made by our Army Air Force. Once we permit our Army and Navy to become weak we find the task of rebuilding them to be much more difficult. We have experienced this in the past. To be definitely sure that our Army and Navy will be strong tomorrow, we must be sure we have done those things necessary to keep them strong today. I strongly favor keeping both strong today.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Ross].

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Chairman, the question of adequate national defense is the most important matter that will come before the Congress this session. Events preceding and subsequent to the termination of hostilities of World War II have forcibly projected the problem of adequate national defense and national security into the thinking of every citizen. Adequate national defense is paramount. It is a gigantic problem. It calls for the prompt integration of every factor and every part of our industrial potential. Adequate national defense means not alone the maintenance of sufficient military forces. It means the adoption of a well-defined program for the complete and timely mobilization of our civilian economy in the event of attack. Our war potential is only as strong as the moral fiber of our people and only as potent as our ability to quickly produce the instruments of war.

I was so impressed with the necessity and the urgency of this that on March 17 I introduced H. R. 2589, a bill to establish a Civilian Mobilization Commission. This bill would set up a Commission of 11 members: 7 to be appointed by the President, 1 of whom shall be chairman; 2 by the President pro tempore of the Senate and 2 by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, from the membership of their respective Houses.

Under the provisions of this bill, the Commission would not be a policy-making Commission, but rather a fact-finding Commission. I want to read section 1 of the bill and ask unanimous consent to insert the entire bill at this point, as part of the RECORD. Section 1 is as follows:

SECTION 1. *Be it enacted, etc.,* That (a) in the interest of world peace and the national security it is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress to insure the right of the United States of America to continue their present way of life and to assure their ability to withstand atomic or other form of attack by preparing for ready use and immediate execution a plan or plans for the complete mobilization of the civilian economy and for the complete protection of the agencies of Government.

(b) It is the purpose of this act to effectuate the policies set out in section 1 (a) by providing, among others, for the following major programs relating to complete civilian mobilization of industries, including protection of the civilian population and the agencies of Government:

- (1) A program of assisting and fostering a decentralization of essential industries;
- (2) A program of assisting and fostering protective plans for essential industries and the agencies of Government;

(3) A program of assisting and fostering a plan for the conversion of civilian industries to war production;

(4) A program of administration which will be consistent with the foregoing policies, and which will enable the Congress to be informed annually as to the appropriate legislation needed to carry into execution any of the foregoing plans or other related plans, none of which shall be put in execution until specifically authorized by law.

All of the leading military authorities recognize and are giving voice to the necessity and urgency of such a program. On May 28, 1947, more than 2 months after introduction of H. R. 2589, Gen. Brehon B. Somervell and Maj. Gen. Leslie R. Groves, addressing the National Industrial Conference Board, came out in favor of a prewar planned program for industrial mobilization in the event of another war.

As reported in the New York Times, General Somervell stated that he was not predicting that war with Russia was inevitable, but was pointing out that it would be folly for us to ignore the fact that the United States would be a rich prize for an ambitious dictator. He said nobody knows whether a third world war would be a Buck Rogers affair using atomic bombs, bacteria rockets, and so forth, but that we would have to realize that dictators are ruthless realists and would have to prepare against the use of such weapons just as we prepared against the use of poison gas in the recent war.

According to the New York Times, General Somervell warned that industrial as well as manpower preparedness had lagged badly since VJ-day. He pointed out that we still lack even paper plans for industrial mobilization. He said:

Industry must be kept from year to year in the same state of semimobilization as our armed forces. In fact, the smaller our Army and Navy become, the greater degree of industrial mobilization we must maintain in time of peace.

To quote the New York Times, General Somervell stated:

The nucleus of civilian agencies to handle labor, civilian defense, civilian production, war materials, facilities, transportation, communication, power, war finance, foreign trade, and other aspects of the war economy must be in operation before the advent of war. The Nation could not afford * * * another long period of bungling and confusion during the next war, such as took place in the last war.

General Groves is quoted as saying that next time there will be no cushion of time, and, therefore, we must consider industrial mobilization a continuing process.

The report of the President's Commission on Universal Military Training, made public on June 1, in its program for a balanced security, stressed the need of a plan for industrial readiness. Point 4 of the program stated, and I quote:

Industrial mobilization: The development of new weapons will be of no value unless our scientific progress is matched by industrial readiness for the problems of war that may come without warning with supersonic speeds. Weapons that were not in being and in the possession of our troops when an ag-

gressor struck would be worthless in inflicting swift retribution upon him or in preventing his approach to our shores. Because of the danger that production centers would be demolished in the first days of war, a start should be made now toward decentralizing the most vital plants and, in some cases, toward building underground or otherwise adequately protected facilities.

Mr. Chairman, during this atomic age, with our country admittedly vulnerable to attack by atomic and projectile bombs and bacteriological vapors, it is absolutely essential that we have on tap for instant use plans for the immediate and total conversion of our civilian economy to a wartime economy. When World War III arrives we will not have time to fumble and bungle our production machine into high gear. We will not have time to experiment with plans for the protection of our civilian population. The need for plans to meet the kind of emergency that may be anticipated in the event of a sudden attack is unquestionable. With all the warning we had of the impending war in 1941, we were not prepared to proceed either defensively or offensively with any semblance of a concerted program. Agencies by the score were created hastily by Executive orders, directives, and so forth, many of them having overlapping or conflicting jurisdiction and duties. This made inevitable a constant reshuffling of agencies and functions, the absorption of some of the agencies by others, and the ultimate liquidation of those which, after considerable delay, were found to be unsuitable or ill-advised. This resulted in the loss of precious time, untold millions of dollars in waste, and inefficiency in our production machine.

In World War II we were fortunate in that we had time. In World War III it is a foregone conclusion that we will not have time. In my bill, H. R. 2589, the Civilian Mobilization Commission will be authorized to conduct continuous studies and assemble pertinent, up-to-date data on the whole question of our national-defense problem as it pertains to the civilian economy. Some phases of our civilian economy and some questions which, to my mind, the Commission will study and make the subject of recommendations to the Congress are:

First. Decentralization or concentration of particular industries in relation to national defense. Example: Whether to provide additional plant facilities or to scatter existing facilities.

Second. The most suitable methods of decentralizing such industries where decentralization is indicated.

Third. Whether particular industries should be sheltered from atomic attack by underground installations or otherwise.

Fourth. Camouflaging of essential industries against aerial observation.

Fifth. Providing for the safety of the agencies and records of the Federal Government in case of atomic attack, including plans for the rapid decentralization or removal of particular agencies of the Government.

Sixth. Means and methods of governing the actions of the civilian population and for providing for their safety.

The creation of the proposed Civilian Mobilization Commission would, as stated by General Somervell, insure efficiency and guard the American free enterprise system against excessive Government controls. H. R. 2589 provides that the plans and programs formulated by the Commission shall be submitted direct to the Congress, so that the needed legislation may be enacted without delay.

There is too much at stake to justify delegation of this problem to some branch or agency of the executive department. If there is to be another war, its outcome may well hinge upon our ability to swing into action at once and to utilize our industrial and economic resources with a minimum of delay. We, as the representatives of the people, have the primary responsibility in this matter. That responsibility must remain here. The commission or body that is entrusted with this vital task should at all times be responsible to the Congress and the Congress should see to it that the job is being done adequately, diligently, and continuously. We cannot risk unpreparedness again.

H. R. 2589

A bill to establish a Civilian Mobilization Commission, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) in the interest of world peace and the national security it is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress to insure the right of the United States of America to continue their present way of life and to assure their ability to withstand atomic or other form of attack by preparing for ready use and immediate execution a plan or plans for the complete mobilization of the civilian economy and for the complete protection of the agencies of government.

(b) It is the purpose of this act to effectuate the policies set out in section 1 (a) by providing, among others, for the following major programs relating to complete civilian mobilization of industries, including protection of the civilian population and the agencies of government:

(1) A program of assisting and fostering a decentralization of essential industries;

(2) A program of assisting and fostering protective plans for essential industries and the agencies of government;

(3) A program of assisting and fostering a plan for the conversion of civilian industries to war production;

(4) A program of administration which will be consistent with the foregoing policies, and which will enable the Congress to be informed annually as to the appropriate legislation needed to carry into execution any of the foregoing plans or other related plans, none of which shall be put in execution until specifically authorized by law.

SEC. 2. (a) There is hereby created a Civilian Mobilization Commission (hereinafter called the Commission) which shall be composed of 11 members, 7 appointed by the President (one of whom shall be Chairman) with the advice and consent of the Senate, 2 by the President pro tempore of the Senate, and 2 by the Speaker of the House from the membership of their respective Houses.

(b) Of the members of the Commission appointed by the President, two shall be appointed for a term of 2 years, two for a term of 4 years, two for a term of 6 years, and the Chairman for a term of 7 years, and at the expiration of each of said terms, the commissioners then appointed shall be appointed for a term of 7 years. Members appointed by the Speaker of the House and by the President pro tempore of the Senate shall serve until the end of the Congress in which they are appointed.

(c) Each member, except the Chairman and four members who are Members of the Congress, shall receive compensation at the rate of \$ per annum; and the Chairman shall receive compensation at the rate of \$ per annum.

(d) Any member of the Commission appointed by the President may be removed by the President for inefficiency, neglect of duty, or malfeasance in office.

(e) Members appointed by the President shall not engage in any other business, vocation, or employment than that of serving as a member of the Commission.

SEC. 3. The principal office of the Commission shall be in the District of Columbia, but the Commission or any duly authorized representative may exercise any or all of its power in any place. The Commission shall hold such meetings and receive such reports as may be necessary to enable it to carry out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 4. The Commission shall have authority to appoint and fix the compensation of such officers and employees as may be necessary to carry out the functions of the Commission. Such officers and employees shall be appointed in accordance with the civil-service laws and their compensation shall be fixed in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, except that to the extent the Commission deems such action necessary to the discharge of its responsibility, personnel may be employed and their compensation be fixed without regard to such laws.

SEC. 5. The Commission is hereby authorized to utilize or employ (with the consent of the agency concerned) the services or personnel of any Government department or agencies, or the services or personnel of any State or local government, or voluntary or uncompensated services or personnel.

SEC. 6. The Commission is authorized to make such studies and investigations, obtain such information, and hold such hearings as the Commission may deem necessary or proper to assist it in exercising any authority provided in this act. For the purpose herein authorized the Commission may subpoena a person to appear and testify or to appear and produce documents, or both, may administer such oaths and affirmations, at any designated place. No person shall be excused from complying with any requirements under this subsection because of his privilege against self-incrimination, but the immunity provisions of the Compulsory Testimony Act of February 11, 1893 (U. S. C. 49; 46), shall apply with respect to any individual who specifically claims such privilege. Witnesses subpoenaed under this subsection shall be paid the same fees and mileage as are paid witnesses in the district courts of the United States.

SEC. 7. The Commission is authorized to establish advisory boards to advise and make recommendations with the Commission on legislation, policy, administration, research, and other matters.

SEC. 8. The Commission shall submit to the Congress, in January of each year, a report concerning the activities of the Commission. The Commission shall include in such report, and shall at such other times as it deems desirable submit to the Congress, such recommendations for additional legislation as the Commission deems necessary or desirable.

SEC. 9. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions and purposes of this act.

SEC. 10. If any provision of this act, or the application of such provision to any person or circumstances, is held invalid, the remainder of this act or the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those to which it is held invalid, shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 11. This act may be cited as the "Civilian Mobilization Act of 1947."

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

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

Mr. LODGE. I want to congratulate the gentleman from New York upon his able presentation of this thesis and on the vision that he has shown in the manner in which he has developed his ideas. No more vital problem confronts the Nation, and I know that we must have a readily expandable industry in order to back up our wartime needs. I commend the gentleman for his splendid address.

Mr. ROSS. I want to thank very much the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut for his kind remarks.

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

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

Mr. KEATING. It seems to me the gentleman has presented a very interesting suggestion here which is deserving of grave consideration by the Congress. I commend him very highly on the great study he has given this problem, resulting in this bill, which displays such unusual foresight and preknowledge of what is likely to confront us in the days to come.

Mr. ROSS. I thank the very able and distinguished gentleman from New York for his kind comments.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I am obliged to the chairman of the subcommittee for giving me this time. I intend to speak on the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947. On tomorrow when the matter is considered, the time will be short and I, therefore, appreciate so much this opportunity for stating my views on the conference report.

I voted against H. R. 3020, and it is my present view that I must vote against the conference report on the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947. The subject is, however, bigger than the vote alone; for all of us know that labor-management peace will not be attained by this bill, but will rather depend on what men do under the law when enacted. This is no interim measure, either, for it is, and is well recognized to be, what the majority considers a basic change in domestic policy. Such a basic change, so early in the tenure of a new majority, certainly calls for awareness and analysis. This bill, I believe, creates the wrong pattern for labor-management relations; for, instead of putting them on an economic base, it puts them on a political base. For example, instead of seeking means by which the worker may produce more, through higher efficiency, and therefore earn more real wages, the bill takes a negative approach and is replete with prohibitions, limitations, and restrictions.

I favor labor legislation which would correct manifest abuses first, and inspire

public confidence; then we could consider drastic regulation if events showed it to be necessary. There are three immediate problems requiring legislation: First, avoidance of national paralysis due to strikes resulting from labor-management deadlocks; second, democracy in some labor unions; and, third, jurisdictional and wildcat strikes, and boycotts, not in aid of labor disputes.

The bill tries to do something to cope with these problems—a good deal of it badly—but it also does other things which nullify its effectiveness as a step in a process of the growth of labor-management responsibility, and make the bill a measure of repression.

Title II deals with national emergencies and provides for injunctions against strikes imperiling the national health or safety for a limited time of approximately 80 days and certain other interim proceedings, but that does not relieve us of the fear of national paralysis due to a strike. The provision for an enforced waiting period in such cases may not in itself be objectionable, but it must be joined with the power of seizure by the Government and the right to operate to the minimal extent required for the public health and safety if it is to mean anything to the public. Injunctions will not run trains or keep electricity going. This basic fear of national paralysis due to labor-management strife is at the root of repressive labor legislation, yet the rank and file of labor does not want any such power and would welcome a constructive solution which does not amount, however, to involuntary servitude.

The provisions of the bill which relate to democracy in labor unions are perhaps its best. I have always insisted that when labor unions become great they become public-service organizations and should be subject to the same responsibilities in the public interest. They should give nondiscriminatory service, and at reasonable rates. But this bill, while imposing some measures of union democracy, fails to provide for grievance machinery for union members with respect to their own unions and union leaders; and also strips unions of the ability to defend themselves against labor spies, internal antiunion agitators, and other active wreckers. For example, a labor union under this bill cannot discipline a member except for nonpayment of dues. A member may, therefore, be a labor spy; he may be preaching constantly against the union and trying to break it up from the inside; he may be a saboteur starting wildcat strikes, and yet the union is helpless to get him fired from the union shop. Paradoxically enough, he may be a proven disciple of Communist revolution who aims to overthrow the Government by force, yet unless he is a union officer the union cannot discipline him. Coupled with the provision in the bill imposing financial liability for wildcat strikes which can break a union, the union is at the mercy of such destructive forces.

Under the extremely wide definition of boycotts in the bill, unions cannot protect themselves against strikebreaking within the same industry. The bill provides that workers may not refuse to handle or work on any goods for the

purpose of forcing their employer to cease handling the goods of another producer; yet that other producer may be in the same line of business, his employees may be out on strike and he may be using the first establishment to work on his goods as a means of strikebreaking. This provision is not only bad, but summary power is vested in any regional attorney of the NLRB to get an immediate court injunction to restrain any such legitimate refusal to handle "hot goods," and the protection of the Norris-LaGuardia Anti-Injunction Act, for which labor fought for 50 years, is removed in such a case. This is not the kind of boycott which is contrary to the public interest, that other kind results from a misguided labor union's efforts to keep certain goods out of a market because the labor union fears the effect of new inventions or new methods. But while dealing with this legitimate abuse, the bill also has the effect of depriving labor of a right of self-preservation which has never been questioned before.

Supervisors are omitted from any protection under the bill—even when separately organized—though we know from industrial experience that they are in the main workers like all others and very numerous as indicated by the strike of foremen at the Ford Motor Co. Yet under this bill such employees may be at the mercy of labor spies, suffer from employer discrimination and employer coercion of all types—the whole tragic history of the labor movement in its "middle ages" may be repeated as to them, and their efforts to protect their own economic interests be defeated. They have become by this bill the "untouchables" of labor.

We are in grave danger now of going into an era of labor-management relations which will repeat almost exactly the bitter experience of American business with the New Deal. There had been excesses and unusual losses then in the stock market and in securities and real estate, due to inflated and unsound values, just as we found irresponsibility and exactions from the public in some labor-union circles more recently. Some regulation of securities and securities markets and of pyramided utility investments was obviously needed. So today some regulation of labor-management relations is needed. But let us see what happened then and is likely to happen now. In 1933 the New Deal thought it had a mandate to suspect every businessman, and especially every banker, as being crooked until proven innocent, just as we are now asked to suspect every labor union of indulging in tactics jeopardizing the economy and the public interest. And so in 1933, with the same mental attitude, there followed the sweeping regulation of business, banking, finance, and public-utility holding companies incorporated in the regulatory acts administered by the Securities and Exchange Commission. These acts almost froze the velocity of the United States economy for critical years and compelled us to finance with Government money at a time when enormous resources lay sterile in the hands of the public. These sweeping acts regulating business, as we now plan to regulate

labor, were largely responsible for forcing the United States economy into a slump and maintaining excessive unemployment from 1937 to 1939 which would have become a major economic disaster if the war in Europe, with its enormous demands on our production, had not broken out in September 1939. Let us not forget that under the Public Utility Holding Company Act, due to its first drastic impact, hundreds of millions of dollars of values in the hands of American investors were lost—in the hands of almost as many millions of investors as the millions of union members we are now affecting—until inflation and the administrative moderation which came from experience restored some of the value. But who benefitted from this come-back—the investors who had sold out at the bottom or who were exchanged out by reorganizations? Of course not. It was largely speculators who bought in at the bottom who reaped the increment.

The mistake of suddenly swinging the pendulum way over in the other direction is being made in this bill, for it is heavily weighted in favor of the employer. For example, to get a union shop under this bill it is not enough that a union be elected by a majority of workers to be their collective-bargaining agent, but another election must be held and another majority of all the workers—a tougher provision than for the election of Congressmen where only a plurality of those who vote is required—simultaneously, or very soon thereafter must be obtained in order to win the right to bargain for a union shop, specifically; and after a year, 30 percent of the employees can set in motion yet another election in which a 51 percent vote can rescind the union shop.

Or, to take another example, in the case of a threat of national strike in a critical industry the workers must vote particularly on the "final offer of settlement made by their employer as stated by him," before they may strike—not on the union's demands, or even on the findings of the President's impartial Board of Inquiry, as well, but on the employer's final offer—strangely reminiscent of an un-American one-ticket election.

The middle-of-the-road course to which I have set myself demands not only that I vote against this report, it demands also that I specify what I see to require correction in labor-management relations. This I have tried to do, in the firm conviction that laws are not solutions, and that good policies can create decent solutions in a democracy, despite bad laws.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. REDDEN].

Mr. REDDEN. Mr. Chairman, several days ago news reports were carried in the press to the effect that a mob in Northampton County, N. C., had gone to the jail and forcibly removed a Negro man who was being detained on a charge of assault on a white woman.

The story goes that the Negro escaped from the mob and later surrendered to the Federal Bureau of Investigation who delivered him to State authorities.

Indictments have been issued against those in the mob and they will be tried according to the laws of North Carolina, and I am sure a just decision upon the evidence will be rendered. That is what every true North Carolinian stands for.

In yesterday morning's news reports from that State a story is carried to the effect that another Negro man in the same county has attempted rape of a white girl, a young bride of 2 weeks, and that the community is very much upset over what appears to be a crime wave of rape in that section. The story describes how "upward of a hundred men, many of them armed, fanned out over the countryside after the girl, a recent high-school graduate and a bride of 2 weeks, reported the alleged attack." Two Negroes were taken under custody by the sheriff and promptly carried to an undisclosed jail for safekeeping. It is certainly regrettable that these attacks continue. They fan the flames of mob violence which tends to bring disrepute upon the good name of a great State.

The cry goes out that we need antilynching legislation. Members of the FBI are sent to investigate to determine if any civil rights of the assailant are violated. Peace officers of our State rise up as one in an effort to prevent the mob from executing its unlawful intentions.

It may be well to have some Federal antilynching legislation. If so, I shall certainly favor it, but I think it would also be well to have some Federal anti-rape legislation. I think also that these organizations and individuals which are so interested in protecting the criminal assailants who undertake to rape the white women of the South, should interest themselves in an organization that will promote good morals and stand for decency and respect. We need organizations and individuals who will not forget that the rights of women have been invaded, that they have been humiliated and embarrassed beyond expression and that a law has been violated in that respect. It seems to be the tendency of some groups to forget that a woman has been assaulted or raped; their whole cry is "Save the criminal from the mob." We need to save the woman from the criminal and a little teaching along that line may help to prevent mob violence.

There has been antilynching legislation offered in this House every session for many years, but I have not heard of anyone offering any law to aid in the prevention of these criminal attacks which are calculated to bring out the mobs. I welcome the day when this legislation comes before the House again, for I expect to attach some amendments that will send the FBI after the criminal in cases of this kind, as well as after the mob, and instead of allowing funds recovered by the estate of the criminal to enrich his next of kin, I expect to offer legislation that will allow the recovery to be paid to the estate of the woman attacked if she does not survive.

We need to let these criminals know, whether they be white or black, that they stand to gain nothing and that they shall be punished to the full extent of a just law, and in that way I believe we may discourage crime.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE].

Mr. LANE. Mr. Chairman, this is a bill to permit the Veterans' Administration to allot supplies of the new anti-tuberculosis drug for the treatment of ex-service men and women, with non-service-connected cases, who are patients in State, county, and municipal hospitals.

Present regulations do not allow the Veterans' Administration to send this expensive drug for treatment of veterans in hospitals which are not under Veterans' Administration jurisdiction. I have received complaints that officials in these outside hospitals are not giving their veteran patients this drug. Whether this policy is dictated by a desire to force them out of these hospitals and into facilities operated by the Veterans' Administration, or for some other obscure reason, I do not know. The fact is, such veterans are entitled to a share of such new treatment, and feel that they are being discriminated against.

The bill I propose will authorize the Veterans' Administration to send such reasonable supplies as are necessary to State, county, and municipal hospitals for the care of veterans who prefer to enter institutions which are near to their homes.

This bill does not interfere in the management or control of the hospitals described.

It merely provides that the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall inspect such hospitals at such times as he may consider necessary in order to satisfy himself with the character of care and treatment being rendered to eligible veterans in said hospitals. When the supplies are made available by this legislation, it will be the responsibility of the Veterans' Administration to see that this drug is being administered to those veterans for whom it is recommended by the medical authorities of the non-veteran hospitals.

I am sure that all of us, in our desire to be of service to the sick veteran, will not resort to penny-pinching economies in this matter.

There was a defect in the original legislation which must be corrected.

In doing this, we shall make supplies of streptomycin available to all veterans suffering from tuberculosis, no matter whether they are being treated in facilities operated by the Veterans' Administration or in State, county, or municipal hospitals.

Our veterans are also citizens.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read down to and including line 6, page 1, of the bill.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. HALLECK, having assumed the Chair, Mr. MICHENER, 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. 3678) making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS ACT, 1947

Mr. HARTLEY submitted a conference report and statement on 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.

MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1948

Mr. HERTER, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 230, Rept. No. 511), which was referred to the House calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That during the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3678) making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, all points of order against title II of said bill or any provisions contained therein are hereby waived.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks made in the Committee of the Whole and include certain tables and quotations.

Mr. DIRKSEN (at the request of Mr. CASE of South Dakota) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include an analysis of the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record on the subject of air accidents.

Mr. MAHON asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole, and include a letter from the Secretary of War, some excerpts from the hearings, and other matter.

LEASING OF PROPERTY BY VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks and include certain information from the Veterans' Administration.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON] wanted certain information regarding leasing of property by General Bradley, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, and also certain information was requested by the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] regarding leasing of property by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

Earlier in the day when I tried to secure the passage of the bill S. 1135 it was objected to by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON], who did not seem to be sure that General Bradley had exhausted all the possibilities of securing federally owned space. I obtained certain information, and I should like to state the Administrator's policy in connection with the acquisition of administrative space for the Veterans' Administration. I am including in my remarks a statement showing the administrative space acquired and in use by the Veterans' Administration as of March 31, 1947:

It is the policy of the Veterans' Administration, before leasing space of any type, to contact the Public Buildings Administration, Post Office, and other Government Departments in an attempt to locate space which may be made available to the Veterans' Ad-

ministration. More than 4,500,000 square feet of leased space has been obtained through or by the Public Buildings Administration for the Veterans' Administration. Much of this space was vacated by other Government agencies, such as the War Department, the Navy Department, Office of Price Administration, etc. While this statement does not show the quantity, many leases have been obtained by direct transfer from the War, Navy, and other departments, and are included in the figures shown as leased by the Veterans' Administration. It will be noted also, from the attached statement, that there is in use by field offices of the Veterans' Administration over 5,000,000 square feet of Federally owned space, much of which was obtained through the Public Buildings Administration and the Post Office Department.

Every effort is made to obtain, from universities, States, and municipalities, space for contact offices and guidance centers, without cost to the Federal Government. Over 274,000 square feet of space has been obtained by that means.

EXHIBIT A.—Veterans' Administration—Summary of space acquired and rental costs,¹ as of Mar. 31, 1947

Branch area	Total space acquired (square feet)	Federal (square feet)	Donated (square feet)	VA lease (square feet)	PBA lease (square feet)	Rental		
						VA	PBA	Total
Boston, No. 1.....	832,901	111,946	6,475	271,993	442,547	\$351,287	\$138,529	\$489,816
New York, No. 2.....	1,828,623	287,530	22,439	358,894	1,159,760	561,223	115,135	676,358
Philadelphia, No. 3.....	1,577,792	646,113	25,381	652,167	254,131	536,996	155,439	692,435
Richmond, No. 4.....	1,118,499	455,678	13,479	360,328	289,014	392,603	77,023	469,626
Atlanta, No. 5.....	1,285,811	727,575	2,445	365,222	190,569	368,346	210,300	578,655
Columbus, No. 6.....	1,473,872	394,984	10,581	672,722	395,585	890,345	332,471	1,162,816
Chicago, No. 7.....	1,644,858	273,344	4,108	686,444	680,962	988,565	135,968	1,124,533
St. Paul, No. 8.....	1,087,454	824,277	8,065	238,883	16,229	278,354	13,803	292,157
St. Louis, No. 9.....	876,480	216,786	47,410	315,809	296,475	405,315	181,045	586,360
Dallas, No. 10.....	1,062,193	378,040	48,907	394,303	240,943	430,721	205,332	636,053
Seattle, No. 11.....	600,796	73,292	73,552	451,152	2,800	742,838	1,050	743,888
San Francisco, No. 12.....	1,293,545	414,480	8,469	391,274	479,322	311,604	190,308	501,912
Denver, No. 13.....	475,674	284,453	3,036	47,831	140,354	54,571	128,037	182,608
Total, branch areas.....	15,158,498	5,088,498	274,347	5,206,962	4,588,691	6,252,768	1,884,449	8,137,217
New York branch, central office.....	690,000				690,000		680,664	680,664
Central office, Washington, D. C.....	1,503,326	1,443,758		15,600	43,968	12,000	34,000	46,000
Grand total.....	17,351,824	6,532,256	274,347	5,222,562	5,322,659	6,264,768	2,999,113	8,863,881

¹ Exclusive of supply depots, domiciliary facilities, and hospitals, except hospital at Saratoga Springs, N. Y., which is leased.

² This rental covers 2,145,259 square feet only. Balance is occupied on a nonreimbursable basis.

Prepared by Real Estate Service, Veterans' Administration.

I hope this statement will be satisfactory to the gentleman from Indiana. I feel very sure that all he wanted to do was to make certain that the administrator of veterans' affairs had exhausted every possible means of securing space so that there would be no additional cost.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes, I am very glad to yield to the gentleman. I know of his interest in the veterans.

Mr. PHILBIN. Does the gentleman propose to insert the data which she has just given in the RECORD?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes, the table will be included.

Mr. PHILBIN. I am sure that the Members will be very much interested in having this report.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It seems advisable to extend the authority to General Bradley for one to make the 5-year leases because he can do it more economically now than if he waits until the time expires, and that is the necessity for immediate action. If General Bradley is not allowed to renew leases probably he will be obliged to vacate buildings almost at once.

Mr. PHILBIN. That would seem to be very sound practice. I want to thank the gentleman very much for preparing this data and submitting it for the benefit of the House.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman has always been helpful in veterans' matters and has been always very cooperative in other matters.

The report of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs to accompany H. R. 3060 is as follows:

EXTENDING FOR 1 YEAR CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF SECTION 100 OF THE SERVICEMEN'S READJUSTMENT ACT OF 1944, AS AMENDED, RELATING TO THE AUTHORITY OF THE ADMINISTRATOR OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS TO ENTER INTO LEASES FOR PERIODS NOT EXCEEDING 5 YEARS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts, from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, submitted the following report:

The Committee on Veterans' Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 3060) to extend for 1 year certain provisions of section 100 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, relating to the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to enter into leases for periods not exceeding 5 years, having considered the same, report favorably thereon, without amendment, and recommend that the bill do pass.

EXPLANATION OF THE BILL

The bill was recommended by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs in a letter addressed to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, dated April 9, 1947, and was approved by the Bureau of the Budget.

The purpose of the bill is to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs until June 30, 1948, to enter into leases for periods of not to exceed 5 years. In making such leases the Administrator is exempted from the provisions of the Economy Act of 1932, as amended (47 Stat. 412, as amended by 47 Stat. 1517). This exemption will permit making a lease where the first year's rental exceeds 15 percent of the fair market value of the premises and will allow alterations in excess of 25 percent of the first year's rental.

Today's real-estate market is such that it is nearly impossible to determine the exact fair market value of any property from day to day, and the present scarcity of materials and labor plus increased cost of both in today's market require the exemption of the 250 percent limitation.

Two other statutes are included in the exemption for technical reasons. Section 3679 of the Revised Statutes prohibits the expenditure in any one fiscal year in excess of the amount appropriated for that year, and also prohibits the making of a contract for future payments in excess of the amount of appropriations. Section 3732 of the Revised Statutes prohibits entering into any contract unless there is an appropriation adequate to its fulfillment. Since the leases will be for periods of 5 years, it is probable that the sums needed will be appropriated annually for each year of the lease rather than for the entire period. It is necessary to exempt these two provisions in order to make a lease entered into under the authority of this bill binding upon the Government where the period is more than 1 year. The Veterans' Administration, under its decentralization program, has established 1,468 branch, regional, subregional, contact, and guidance offices which are quartered in 1,685 separate buildings occupying approximately 13,500,000 square feet of office space as compared with an anticipated 15,000,000 square feet of office space. It would have been impossible to acquire much of this space under the conditions existing in the real-estate market of the country during the fiscal year 1947 had it not been for the authority contained in Public Law 424 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, which was favorably reported by this committee, giving this authority to the Administrator up to and including June 30, 1947.

During the coming fiscal year it is the intent of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to consolidate many of these offices under one roof, and to carry out this program of consolidation successfully it will be necessary to extend this law for one more year.

It has been the policy of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to exercise the leasing authority granted him only in cases in which it has been determined that the exercise of such authority was necessary in the public interest. It is believed this policy will remain in effect if the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to negotiate such leases is continued for the fiscal year 1948. Without such authority it doubtless would have been necessary in many cases either to accept undesirable space or to resort to condemnation or purchase to acquire suitable space.

The committee feels that failure to continue the provisions of Public Law 424, Seventy-ninth Congress, for another year would seriously hamper the activities of the Veterans' Administration, particularly those relating to the installation of out-patient treatment clinics. It would probably result in an increase in the expenditure of public funds.

The report of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs recommending the bill follows:

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., April 9, 1947.

Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: There is transmitted herewith draft of a bill to amend section 100 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, with the request that the same be introduced and considered for enactment.

The purpose of the proposed bill is to extend for 1 year the provisions of the second paragraph of section 100 of the act, as added by Public Law 424, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved June 22, 1946, which authorizes the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to enter into 5-year leases, notwithstanding the fact that appropriations are not presently available for the entire period and further to permit such leases to be made free from the restrictions of the so-called Economy Act of 1932 (47 Stat. 412) approved June 30, 1932, as amended (47 Stat. 1517), prohibiting entering into any lease where the annual rental rate, in cases of rentals above \$2,000 per annum, exceeds 15 percent of the fair market value of the premises at date of the lease, or where the amount of alterations, repairs, and improvements to be made at Government expense exceeds 25 percent of the first year's rental. These provisions of section 100, supra, expire June 30, 1947.

No substantial change in the rental market is presently anticipated and the Veterans' Administration will have the same difficulty in securing rental space during the fiscal year 1948 as required by special authorizations contained in the act of June 22, 1946.

The Veterans' Administration, under its decentralization program, has established 1,468 branch, regional, subregional, contact, and guidance offices. These field offices are quartered in 1,685 separate buildings and occupy approximately 13,500,000 square feet of office space as compared with an anticipated maximum requirement of approximately 15,000,000 square feet of space. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs would have been unable to acquire much of this space under the conditions which existed in the real-estate markets of this country during the fiscal year 1947 had it not been for the authority contained in section 100, supra.

During the coming fiscal year, in the interest of improved service for veterans and maximum economy of operation, many of these offices will be consolidated under one roof. The number that will be consolidated cannot be estimated with any degree of accuracy, but such consolidations will be made wherever practical. However, if the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is to successfully carry out this program of consolidation, it will be necessary for him to continue to exercise his present authority under section 100, supra.

The policy of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs during the fiscal year 1947 has been to exercise the leasing authority in question only in those instances in which it has been determined that the exercise of such authority was necessary in the public interest. This policy will remain in effect if the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to negotiate such leases is continued for the fiscal year 1948. In this connection, it should be noted that to date but approximately 50 leases have been entered into for a period exceeding 1 year. Without such authority, it doubtless would have been necessary in many cases either to accept undesirable space or to resort to condemnation or purchase to acquire suitable space.

Failure to continue the provisions of the second paragraph of section 100, supra, would seriously hamper the activities of the Veterans' Administration, particularly those re-

lating to the installation of out-patient treatment clinics. It would also probably result in an increase in the expenditure of public funds.

The conclusions stated in the preceding paragraph are based upon the following considerations. The Veterans' Administration is now excepted by the provisions of section 100, supra, from the restrictions imposed by the terms of the act of June 30, 1932, as amended, supra, which limit expenditures for alterations, improvements, and repairs of leased space to 25 percent of the first year's rental. This restriction under present market conditions would make it difficult to obtain space at a reasonable price, since in the experience of the Veterans' Administration, cheaper space costing, for example, 50 cents per square foot per annum would generally require a greater expenditure for alterations than higher-priced space costing perhaps \$3 per square foot per annum. Notwithstanding this fact, however, under the restrictions of the act of June 30, 1932, as amended, the Veterans' Administration could spend 75 cents per square foot for alterations on the more expensive space whereas on the cheaper space it could spend for alterations but 12½ cents per square foot. Consequently, when space is required for a long-term use, it would in many cases result in a substantial saving to the Government to acquire cheaper space and put it into condition for use. An estimate of gross savings which might be realized by the Government in this manner cannot be definitely determined but undoubtedly it would approximate many thousands of dollars. Further, in connection with the installation of medical clinics in leased premises, the Veterans' Administration is unable, because of the peculiar and extensive character of the alterations required, to make the necessary alterations for as little as 25 percent of the annual rental.

For the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully requested that the proposed legislation be introduced and given early consideration for enactment.

Advice has been received from the Bureau of the Budget that there would be no objection by that office to the submission of the proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

OMAR N. BRADLEY,
General, United States Army,
Administrator.

RAMSEYER RULE

In accordance with the provisions of clause 2a, rule XIII, House of Representatives, the changes made in existing law by the bill are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is in black brackets; new matter is in italics; existing law in which no changes are proposed is shown in roman):

Section 100 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended:

Sec. 100. The Veterans' Administration is hereby declared to be an essential war agency and entitled to priority equal to the highest granted any department or agency of the Government in personnel, service, space, equipment, supplies, and material under any laws, Executive orders, and regulations pertaining to priorities. The Administrator is authorized, for the purpose of extending benefits to veterans and dependents, and to the extent he deems necessary, to procure the necessary space for administrative, clinical, medical, and out-patient treatment purposes by lease, purchase, or construction of buildings, or by condemnation or declaration of taking, pursuant to existing statutes.

Until [June 30, 1947] June 30, 1948, the Administrator is authorized to enter into leases or renewals of leases of property for any of the purposes specified in this section for periods not exceeding five years. The provisions of the Act of June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 412), as amended by section 15 of the Act of March 3, 1933 (47 Stat. 1517; 40 U. S.

C. 278a), the provisions of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended by the Act of March 3, 1905 (33 Stat. 1257), and the Act of February 27, 1906 (34 Stat. 48; 31 U. S. C. 665); and the provisions of section 3732 of the Revised Statutes (41 U. S. C. 11) shall not apply to any lease entered into by the Administrator under the authority of this section. Nothing in this section shall be construed to diminish, or in any way limit any rights, power, or authority granted to the Administrator under any other law.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON LABOR BILL

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MICHENER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask for this time in order to announce that the conference report on the labor bill which we propose to call up tomorrow will be called after the final action on the pending War Department appropriation bill if it is disposed of before 3 o'clock. If, however, that bill is not disposed of by 3 o'clock we will have the committee rise in order to act on the conference report on the labor bill.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. RAYBURN. Is the gentleman still of the opinion that he could not give us more time than that? I thank the gentleman for his courtesy in giving us 3 more hours, but, frankly, I still do not think the Members are going to have time to read and digest this conference report in such a short time because they will only be able to get it in the morning.

Mr. HALLECK. I appreciate the gentleman's attitude, but as matters now stand I find it necessary to proceed with the program as I have outlined it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I was one of the conferees. The writing of the final bill shifted so rapidly over there that even I was not able to keep track of it. When will we get this report? Is it available now or is it just being printed now?

Mr. HALLECK. The report which has been filed will be in the RECORD in the morning. The bill as agreed upon was available to the extent of a few copies over the week-end and every Member had delivered to his office this morning a copy of this bill as agreed upon by the conferees, so they have had that in their possession available for study today.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I would say to the gentleman I had a copy of that yesterday and I read it very carefully; that is, the proposed bill. But I was greatly interested in reading this conference report to see if I could find something in the report that would justify supporting the bill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, this morning I obtained unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include an address delivered by

Bishop Charles B. Galloway of my State on the life and character of Jefferson Davis. I find that it exceeds the amount allowed, but I ask unanimous consent that it may be included regardless of the cost.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HALLECK). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi? There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. KELLEY for 7 weeks, on account of appointment as substitute delegate and adviser to International Labor Organization Conference, Geneva, Switzerland.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A joint resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. J. Res. 117. Joint resolution providing for acceptance by the United States of America of the Constitution of the International Labor Organization Instrument of Amendment, and further authorizing an appropriation for payment of the United States share of the expenses of membership and for expenses of participation by the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 51 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 4, 1947, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

731. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a report of a proposed transfer of a motor launch to the Junior Militia, Inc., of the State of Maryland; to the Committee on Armed Services.

732. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to reimburse employees of the Department for expense of entertainment of representatives of other countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

733. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, recommending an amendment to section 17 (c) of the Federal Airport Act, Public Law 377, Seventy-ninth Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

734. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the act of September 7, 1916, to authorize certain expenditures from the employees' compensation fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

735. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of a proposed joint resolution providing for membership and participation by the United States in the Caribbean Commission and authorizing an appropriation therefor; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

736. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting report on records proposed for disposal by various Government

agencies; to the Committee on House Administration.

737. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated June 17, 1946, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of reports on and a preliminary examination and survey of Polecat Creek, Creek County, Okla., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, adopted on July 23, 1941, and also authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on August 18, 1941 (H. Doc. No. 290); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with three illustrations.

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. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 2167. A bill to authorize the inclusion within the Angostura water conservation and utilization project of certain lands owned by the United States; with amendments (Rept. No. 503). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WEICHEL: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 2721. A bill to amend the act of March 10, 1934, entitled "An act to promote the conservation of wildlife, fish, and game, and for other purposes," as amended by the act approved August 14, 1946; without amendment (Rept. No. 504). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BRADLEY: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 3333. A bill to authorize the transfer of the *Joseph Conrad* to the Marine Historical Association of Mystic, Conn., for museum purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 505). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HARTLEY: Committee on Education and Labor. Report pursuant to House Resolution 111, resolution authorizing the Committee on Education and Labor to conduct studies and investigations relating to matters within its jurisdiction (Rept. No. 506). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SHAFER: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 3049. A bill to continue in effect section 6 of the act of July 2, 1940 (54 Stat. 714), as amended, relating to the exportation of certain commodities; with an amendment (Rept. No. 507). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 3055. A bill to permit the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of War to supply utilities and related services to welfare activities, and persons whose businesses or residences are in the immediate vicinity of naval or military activities and require utilities or related services not otherwise obtainable locally, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 508). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ELSTON: Committee on Armed Forces. H. R. 3191. A bill to amend Public Law 301, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved February 18, 1946, so as to extend the benefits of the Missing Persons Act, approved March 7, 1942 (56 Stat. 143), as amended, to certain members of the organized military forces of the Government of the Commonwealth of the Philippines; without amendment (Rept. No. 509). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 230. Resolution waiving points of order against title II of H. R. 3678, a bill making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 511). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 3700. A bill to provide for and fix the fees payable to the Patent Office and to amend sections 4884, 4931, and 4934 of the Revised Statutes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WELCH:

H. R. 3701. A bill to repeal that portion of section 203 of title 2 of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, as amended, as designates the land herein described as available land within the meaning of that act, and to restore the land to its previous status under the control of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. LANDIS:

H. R. 3702. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to promulgate safety regulations to be observed in the operation of coal mines; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 3703. A bill to authorize transfer of surplus real property to the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior for consolidation of Federal holdings within areas administered by the National Park Service; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. GEARHART:

H. R. 3704. A bill to exclude vendors of newspapers from certain provisions of the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MATHEWS:

H. R. 3705. A bill to provide a presumptive period of 2 years for certain diseases for World War II veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. R. 3706. A bill to amend section 6 of the Reorganization Act of 1945; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Department.

By Mr. MARCANTONIO:

H. R. 3707. A bill to extend for 1 year the time within which application may be made for benefits under the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 3708. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, approved May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to make such act applicable to officers and employees of national farm-loan associations; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 3709. A bill to permit the Veterans' Administration to assist States, counties, and municipalities in the treatment of veterans suffering from tuberculosis; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BATTLE:

H. R. 3710. A bill to make the educational benefits of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 available to the children of persons who died in active service or who died as a result of wounds received in World War II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER of Connecticut:

H. R. 3711. A bill to provide Federal aid to the States for the construction of armories and similar training facilities for the National Guard and Naval Militia; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. Con. Res. 51. Concurrent resolution against adoption of Reorganization Plan No. 3 of May 27, 1947; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. Res. 228. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 195; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. GILLIE:

H. Res. 229. Resolution providing for an investigation with respect to the background and qualifications of persons considered for appointment as Superintendent of Police of the District of Columbia; 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. 3712. A bill for the relief of Frank Loiacomo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 3713. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Judge E. Estes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMASON:

H. R. 3714. A bill for the relief of James Fred Girdley; 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:

596. By Mr. BRADLEY: Petition of R. H. Simmons and 24 others, of the Eighteenth Congressional District of California, urging favorable consideration and passage of H. R. 969, which would increase the pensions of the Spanish-American War veterans and their widows by 20 percent; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

597. By Mr. CASE of South Dakota: Petition of Charles R. Horton, Sr., Quinn, S. Dak., and 26 others, all members of Eastern Pennington County Cooperative Grazing District, asking that certain recommendations attached hereto be considered before any action is taken on H. R. 1692, which proposes disposition of submarginal lands acquired under the Bankhead-Jones Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

598. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Francis Jean Reuter, petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to civil-service status; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

599. Also, petition of the membership of the Tampa Townsend Club, No. 19, Tampa, Fla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

600. Also, petition of the membership of the Tampa Townsend Club, No. 35, Tampa, Fla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

601. Also, petition of the membership of the Tampa Townsend Club, No. 15, Tampa, Fla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

602. Also, petition of the membership of the Tampa Townsend Club, No. 8, Tampa, Fla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 4, 1947

(Legislative day of Monday, April 21, 1947)

The Senate met, in executive session, at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

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

O Lord our God, as we seek Thy guidance this day, we do not ask to see the distant scene, knowing that we can take only one step at a time. Make that first step plain to us, that we may see where our duty lies, but give us a push, that we may start in the right direction.

Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the legislative proceedings of Tuesday, June 3, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 135) to legalize the admission into the United States of Frank Schindler.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 617. An act for the relief of James Harry Martin;

H. R. 631. An act for the relief of the Allied Aviation Corp.;

H. R. 637. An act for the relief of Marvin Pettus;

H. R. 837. An act for the relief of the estate of Abram Banta Bogert;

H. R. 987. An act for the relief of Lorenzo H. Froman;

H. R. 993. An act for the relief of the estate of Norman C. Cobb, Naomi R. Cobb, and Garland L. Cobb;

H. R. 1144. An act for the relief of Samuel W. Davis, Jr., Mrs. Samuel W. Davis, Jr., and Betty Jane Davis;

H. R. 1152. An act for the relief of Mrs. Inga Patterson, widow of F. X. Patterson;

H. R. 1497. An act for the relief of the estate of George W. Coombs;

H. R. 1531. An act for the relief of William P. Gillingham;

H. R. 1658. An act for the relief of Norman Thoreson;

H. R. 1742. An act for the relief of Mary Lomas;

H. R. 1799. An act for the relief of Eva L. Dudley, Grace M. Collins, and Guy B. Slater;

H. R. 1851. An act for the relief of A. J. Davis, Mrs. Lorene Griffin, Earle Griffin, and Harry Musgrove;

H. R. 2302. An act for the relief of New Jersey, Indiana & Illinois Railroad;

H. R. 3170. An act for the relief of R. W. Wood;

H. R. 3387. An act for the relief of Bruce Bros. Grain Co.; and

H. J. Res. 96. Joint resolution authorizing the President to issue posthumously to the late Roy Stanley Geiger, lieutenant general, United States Marine Corps, a commission as general, United States Marine Corps, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

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

S. 565. An act to amend section 3539 of the Revised Statutes relating to taking trial pieces of coins;

S. 566. An act to amend sections 3533 and 3536 of the Revised Statutes with respect to deviations in standard of ingots and weight of silver coins;

S. 583. An act to authorize the exchange of lands acquired by the United States for the Silver Creek recreational demonstration project, Oregon, for the purpose of consolidating holdings therein, and for other purposes;

S. 993. An act to provide for the reincorporation of Export-Import Bank of Washington, and for other purposes;

S. 1022. An act to authorize an adequate White House Police force;

S. 1073. An act to extend until June 30, 1949, the period of time during which persons may serve in certain executive departments and agencies without being prohibited from acting as counsel, agent, or attorney for prosecuting claims against the United States by reason of having so served; and

H. R. 1. An act to reduce individual income-tax payments.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

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

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

CONSULAR CONVENTION WITH THE REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate Executive Q, Eightieth Congress, first session, a consular convention between the United States and the Republic of the Philippines, signed at Manila on March 14, 1947. Without objection, the injunction of secrecy will be removed from the convention, and it will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The convention is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith the consular convention between the United States of America and the Republic of the Philippines, signed at Manila on March 14, 1947.

I also transmit for the information of the Senate the report by the Secretary of State with respect to the convention.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, June 4, 1947.

(Enclosures: 1. Report of the Secretary of State. 2. Consular Convention between the United States and the Republic of the Philippines, signed March 14, 1947.)