

of Washington, D. C., to make loans to fur farmers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JACKSON of California:

H. Con. Res. 122. Concurrent resolution relating to the formation of an international police force for action in Greece; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H. Res. 402. Resolution for the relief of Minnie E. Beatty; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MACY:

H. Res. 403. Resolution to authorize and direct the Public Works Committee, or any subcommittee thereof, to make a study of black markets; 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. JACKSON of California:

H. R. 4746. A bill for the relief of Miguel U. Royo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 4747. A bill for the relief of Czeslaw Luniewski; 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:

919. By Mr. FORAND: Petition of Mrs. Florence A. Smith and 18 other members of Stark Parker Unit No. 21, East Providence, R. I., American Legion Auxiliary, in favor of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

920. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 14 residents of Beaver County, Pa., in support of legislation establishing a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

921. By Mr. HOPE: Petition of Rev. C. R. Vasey and 11 other residents of South Haven, Kans., against H. R. 4278, a bill to enact the National Security Training Act of 1947; to the Committee on Armed Services.

922. By Mr. KILDAY: Petition of Adolph J. Specia and 56 others, of San Antonio, Tex., urging the establishment of a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

923. Also, petition of Alamo Post, No. 2, American Legion, San Antonio, Tex., containing 67 names, urging the establishment of a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

924. By Mr. CASE of South Dakota: Petition of Mrs. M. S. Hamre, Willow Lake, S. Dak., and 18 others, requesting legislation to prohibit advertising liquor in interstate commerce and over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

925. Also, petition of Mrs. J. S. Vevory, president, Ladies Aid of Grace Lutheran Church, Watertown, S. Dak., and 32 other members, urging legislation to prohibit the advertising of liquor in interstate commerce and over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

926. Also, petition of Mrs. Thomas Ostrem, Centerville, S. Dak., and 16 others, urging the enactment of legislation which would prohibit advertising liquor in interstate commerce and over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

927. Also, petition of Mrs. Claude C. Davison and 28 other members of the Bethany Lutheran Congregation, Howard, S. Dak., urging enactment of legislation to prohibit advertising liquor in interstate commerce and over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

928. Also, petition of Mrs. B. L. Ness, president of St. John's Ladies Aid, Bruce, S. Dak., and 15 other members, urging the enactment

of legislation to prohibit the advertising of liquor in interstate commerce and over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

929. By Mr. REED of Illinois: Petition of Ralph H. Wilson, of Joliet, Ill., and 17 others, protesting the enactment of House Joint Resolution 239, joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to religious freedom; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

930. By Mr. BRADLEY: Petition of 477 residents of the Eighteenth Congressional District of California, urging that the excise tax on cosmetics, leather goods, and jewelry be repealed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

931. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Miss Emma MacKay, Boynton Beach, Fla., petitioning consideration of her resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

932. Also, petition of Coconut Grove Townsend Club, No. 1, Coconut Grove, Fla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to signing of Discharge Petition No. 7, relative to the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

933. Also, petition of Mrs. Frances B. Turner, Miami, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

934. Also, petition of Oliver A. Hays, Orlando, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

935. Also, petition of Rev. J. A. Logan, Geneva, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

936. Also, petition of Henry A. Morris, Houston, Tex., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to protesting the abolition of the right of the RFC to purchase secondary GI mortgages; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

937. Also, petition of the City Commissioners of the City of West Palm Beach, Fla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the recent flood conditions in the Everglades of Florida; to the Committee on Appropriations.

938. Also, petition of J. C. Warlick and various citizens of the State of North Carolina, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to request for amendment of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

939. Also, petition of members of Local 165, United Packinghouse Workers of America, CIO, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to requested lower prices; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SENATE

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 16, 1947

(Legislative day of Thursday, December 4, 1947)

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

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

Lord Jesus, in the hush of this moment, we pray that Thy tender Spirit may steal into our hearts and reveal to us how near and how dear Thou art.

There are times when Thou art not real to us, and we know why. It is not because Thou hast withdrawn from us,

but because we have wandered away from Thee; not because Thou art not speaking, but because we are not listening; not because Thy love for us has cooled, but because we have fallen in love with things instead of persons.

O Lord, melt the coldness of our hearts that we may again fall in love with Thee who didst love us. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHITE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, December 15, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED DURING RECESS

Under authority of the order of the Senate of the 15th instant,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore announced that on today he signed the enrolled bill (S. 1774) to promote world peace and the general welfare, national interest, and foreign policy of the United States by providing aid to certain foreign countries, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, December 16, 1947, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 1774) to promote world peace and the general welfare, national interest, and foreign policy of the United States by providing aid to certain foreign countries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4627) to authorize an appropriation for the immediate relief of the Navajo and Hopi Indians, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 4651) to authorize the reinstatement of lapsed 5-year level-premium-term national-service life insurance on a comparative health basis until December 31, 1948, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

TWO ADDITIONAL ASSISTANT SECRETARIES OF AGRICULTURE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to establish two additional offices of Assistant Secretaries of Agriculture, and for other purposes, which, with an accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

PETITION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the petition of John C. Burt, of New York City, N. Y., praying for the restoration of his civil rights, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR ADVERTISING—PETITION

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and to have printed in

the RECORD a petition signed by sundry citizens of Beloit, Kans., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 265, to prohibit the transportation of liquor advertising in interstate commerce, introduced by me.

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

PETITION

To Our Senators and Representatives in Congress:

We respectfully request that you use your influence and vote for the passage of S. 265, a bill to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and broadcasting of alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio. The most pernicious effect of this advertising is the constant invitation and enticement to drink. The American people spent \$7,770,000,000 for alcoholic beverages in 1946, as compared with \$3,700,000,000 for alcoholic beverages in 1942. During the same period there was a corresponding increase each year in crime. There is every reason why this expenditure should not be increased, but decreased. We want this Capper bill with no changes. No exemptions to beer.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION
INTRODUCED

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

(Mr. BARKLEY introduced Senate bill 1881, to amend the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended, to grant the Secretary of Agriculture authority to regulate margin requirements with respect to speculative transactions in commodity futures on commodity exchanges, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. BARKLEY also introduced Senate bill 1882, to authorize a food and feed conservation program, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MYERS:

S. 1883. A bill for the relief of G. Brinton Fagen;

S. 1884. A bill for the relief of the estate of Luke A. Treacy;

S. 1885. A bill for the relief of Gerardo Picardi; and

S. 1886. A bill for the relief of William M. Looney; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. HATCH introduced Senate bill 1887, to amend section 5 of the act of July 19, 1940, to prohibit the receipt by any person from any contractor with the United States, during the period of his performance under the contract, of any contribution for a political purpose or use, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. BARKLEY introduced Senate bill 1888, to provide for the temporary control of prices on certain vital commodities in short supply that basically affect the cost of living or agricultural or industrial production, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. BARKLEY introduced Senate Joint Resolution 168, to authorize Commodity Credit Corporation to promote the production of foods, agricultural commodities, and products thereof, in non-European foreign countries, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and appears under a separate heading.)

PROPOSED LEGISLATION RELATING TO
FOOD AND FOOD PRODUCTS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce a joint resolution and two bills which I shall merely describe by calling attention to their purposes.

The joint resolution is to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to promote the production of foods, agricultural commodities, and products thereof, in non-European foreign countries.

I presume the joint resolution will go to the Committee on Banking and Currency as it deals with the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The first bill is to amend the Commodity Exchange Act by authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to regulate certain matters pertaining to commodity margins in the purchase and sale of commodities on commodity exchanges and authorizing him to fix margins with respect to the purchase and sale of such commodities.

The second bill provides for the establishment of food- and feed-conservation programs in the United States. I presume that the bills will go to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, but I ask that they be appropriately referred.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the joint resolution and bills introduced by the Senator from Kentucky will be received and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the joint resolution and bills were received, severally read twice by their titles, and referred, as follows:

S. J. Res. 168. Joint resolution to authorize Commodity Credit Corporation to promote the production of foods, agricultural commodities, and products thereof, in non-European foreign countries; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 1881. A bill to amend the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended, to grant the Secretary of Agriculture authority to regulate margin requirements with respect to speculative transactions in commodity futures on commodity exchanges; and

S. 1882. A bill to authorize a food and feed conservation program; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

AMENDMENT OF ACT RELATING TO
PERNICIOUS POLITICAL ACTIVITIES

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend section 5 of the act of July 19, 1940, to prohibit the receipt by any person from any contractor with the United States, during the period of his performance under the contract, of any contribution for a political purpose or use.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1887) to amend section 5 of the act of July 19, 1940, to prohibit the receipt by any person from any contractor with the United States, during the period of his performance under the contract, of any contribution for a political purpose or use, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be permitted to make a brief statement in connection with the introduction of the bill.

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

Mr. HATCH. The particular bill I have just introduced is to amend an act entitled "An act to prevent pernicious political activities." One section of that act, Mr. President, made it a crime for any person having a contract with the Federal Government to make a contribution to any political party or for any political purpose during the progress of the contract. It also made it subject to a penalty for any person to solicit any such contribution. For some reason, which I cannot now recall, there was left out of the act the words "or receive." Certainly, Mr. President, if it is wrong to make a contribution or to solicit such a contribution in the situation referred to, it would be wrong for a person to receive it. Therefore, the amendment I now propose corrects that omission. It merely adds to the existing law the words "to receive."

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 4651) to authorize the reinstatement of lapsed 5-year level-premium-term national-service life insurance on a comparative health basis until December 31, 1948, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

INVESTIGATION OF DISTILLING
INDUSTRY SHUT-DOWN

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to submit for appropriate reference a resolution to investigate the present shut-down in the distilling industry.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 175), submitted by Mr. LANGER, was received and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, as follows:

Resolved, That the appropriate committee of the United States Senate or a subcommittee thereof be empowered to investigate (1) the present shut-down in the distilling industry, and (2) proposals for continuing such shut-down, and to report to the Senate:

1. Whether or not such shut-down and/or its continuance has resulted or will result in unjust enrichment to certain individuals or companies at the expense of the public.

2. To what extent the shut-down and/or its continuance has resulted or will result in promoting monopoly and raising consumer prices by cartelizing the distilling industry by the continued artificial allocation of grain.

3. Whether or not such shut-down has resulted in any saving of grain for human or animal consumption.

4. Whether or not such shut-down and/or its continuance has resulted or will result in placing American industries at a competitive disadvantage as against similar industries in other countries in view of (a) the continued operation of distilleries while American distilleries are shut down; (b) the unrestricted purchase of American grain shipped to Canada for such purpose; (c) the reduction in tariff on Canadian liquor made in whole or in part from American grain denied to American distilleries; (d) the comparative requirements of American as compared to Canadian whisky-labeling regulations.

5. Whether or not American grain shipped to Europe is being used directly or indirectly for making whisky by European distilleries.

6. How much of the grain being requested by European nations in front of and behind the iron curtain will be used directly or indirectly for distilling purposes rather than to feed human beings.

INVESTIGATION OF LEGALITY OF EXPENDITURES MADE BY BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

Mr. DOWNEY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 176), which was referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments:

Resolved, That the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation with a view to ascertaining (1) whether expenditures of public funds have been made by the Bureau of Reclamation, or by any officer or employee thereof, in violation of the provisions of section 6 of the act of July 11, 1919 (41 Stat. 68); (2) the extent to which employees of the Bureau of Reclamation and the Department of the Interior have been guilty of issuing false and misleading statements for the purpose of influencing Congress with respect to pending legislation; and (3) whether employees of the Bureau of Reclamation have been guilty of the misuse of public funds for purposes of propaganda and publicity. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of its study and investigation together with such recommendations as it may deem desirable.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

THE ROLE OF THE UNITED STATES IN ECONOMIC AFFAIRS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR HAWKES

[Mr. HAWKES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Role of the United States in Economic Affairs," delivered by him at the sixty-second annual dinner of the American Tariff League, October 17, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING—EXCERPTS FROM ADDRESS BY ROBERT M. HUTCHINS

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from an address on universal military training delivered by Robert M. Hutchins, chancellor of the University of Chicago, before the National Council for the Prevention of War, December 14, 1947, which appear in the Appendix.]

GRAIN EXCHANGE "GAMBLING"—LETTER FROM C. M. YAGER AND EDITORIAL FROM MODERN MILLER AND BAKERS NEWS

[Mr. BROOKS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from C. M. Yager and an editorial entitled "Grain Exchange 'Gambling,'" from the Modern Miller and Bakers News, for December 13, 1947, which appear in the Appendix.]

SURVEY OF EFFORTS TO CONSUMMATE THE IDEAL OF HEMISPHERIC DEFENSE

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, on Monday, December 8, the Senate of the United States, with but a single vote in opposition, gave assent to a treaty providing for hemispheric defense, thus fulfilling in formal document a century-

and-a-quarter-old pronouncement of Thomas Jefferson: "Make our hemisphere one of freedom. An attack on one is an attack on the whole." These words have, for several years, been inscribed on the Thomas Jefferson Memorial in Washington, D. C.

Mr. President, because of illness, I was not able to be present in the Senate on that day. I, therefore, deem it now not out of place to ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the body of the RECORD as part of my remarks what might be termed a historical survey of the efforts of the great statesmen of the Americas to consummate this ideal which has been borne in the hearts of so many of them and been so often expressed throughout our history to such an extent that it was not difficult to weave the American theory for peace and defense out of this one story.

To those who have assumed that the United States has had no foreign policy a mere reading will display their lack of information. America has, at all times and under all circumstances and under varied leadership, responded unitedly to the hopes and aspiration and the dreams of those among our founding fathers who saw in the establishment of the United States the political techniques and governmental devices that would create the means toward attaining liberty and freedom for man and dignity and independence for the state, tempered only by the state's duty to a community of states or the sisterhood of nations.

Treaties, of course, have not guaranteed peace; neither have boundaries; neither have any of the devices or techniques of government. But there never can be peace unless men and governments are taught to keep their promises, to live and let live, and to develop a spirit which at all times insists that agreements must be met.

Mr. President, it would not be right to detain the Senate with a historical recital. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent to have it inserted in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement prepared by Mr. THOMAS of Utah was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On the walls of the Jefferson Memorial in our National Capital are inscribed the words: "Make our hemisphere one of freedom. An attack on one is an attack on the whole."

In these few words are embodied the philosophy of Thomas Jefferson as it applies to the position occupied by the United States and other independent countries of the Western Hemisphere in relation to Europe and the rest of the world. This philosophy can be found in the statements of Washington, Madison, Monroe, Wilson and many other eminent American statesmen and is now contained in the words of the Treaty of Continental Peace and Security signed at Rio de Janeiro and passed by the Senate with but one dissenting vote on Monday, December 8, 1947.

The foreign policy of the United States, as a leader of the Western Hemisphere since the establishment of independent republics in the Americas, has always been dominated by a single principle. This principle is based on the theory that the Western Hemisphere constitutes a separate area of international action apart from the rest of the world and

particularly in relation to Europe. As a consequence of this theory, our foreign policy has kept our political contact with the Old World at a minimum. This principle is apparent in the history of our foreign relations since our inception as an independent Nation.

George Washington, with the Neutrality Proclamation of April 22, 1793, and in his famous Farewell Address, was one of the first of our statesmen to give public acknowledgment to a point of view that had already found expression in our newly founded Republic. When Washington asserted "It is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliances with any portion of the foreign world" he was not thinking so much in terms of a policy of isolation as he was of the exclusion of foreign influence in the development of the United States.

Thomas Jefferson furthered this policy in his inaugural address in 1801 by his warning against entangling alliances. Jefferson was strongly opposed to European involvements and throughout his term as President, inaugurated a policy that strengthened American nationality and aroused a new respect for the United States.

Up to the time of the establishment of independence by the countries of Central and South America, our policy had largely been aimed at avoiding involvement in European affairs. The circumstances surrounding the revolt of the Spanish colonies marked the rounding out of this principle to include the idea that Europe should also stay out of American affairs. This aspect of our foreign policy which was the logical counterpart to the maxim of no entangling alliances was publicly announced in President James Monroe's message to Congress that has since come to be known as the Monroe Doctrine.

In advocating the recognition of the independence of the revolted Spanish colonies, Henry Clay made the following statement in the House of Representatives on May 10, 1820: "We should become the center of a system which would constitute the rallying point of human wisdom against all the despotism of the Old World."

Congress passed a resolution on January 15, 1811, to carry out the recommendation of President Madison made in a secret message to Congress on January 3, 1811. President Madison's message dealt with the Floridas and the congressional resolution "taking into view the peculiar situation of Spain, and of her American provinces" and "the influence which the destiny of the territory adjoining the southern border of the United States may have upon their security, tranquility, and commerce," resolved that the United States could not "without serious inquietude, see any part of the said territory pass into the hands of any foreign power."

The most famous statement of this philosophy is contained in President Monroe's message to Congress on December 2, 1823:

"The American Continents, by the free and independent condition which they have assumed and maintain, are henceforth not to be considered as subjects for future colonization by any European powers.

"The political system of the allied powers is essentially different in this respect from that of America. * * * We owe it, therefore, to candor and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those powers to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety. * * * With the governments who have declared their independence and maintained it, and whose independence we have, on great consideration and on just principles, acknowledged, we could not view any interposition for the purpose of oppressing them, or controlling in any other manner their destiny, by any European power in any other light than as the manifestation of an un-

friendly disposition toward the United States."

Simon Bolivar, the South American revolutionary hero, in his invitation to the Congress of Panama issued at Lima on December 7, 1824, to the Governments of Colombia, Mexico, Central America, Buenos Aires, Chile, and Brazil, proposed an assembly of plenipotentiaries "that should act as a council in great conflicts, to be appealed to in case of common danger, and be a faithful interpreter of public treaties, when difficulties should arise, and conciliate, in short, all our differences." In his instructions to the Peruvian delegates to the Congress issued by General Bolivar on May 15, 1825, he directed them as follows:

"You shall see that the proclamation which, under article 7 of these instructions, must be issued and published by the Great Congress of the Isthmus, contains such an energetic and efficient declaration as that made by the President of the United States of America in his message to Congress of last year in regard to the necessity for the European power of abandoning all ideas of further colonization on this continent, and in opposition to the principle of intervention in our domestic affairs."

The Treaty of Perpetual Union, League, and Confederation between the Republics of Colombia, Central America, Peru, and the United Mexican States, signed at Panama on July 15, 1826, stated that its object will be "to maintain in common, defensively and offensively, should occasion arise, the sovereignty and independence of all and each of the confederated powers of America against foreign subjection, and to secure to themselves from this time forward the enjoyment of unalterable peace, and to promote in this behalf better harmony and good understanding as well between the countries, citizens, and subjects, respectively, as with the other powers with which they should maintain or enter into friendly relations." Article 3 of the same treaty states:

"The contracting parties obligate and bind themselves to mutually defend themselves against every attack which shall endanger their political existence, and to employ against the enemies of the independence of all or any of them all their influence, resources, and naval and land forces, in the proportion which, according to the separate convention of equal date, each is bound to contribute to the maintenance of the common cause."

The United States and the Latin-American Republics began the joint consideration of their mutual welfare at the series of International Conferences of American States, popularly known as the Pan-American Conferences, starting at Washington in 1889. The President in calling that Congress acted in pursuance of the act of Congress of May 24, 1888, specifically requesting him to call such a conference. Historically, the most outstanding act of the first conference was its recommendation outlawing conquest. The conference had drafted an arbitration treaty and along with this treaty a recommendation was made that "the principle of conquest shall not, during the continuance of the treaty of arbitration, be recognized as admissible under the American public law." A second paragraph of the recommendation declared "that all cessions of territory made during the continuance of the treaty of arbitration shall be void if made under threats of war or in the presence of an armed force." This recommendation, adopted April 18, 1890, was in reality the beginning of the American doctrine of nonrecognition of acts contrary to treaty obligations which, when later applied to the Japanese aggression on China, became known as the Stimson doctrine.

Subsequent inter-American conferences in this series have reiterated the foregoing principle, and in later years have coupled with it another principle, that of American continental solidarity. A resolution of the

Sixth Conference, held in Habana in 1928, declared that "war of aggression constitutes an international crime against the human species."

At the Third International Conference of American States held at Rio de Janeiro in 1906, Elihu Root, then Secretary of State of the United States, made the following celebrated statement disclaiming any claim of the United States to hegemony in the Western Hemisphere:

"We deem the independence and equal rights of the smallest and weakest member of the family of nations entitled to as much respect as those of the greatest empire; and we deem the observance of that respect the chief guaranty of the weak against the oppression of the strong. We neither claim nor desire any rights or privileges or powers that we do not freely concede to every American republic."

President Wilson's great pronouncement at Mobile, Ala., on October 27, 1913, gave birth to what has been later called the good-neighbor policy. At that time, he said:

"The future, ladies and gentlemen, is going to be very different for this hemisphere from the past. These states lying to the south of us, which have always been our neighbors, will now be drawn closer to us by innumerable ties, and, I hope, chief of all, by the tie of a common understanding of each other. Interest does not tie nations together; it sometimes separates them. But sympathy and understanding does unite them, and I believe that by the new route that is just about to be opened, while we physically cut two continents asunder, we spiritually unite them. It is a spiritual union which we seek.

"Do you not see now what is about to happen? These great tides which have been running along parallels of latitude, and that opening gate at the Isthmus of Panama will open the world to a commerce that she has not known before, a commerce of intelligence, of thought and sympathy between north and south. The Latin-American States, which, to their disadvantage, have been off the main lines, will now be on the main lines. I feel that these gentlemen honoring us with their presence today will presently find that some part, at any rate, of the center of gravity of the world has shifted.

"What these states are going to see, therefore, is an emancipation from the subordination, which has been inevitable, to foreign enterprise and an assertion of the splendid character which, in spite of these difficulties, they have again and again been able to demonstrate. The dignity, the courage, the self-possession, the self-respect of the Latin-American States, their achievements in the face of all these adverse circumstances, deserve nothing but the admiration and applause of the world. In the future they will draw closer and closer to us because of circumstances of which I wish to speak with moderation and, I hope, without indiscretion.

"We must prove ourselves their friends and champions upon terms of equality and honor. You cannot be friends upon any other terms than upon the terms of honor. We must show ourselves friends by comprehending their interest whether it squares with our own interest or not. It is a very perilous thing to determine the foreign policy of a nation in the terms of material interest. It not only is unfair to those with whom you are dealing, but it is degrading as regards your own actions.

"Comprehension must be the soil in which shall grow all the fruits of friendship, and there is a reason and a compulsion lying behind all this which is dearer than anything else to the thoughtful men of America. I mean the development of constitutional liberty in the world. Human rights, national integrity, and opportunity as against material interests—that, ladies and gentlemen, is the issue which we now have to face. I want to take this occasion to say that the United

States will never again seek one additional foot of territory by conquest. She will devote herself to showing that she knows how to make honorable and fruitful use of the territory she has, and she must regard it as one of the duties of friendship to see that from no quarter are material interests made superior to human liberty and national opportunity. I say this, not with a single thought that anyone will gainsay it, but merely to fix in our consciousness what our real relationship with the rest of America is. It is the relationship of a family of mankind devoted to the development of true constitutional liberty. We know that that is the soil out of which the best enterprise springs. We know that this is a cause which we are making in common with our neighbors, because we have had to make it for ourselves.

"Reference has been made here today to some of the national problems which confront us as a nation. What is at the heart of all our national problems? It is that we have seen the hand of material interest sometimes about to close upon our dearest rights and possessions. We have seen material interests threaten constitutional freedom in the United States. Therefore, we will now know how to sympathize with those in the rest of America who have to contend with such powers, not only within their borders but from outside their borders also.

"I know what the response of the thought and heart of America will be to the program I have outlined, because America was created to realize a program like that. This is not America because it is rich. This is not America because it has set up for a great population great opportunities of material prosperity. America is a name which sounds in the ears of men everywhere as a synonym with individual opportunity because a synonym of individual liberty. I would rather belong to a poor nation that was free than to a rich nation that had ceased to be in love with liberty. But we shall not be poor if we love liberty, because the nation that loves liberty truly sets every man free to do his best and be his best, and that means the release of all the splendid energies of a great people who think for themselves. A nation of employees cannot be free any more than a nation of employers can be.

"In emphasizing the points which must unite us in sympathy and in spiritual interest with the Latin American peoples we are only emphasizing the points of our own life, and we should prove ourselves untrue to our own traditions if we proved ourselves untrue friends to them. Do not think, therefore, gentlemen, that the questions of the day are mere questions of policy and diplomacy. They are shot through with the principles of life. We dare not turn from the principle that morality and not expediency is the thing that must guide us and that we will never condone iniquity because it is most convenient to do so. It seems to me that this is a day of infinite hope, of confidence in a future greater than the past has been, for I am fain to believe that in spite of all the things that we wish to correct the nineteenth century that now lies behind us has brought us a long stage toward the time when, slowly ascending the tedious climb that leads to the final uplands, we shall get our ultimate view of the duties of mankind. We have breasted a considerable part of that climb and shall presently—it may be a generation or two—come out upon those great heights where there shines unobstructed the light of the justice of God."

Again, on December 7, 1915, President Wilson said in an address to Congress:

"The States of America are not hostile rivals but cooperating friends, and their growing sense of community of interest, alike in matters political and in matters economic, is likely to give them a new significance as factors in international affairs and in the political history of the world. It presents

them as in a very deep and true sense a unit in world affairs, spiritual partners, standing together because thinking together, quick with common sympathies and common ideals. Separated, they are subject to all the cross currents of the confused politics of a world of hostile rivalries; united in spirit and purpose, they cannot be disappointed of their peaceful destiny. This is pan-Americanism. It has none of the spirit of empire in it. It is the embodiment, the effectual embodiment, of the spirit of law and independence and liberty and mutual service."

The Covenant of the League of Nations specifically recognized regional understandings like the Monroe Doctrine. Article 21 of the Covenant reads as follows:

"Nothing in this Covenant shall be deemed to affect the validity of international engagements, such as treaties of arbitration or regional understandings like the Monroe Doctrine, for securing the maintenance of peace."

In the report of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee of January 15, 1929, recommending ratification of the Kellogg Pact, it is specifically stated that "the United States regards the Monroe Doctrine as a part of its national security and defense."

Following the conclusion of the Chaco War between Bolivia and Paraguay, President Franklin D. Roosevelt, on January 30, 1936, proposed the convening of an extraordinary Inter-American Conference at Buenos Aires.

In his circular letter of January 30, 1936, proposing the conference, President Roosevelt expressed the conviction that "the moment has now arrived when the American Republics, through their designated representatives seated at a common council table, should seize this altogether favorable opportunity to consider their joint responsibility and their common need of rendering less likely in the future the outbreak or the continuation of hostilities between them, and by so doing, serve in an eminently practical manner the cause of permanent peace on this Western Continent." He added: "These steps, furthermore, would advance the cause of world peace, inasmuch as the agreements which might be reached would supplement and reinforce the efforts of the League of Nations and of all other existing or future peace agencies in seeking to prevent war." (International Conferences of American States, First Supplement, 1933-40, pp. 129-130.)

The conference was held December 1-23, 1936. It adopted, among others, a Declaration of Principles of Inter-American Solidarity and Cooperation (p. 160) which proscribed territorial conquest and intervention by one state in the affairs of another. It also adopted a Convention for the Maintenance, Preservation, and Reestablishment of Peace (p. 188) which provided for consultation in the event that the peace of the American Republics is menaced from within or without.

(5) At the Eighth International Conference of American States held at Lima, December 9-27, 1938, a declaration was adopted to improve the procedure of consultation established by the preceding conference.

(6) The Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the American Republics have met for consultation under the Inter-American agreements of Buenos Aires and Lima on several occasions.

(a) Following the outbreak of the war in Europe on September 1, 1939, they met at Panama, September 23-October 3. Among other acts, they adopted a Joint Declaration of Continental Solidarity, a General Declaration of Neutrality of the American Republics, and a Declaration of Panama in which "as a measure of continental self-protection" it was declared that the American Republics are as of inherent right entitled to insist that the waters adjacent to the American Continent remain free from the commission of any hostile act by any non-American bel-

ligerent nation. The Declaration delimited the so-called neutrality zone which extended around the American continents for a distance varying from 300 to 1,400 miles. They agreed to consult together to determine the measures to be taken individually or collectively to secure the observance of the provisions of this Declaration (International Conferences of American States, 1st supp., 1933-40, pp. 334-336).

(b) A second meeting of the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the American Republics was held at Habana, Cuba, July 21-30, 1940, to consider, among other things, measures for the protection of the peace of the Western Hemisphere. In a Declaration on Reciprocal Assistance and Cooperation for the Defense of the Nations of the Americas (p. 360), the second meeting declared, "that any attempt on the part of a non-American state against the integrity or inviolability of the territory, the sovereignty or the political independence of an American state shall be considered as an act of aggression against the states which sign this Declaration." The second meeting also adopted a convention which declared "That any transfer, or attempted transfer, of the sovereignty, jurisdiction, possession, or any interest in or control over any such region to another non-American state, would be regarded by the American Republics as against American sentiments and principles and the rights of American states to maintain their security and political independence." (Pp. 373-374.) The treaty further provided that no such transfer would be recognized or accepted by the American Republics and stipulations were agreed upon for the provisional administration of European colonies and possessions in America in case of any such transfer or attempted transfer.

Following this meeting, the United States Congress, on April 10, 1941, adopted a joint resolution reading as follows:

"1. That the United States would not recognize any transfer, and would not acquiesce in any attempt to transfer, any geographic region of this hemisphere from one non-American power to another non-American power; and

"2. That if such transfer or attempt to transfer should appear likely, the United States shall, in addition to other measures, immediately consult with the other American Republics to determine upon the steps which should be taken to safeguard their common interests."

(c) The third meeting of the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of American Republics was held at Rio de Janeiro, January 15-28, 1942. The action of this meeting dealt largely with continental problems following the attack on Pearl Harbor and the entry of the United States into the war as a belligerent. The meeting reaffirmed previous declarations that any act of aggression by a non-American state against one of them was an act of aggression against all of them, and their complete solidarity and determination to cooperate jointly for mutual protection. A resolution recommended that the American Republics break off diplomatic relations with Japan, Germany, and Italy. (American Journal of International Law, supplement, vol. 36 (1942), p. 61.)

(7) (a) Following the publication of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals for the establishment of an international organization and prior to the convening of the United Nations Conference on International Organization at San Francisco, an Inter-American Conference on Problems of War and Peace was held in Mexico City in February and March 1945. The most important act of that Conference is what is known as the Act of Chapultepec, approved March 6, 1945. Its full title is "Reciprocal Assistance and American Solidarity." This act summarized the principles agreed upon at American international conferences since 1890. It reiterated the pre-

vious declaration "that every attack of a state against the integrity or the inviolability of the territory or against the sovereignty or political independence of an American state shall be considered as an act of aggression against the other states which sign this act." It added a definition of flagrant acts of aggression, that is, "Any invasion by armed forces of one state into the territory of another, trespassing boundaries established by treaty and demarcated in accordance therewith." It also repeated the provision that in case of acts of aggression or belief that such an act is about to be committed the signatories should consult together.

The history of the Rio Treaty from this point on is too well known to be repeated here. It can be seen, however, from the sources quoted that the provisions of this treaty embody the principles that have been followed by our own country since our establishment as an independent nation.

UNITED STATES INFORMATION PROGRAM OVERSEAS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on December 4 last I submitted four suggestions of ways and means adequately publicizing America abroad. I am glad to say that there was very widespread interest in my suggestions. Following up on them on December 10, I wrote a letter to Secretary of State Marshall describing my thoughts in somewhat greater detail and presenting certain specific proposals on which I sought his reactions and the reactions of other Government agencies. Because of the widespread interest in this subject, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD the text of my letter to General Marshall.

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

UNITED STATES SENATE,
December 10, 1947.

Gen. GEORGE C. MARSHALL,
Secretary of State,

Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR GENERAL MARSHALL: Knowing, of course, of your deep interest in bringing about an adequate United States information program overseas through a Voice of America, I am writing to you to respectfully submit some specific proposals which I made in the Senate along this line on December 4. These proposals might, of course, and undoubtedly will, if only in part, be incorporated in the ultimate Voice of America program. I have, however, not seen any mention recently of these specific features and/or practical plans for bringing them about. What I have seen are a lot of generalities about bringing to the attention of foreign peoples the truth about America through the medium of adequate publicity.

I know, however, that you are interested in any concrete plans and devices by which we can sell America to Europe rather than to have America sold short. I believe that there will be substantial agreement on the general proposal of adequate United States publicity of the right sort, but where we will fall down and where we have fallen down, I believe, is on the matter of executing our plans, concretely and, very important, economically.

As I see it, the major pitfalls we should avoid are:

1. The building up of a vast bureaucracy for alleged information purposes whereas a relatively small but adequate amount of personnel might be able to do the job in collaboration with private news-gathering and news-disseminating sources.

2. The wasteful squandering of a vast amount of money for information purposes.

simply because our foreign aid involves billions of dollars.

3. The dissemination of partisan type United States Government propaganda, in which the truth might be distorted by the particular political philosophies of Government officials.

On the occasion of my address in the Senate on December 4, the following were my four suggestions:

1. Air delivery to key cities and keymen in Europe of the latest issues of the big cosmopolitan dailies of America. (At present only issues many weeks old—"museum pieces"—can be secured.)

2. Dissemination of news about America through newspapers published in Europe, for example, through a regular American half page or full page in those foreign papers.

3. Air delivery and distribution of the great magazines of American.

4. Word-of-mouth circulation of the truth about America by Americans visiting in Europe.

Of course, items 1 and 3 are very similar, although the distribution problem for newspapers and magazines varies in some essentials.

It is, however, on point 1 that I want principally to confine these comments. I ask your kind indulgence in reviewing these somewhat lengthy thoughts.

In the Senate I asked the question: What is the single best organ of publicity about America overseas? My answer was: The daily newspaper. Not only are foreigners interested in general news about America but they would, of course, be particularly interested in the news about happenings in our land concerning groups of related national origins, as reported in our great dailies, whether they be the New York Times, the New York Herald Tribune, the Milwaukee Journal, or other papers.

The following, then, are proposals which have been submitted to me, on which I would like to get your reactions. I do not endorse these proposals (a) because I have not had the opportunity to study them in full, (b) because they are complex, and (c) because they involve both many private sources and numerous Government agencies—the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Post Office Department, the Commerce Department—as well as your own Department, from whom I am seeking to get well-qualified reactions.

1. The possibility of a United States Government subsidy of the shipment of United States periodicals abroad by air. (Obviously, it would be impossible to ship now, let us say, a 72-page issue of an American newspaper by air, for the cost would be prohibitive at present mailing rates in mass quantities.)

2. The possibility of suspending or reducing the United States tariff restrictions on the movement here of foreign periodicals. We would not, of course, allow the entry of any printed matter advocating the overthrow of our Government.

3. An amendment to all future foreign-aid legislation requiring that countries receiving the benefit of United States aid similarly suspend their tariff and other restrictions on the importation of United States printed matter. Freedom of port must be assured or else the air shipments will be made a farce by interminable customs delay.

4. The submittal by the United States to the International Postal Union of proposals for cooperation among all the nations for the free entry of air-borne periodicals.

5. Arrangement with foreign countries so that present exchange restrictions of those countries (preventing the shipments of dollars abroad for the purposes of payment for printed matter) be suspended. (Of course, I well recognize the financial plight of many of these countries, and this may seem to some to be requesting preferential treatment for the publishing industry. Nevertheless, I believe that, if the free flow of news-

papers and magazines is cut because of restrictions on exchange, foreign peoples will not be able to get the benefit of frank United States reactions to the world situation. These foreign peoples may thus be misled as to the United States position on international affairs.)

6. Arrangement for interlibrary loans of United States books overseas, particularly from our Library of Congress, wherever possible and appropriate.

7. Cooperation with the leading private individuals and organizations who are vitally concerned with selling the American idea. I have in mind such groups as the American Newspaper Publishers Association, the Associated Press, United Press, International News Service, and similar services, the National Association of Magazine Publishers, American Book Publishers' Council, etc., to handle both common problems of newspapers, magazines, and books, and problems unique to each medium.

8. Cooperation with the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization along the above lines.

The big problem, as I see it here, is to stimulate our private groups insofar as possible so as to tap our private American genius, at the same time that Government handles those aspects of the news-distribution problem which it alone can handle.

You know, of course, of the magnificent service which has been rendered to international understanding by both American newspapers and by foreign editions of American periodicals and American books. We have not, however, done anything but skim this market from any standpoint. The world is hungry for news about America and by America, as you know.

I believe that merely continuing our previous foreign publicity efforts abroad will not serve our present purposes nor our future needs. We are in a tremendous battle of ideas with a totalitarian power which is a past master at propaganda art. We need new devices, new media, new approaches to our overseas information program.

I do not believe, of course, that we can afford to squander or dissipate our money in this or any other program, but I do believe that we can invest it in ways best calculated to insure maximum returns for the American taxpayer. I do not believe either that we should try to substitute the propaganda of our Government for the propaganda of the Russian Government. On the contrary, I believe that America's great press wire services, her leading magazines, and similar institutions can do a magnificent job for us without involving us in the possibilities of a Government "propaganda mill" with a partisan approach.

I submit these thoughts to you for whatever value they may have. I sincerely seek your frank reactions, although I do not ask specific answers to any of these subjects because your responsibilities are, of course, tremendous during chaotic postwar conditions. Please be assured of my highest esteem in your vast endeavors.

Sincerely yours,

ALEXANDER WILEY.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. LUCAS asked and obtained consent to be excused from attending the sessions of the Senate during the remainder of this week.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I am advised by the majority leader that the Senate will probably not be in session tomorrow. I therefore take this occasion to submit a unanimous-consent request for leave of absence from the Senate on account of illness in my immediate family until the 6th of January, beginning with tomorrow at noon.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I should like to say a word. A while back I did express the opinion that the Senate will not be in session tomorrow. I would not wish the Senator from Georgia to place too much reliance upon that statement of mine. There are uncertainties respecting the situation in the Senate. There is an effort to reach adjournment during the week and one cannot be sure what will come before the Senate. I simply wish to speak that word of caution.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I modify my request and ask unanimous consent for leave of absence beginning at the conclusion of tomorrow's business.

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

SECTIONAL DISCRIMINATION BY A GOVERNMENTAL AGENCY

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I have received a letter from Mr. Edwin J. MacEwan, executive vice president of the Paterson Chamber of Commerce, Paterson, N. J., in which he raises a question which I feel should be brought to the attention of the Senate. Apparently, some of our Government agencies are entering into the sphere of high-powered salesmanship on a sectional basis. They are trying to induce the people of one section of the country to move to other sections, claiming that the West offers greater opportunities for profitable expansion than the East or any other section of the country. If they were in private business I should have no objection to their solicitations, but it certainly is not within the province of government as I have known it to become partisan in favor of any State or any section of the Nation. The people have always been permitted as free people to choose the place, State or section of the Nation in which they wish to live and work.

I desire to read Mr. MacEwan's letter because I am certain every Senator is interested in protecting and preserving the rights and opportunities of the citizens of their individual States, allowing those citizens to choose for themselves where they wish to live and where they wish to work and develop business.

Mr. MacEwan's letter is dated December 5, 1947, and reads as follows:

Mr. ROBERT M. LITTLEJOHN,
Administrator, War Assets Administration,
Railroad Retirement Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LITTLEJOHN: Within the last few days a brochure has come to my attention which was addressed to this office and which apparently has been issued by the Office of the Zone Administrator, 1182 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif. It is dated November 1947, and is entitled "Go West for Profitable Expansion."

We in the Paterson Chamber of Commerce are definitely opposed to this sort of propaganda emanating from a Government agency. We do not take exception to the attempt on the part of the War Assets Administration to dispose of any and all plants for which it may be responsible. We do object strenuously, however, to the phrase "Go West for Profitable Expansion," just as we would object to the phrase "Go South, or North, or East."

The section of the country where profitable expansion may take place is a matter of personal opinion and in our opinion no Government agency nor any Government official

has any right to hold up one section of the country against another section. As a matter of fact, inasmuch as the bulk of our Nation's population and the bulk of our Nation's taxpayers are located in the eastern part of the United States, it seems rather paradoxical that the money spent to build war plants in the far West, and which in a major part came from the eastern taxpayer, should now be used as a basis for attempting to raid the East in order to peddle the western plants.

Whether or not expansion in the West is profitable depends entirely on the economics of the industry, and for any Government official to imply that one may have profitable expansion by going west is, in my opinion, taking liberties far beyond the prerogatives of a Government bureau employee.

Most of these plants were built during the war regardless of the normal peacetime economics, for the purpose of scattering these establishments in the case of an attack by the enemy, without regard for availability of employees or any of the normal standards used in determining plant location in peacetime. Many industries could not operate profitably in some sections of the country regardless of how cheaply they might purchase or lease industrial space. Proximity to market, skill and productivity of employees and other human and economical factors more than offset inexpensively acquired real property.

It might be far less expensive to the American taxpayer if some of these plants were forgotten and charged off to the expense of carrying on war which we hope will not be repeated.

Sincerely yours,

EDWIN J. MACEWAN,
Executive Vice President.

Mr. President, I have written a letter to the Acting Administrator of the War Assets Administration, Mr. Jess Larson, bringing this matter to his attention and asking that he advise me if, in his opinion, it is proper for any agency of the Government, or administrator thereof, to solicit the people in any section of the Nation to go to some other section for profitable expansion. It seems to me if the time ever comes when such action is necessary and, therefore, proper, then the decision should be one for the Congress of the United States to make.

I assure the Senate I have a great respect for the West, and will say that some members of my family live in California, so my statement should not be construed as being opposed to any section of the country, but rather as questioning the wisdom of such a solicitation as the one contained in Mr. MacEwan's letter.

Great harm could come from ill-advised solicitation of this kind because if people moved from one section to another on Government advice and found that the opportunities which they were led to believe existed did not in fact exist, they might have just grounds for criticizing any agency of the Government or the Government itself for permitting such solicitation before the governing body of the people—the Congress—determined that it was right.

I am not advocating that the people remain in any particular part of the Nation, or any particular State, but as one of the Senators from New Jersey, I am saying that the people of New Jersey feel that New Jersey offers as great an opportunity for development in business and industry as any other State in the Union, and that it has by no means reached the limits for profitable expansion.

If the Government is going to do advertising such as that imputed to the War Assets Administrator by Mr. MacEwan, then I should like to be certain that New Jersey receives its share of honorable mention.

ADJOURNMENT OF THE LONDON MEETING OF THE FOREIGN MINISTERS

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "End of the Road," published in this morning's New York Herald Tribune. The editorial refers to the sine die adjournment of the Conference of Foreign Ministers.

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

END OF THE ROAD

On Secretary Marshall's motion the conference of Foreign Ministers has adjourned sine die. For the first time since it was established by the Yalta Conference, early in 1945, as a continuing medium of great-power consultation, it has risen from a total deadlock without setting any date for a resumption of its discussions. We have thus reached the end of another road.

It is worth while looking back toward its beginning. It was Hitler's attack on Russia in June 1941, which forged the coalition between Soviet Russia and the democratic west. At least one purpose of the Atlantic conference (which followed in August) was to clarify the terms on which this coalition would be conducted and to state what the United States could expect in return for the heavy lend-lease contributions which she was about to make. The Soviet Union's acceptance of the Atlantic Charter, when she joined the United Nations at the beginning of 1942, seemed to make the position clear, and large quantities of lend-lease aid were subsequently extended to her.

Unfortunately, it became more and more apparent that the position was not clear. An early effort by the Roosevelt administration to secure, under the terms of the Charter, the independence of the small Baltic States ended in the air, with an appearance of success which was soon to prove illusory. The difficulties accumulated as the war progressed. The earlier conferences were primarily military in purpose, but finally at Yalta President Roosevelt realized that the political differences would have to be solved; and no one can re-read his report to Congress on that gathering without the conviction that he believed they had been solved, in a great compromise of statesmanlike proportions. "We achieved," he said, "a unity of thought and a way of getting along together," and he added at a later point that "under the agreement reached at Yalta there will be a more stable political Europe than ever before."

From the early winter of 1945 until today the effort, in essence, has been to make the Yalta agreement work. The Council of Foreign Ministers was to have been the continuing, working instrument of that agreement. It has now ended in deadlock. This means that the age of Yalta has come to an end; the agreement has proved to have been no agreement, the compromise actually compromised nothing, the basic diversity of the two great systems has proved too great to be bridged by any of the principles or diplomatic adjustments upon which Yalta relied. We are in fact confronted by two worlds. It is better to accept the fact than to play any longer with the pretenses that it does not exist.

It was on Mr. Marshall's motion that the Council broke up; but the Russians had offered no basis on which it might have been continued. It is better so. The immediate result will be to double forge the

iron curtain that has already long separated the west from the Soviet systems, but at the very least that will for the first time afford us the opportunity to make the western system function on its own resources. The division of Germany will at least free us to incorporate western Germany into a viable western system; it will make many other problems easier, but it will also impose upon us a more compelling responsibility than before to see that our western system does function, to the best of its immense latent abilities, in the interests of those who live by it. One road ends. Another opens before us.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Failure at London," published in the New York Times of this morning, which is very similar in its conclusions to the editorial published in the New York Herald-Tribune.

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

FAILURE AT LONDON

After 3 weeks of futile debate, the London meeting of the Foreign Ministers Council has adjourned indefinitely. The Ministers' deputies are still supposed to meet today to explore the possibility of agreement on a treaty for Austria. But even in that matter it seems most unlikely that the deputies can succeed where their chiefs have failed, and unless a last-minute miracle takes place the London Conference may be considered at an end.

The failure at London is more than a failure of a conference, such as has occurred repeatedly before. This was a last-chance, show-down session, and its collapse marks also the collapse of the whole Yalta-Potsdam policy in both substance and procedure. It is a failure in substance because it has been unable to accomplish what it set out to do, namely, organize a united but disarmed, de-industrialized and decentralized Germany under four-power control as a basis for continued collaboration between Russia and the west. And it is a failure in procedure because the Foreign Ministers' Council, by giving Russia an absolute veto in all peace negotiations, has proved to be a costly blunder. It has already cost the world more than 2½ years of delay in peace, and its actual accomplishments have been so negative that even its author, Mr. Byrnes, is now willing to disown it.

Responsibility for the outcome at London has been identified correctly by Secretary Marshall. Three delegations, he declared—namely, those of the United States, Britain and France—have been able to agree and were willing to make the necessary decisions then and there. The Soviet Union alone refuses to agree. It refused to agree on a boundary commission to determine what territory the postwar Germany is to comprise—certainly a necessary preliminary to any kind of treaty. It refused to agree to stop its unilateral exploitation of Germany for its own benefit and at the expense of Germany, of the other victors, and of Europe as a whole. It even refused to provide information on this subject. On the contrary, it sought by every means to prevent or delay any kind of agreement, while it pursued its own aims by direct action in every European country where either its own troops or its Communist Fifth Columns could exert their influence. The events have amply demonstrated that these aims are nothing less than the establishment of a Russian hegemony over the whole European continent.

In these circumstances the Western Powers must now proceed with organizing peace and reconstruction as best they can. The first step in that organization must be the

political and economic unification of Germany, insofar as that is possible. That must mean, first of all, a merger of the three western occupation zones into an economic and political unit as a basis for the unification of all Germany, and the establishment of a provisional German government in the west as a foundation for an all-German Government on the federal basis agreed upon by the Western Powers. It must likewise mean the abolition of the allied military governments, which have proved to be as big failures politically and economically as the whole Potsdam system, and their transformation into purely occupational and military control authorities. Finally, it must mean the abolition of the Foreign Ministers' Council and the transfer of all future peace negotiations to what has always followed any war—a general peace conference in which all the belligerents, and not just the Big Powers, participate. That procedure is already being adopted in the case of Japan. There is no reason why it should not be followed in the case of Germany. If Russia wants to participate, well and good. If not, then the other nations will have to proceed without her. The world cannot wait for one power endlessly, or forever submit to Russian bluster and obstruction.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I think it would perhaps be too strong an expression to say, "Failure at London," because now that perhaps we have reached the end of the Potsdam program, henceforth there may be a peace conference of all the peoples of the earth who are interested in the peace, the foreign ministers having failed to make any progress in the last meeting. These two editorials call attention in a most forceful way to the two strategic or policy mistakes which we, understandingly, made. First of all, our conclusion to reduce Germany to a pastoral state. It is quite understandable why that conclusion should have been reached. It is very proper of course to destroy militarism as such, but the complete destruction of German economy was a vital mistake so far as the peace of western Europe and the world is concerned.

The second mistake which is recognized in both editorials is that we wholly misconceived the aims of Soviet Russia. Having been associated with Soviet Russia in a high military enterprise we naturally assumed that she shared somewhat our democratic ideas, at least our main objectives and purposes. Events have very clearly demonstrated that in both these conclusions we were in error, grievously in error, although our error was an understandable one.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. WHITE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

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

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

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

Aiken	Buck	Connally
Baldwin	Bushfield	Cooper
Ball	Butler	Cordon
Barkley	Byrd	Donnell
Bricker	Cain	Downey
Bridges	Capper	Dworshak
Brooks	Chavez	Eastland

Ecton	Lodge	Robertson, Wyo.
Ellender	Lucas	Russell
Ferguson	McCarran	Saltonstall
Flanders	McCarthy	Smith
Fulbright	McClellan	Sparkman
George	McFarland	Stennis
Green	McKellar	Stewart
Gurney	McMahon	Taft
Hatch	Magnuson	Taylor
Hawkes	Martin	Thomas, Okla.
Hayden	Maybank	Thomas, Utah
Hickenlooper	Millikin	Thye
Hill	Moore	Toby
Hoey	Morse	Umstead
Holland	Murray	Vandenberg
Ives	Myers	Watkins
Jenner	O'Connor	White
Johnson, Colo.	O'Daniel	Wiley
Johnston, S. C.	O'Mahoney	Williams
Kem	Overton	Wilson
Kilgore	Reed	Young
Knowland	Revercomb	
Langer	Robertson, Va.	

Mr. WHITE. I announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] is absent by leave of the Senate because of official business.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] is absent by leave of the Senate because of the death of his father, David E. Wherry.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. McGRATH], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are absent on public business.

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

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

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. VANDENBERG, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Lt. Gen. Matthew Bunker Ridgway (brigadier general, U. S. Army), Army of the United States, to be senior United States Army member of the Military Staff Committee of the United Nations with rank of lieutenant general;

Herbert S. Bursley, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Honduras;

Avra M. Warren, of Maryland, now Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to New Zealand, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Finland;

Robert M. Scotten, of Michigan, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to New Zealand; and

J. Russell Andrus, of California, and sundry other Foreign Service reserve officers, for promotion in the diplomatic service.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

The legislative clerk read the nomination of David A. Morse to be Under Secretary of Labor.

NORTH DAKOTA AND ITS RECORD IN PEACE AND WAR

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, some months ago I brought to the attention of the Senate the fact that more than half the members of the Cabinet at that time were residents of the State of New York. I also called attention to the fact that from the time North Dakota

attained statehood, no member of the President's Cabinet had ever been appointed from that State. I brought out the fact that in 57 years no Ambassador had ever been appointed from the State of North Dakota. I also disclosed the fact that in all that period of time no first assistant to any Cabinet member had ever been appointed from the State of North Dakota.

Today I pick up the Executive Calendar and find that out of 10 nominations 3 are from the State of New York and 2 from the State of Utah. I know that Senators are sympathetic; I know they believe that every State in the Union should have a square deal; I am sure they feel that the people of every State should be treated fairly in the matter of appointments.

I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the confirmation of the nomination of the Postmaster General yesterday was made after consideration by the Senate Committee on Civil Service. Some of us have made a determined effort to see to it that at no time in the future shall any Cabinet member, including the Postmaster General, be chairman of the national committee of any political party in the United States. I might add we went further and said we believe that postmasters should be appointed in the various towns from the rank and file of the men who had made the post-office business their career, and that the lowliest mail carrier, and the lowliest clerk, should feel that sooner or later, on the basis of merit, he might be appointed postmaster in his town.

Mr. President, I dislike very much to object to the appointment of David A. Morse, or to any other that is upon the Executive Calendar today. I certainly am not going to object to the confirmation of the appointment of Abe Murdock, of Utah. I shall vote to confirm his nomination.

Mr. President, I want to bring to the attention of the Senate once more the proud record of the State of North Dakota.

Three years ago today all America was holding its breath. The Battle of the Bulge was raging. The turning point in the war had been reached. The arsenal of democracy was undergoing its supreme test.

And now, 3 years later, democracy is being put to another test. We are called upon to make secure the peace which our armed forces so nobly won. But today the mightiest weapon in the arsenal of democracy is bread—not bullets.

Feeding the hungry people of the world is the No. 1 problem in the world today. One needs only to have listened to the debates in the Senate Chamber during the past several weeks to realize that fact. The continent of Europe is still on its knees, begging for food. Food is the foundation of the Marshall plan. Food will check the creeping paralysis of communism. And on the amount of food which this country can share with starving millions abroad may well hinge the history of the world for generations to come.

These facts are known to all of us. They have been pointed out many, many times by the Members of this body. My

own position has been that our country should send every ounce of food that can be spared for the relief of hunger and suffering in other parts of the world. We have already sent huge quantities. We can and should send more. There is not the slightest doubt in my mind that the great heart of America will answer the plea for food.

I wish at this time to invite the attention of the Senate to another aspect of the food problem.

During all the debate and newspaper comment on our aid-to-Europe program and the Marshall plan, it has seemed to me that one very important factor has been pretty largely overlooked. It is all very well to talk glibly about sending thousands upon thousands of tons of food to Europe, but I say it is time we gave a little credit to the men and women on our farms who produce the food, the men and women without whose help all the talk about feeding the hungry would be so many empty words.

As you know, Mr. President, I represent in part the great farming State of North Dakota. I want to take my hat off this afternoon to the farmers of North Dakota and to the farm people in other States for the truly magnificent job they have done in recent years in producing the food which is now so sorely needed.

One could very easily receive the impression, from reading the metropolitan newspapers here in the East, that all the food we are sending to Europe would miraculously become available by turning on a faucet, or by pressing a button some place; or one could be led to believe that these mountains of wheat were coming off the ticker tape at the Chicago Board of Trade, or that the Department of Agriculture was going to get this food out of a hat with the aid of a little Government hocus-pocus.

I wish it were as simple as that. But it is not. Every bushel of grain we send to Europe, every pound of meat, potatoes, butter, and eggs was produced on an American farm and represents the work and effort of an American farm family. I am happy, of course, that we do have food to spare. I am happy that our farmers have produced such good crops that newspaper editorial writers do not have to worry about where they are going to get the food they so freely give away. All I am asking is that they give the farmers a little credit. They should not become so absorbed in the problem of where the food is going that they completely forget where it came from.

For example, consider the ship loaded with wheat coming out of the mist in New York Harbor, bound for Europe. The history of the wheat in its hold does not begin in the harbor; it begins on a North Dakota farm. It is a part of Jim Thoreson's crop out near Valley City, N. Dak. Another part of it came from Tony Schmidt's farm near Napoleon. Bill Crockett hauled in 500 bushels to the elevator at Langdon. Another 500 bushels came out of Bill Kamrath's granary on his farm near Leith. Joe Allmares, near New Rockford, put in plenty of long hours to produce a part of it.

Mr. President, my colleague, the distinguished junior Senator from North

Dakota [Mr. Young] has produced thousands upon thousands of bushels of wheat upon his farm by actual hard work, and by devoting long hours to the task. What he has produced on his farm is typical of what the farmers do all over the great State of North Dakota.

These farmers and others like them on North Dakota's 70,000 farms, are the world's champions, when it comes to producing hard spring wheat. They cannot be beat.

I am proud of the record which these men and women on the farms of North Dakota have made in food production. I am proud of the contribution they have made, and are making, toward keeping thousands of men, women, and children from starving to death in Europe this winter.

And as one of the representatives of these farmers in the Senate of the United States, I am taking the floor this afternoon to call the attention of the Senate to their record, to pay tribute to their accomplishment, and to say that they have not been properly recognized in the matter of appointments by Chief Executives of the United States, both past and present.

The farmers of North Dakota produce more hard spring wheat than is produced in any other State of the Union. The farmers of North Dakota produce more durum wheat than any other State. They produce 90 percent of all the durum wheat grown in the United States.

This year we had another bumper crop. So much wheat that the elevators could not hold it all, and the railroads could not find enough boxcars to haul it. The crop exceeded 154,000,000 bushels, a total wheat production which is second only to that of the great State of Kansas.

In that connection I may say that Kansas raises soft wheat, not the fine hard spring wheat we produce in our State. When the people of Kansas want to bake good bread they add a handful of flour produced in North Dakota to the flour produced in Kansas in order to bake good bread.

The record made by the farmers of North Dakota in wheat production during the war years was even more spectacular. That record was made, incidentally, in spite of a great many obstacles. The farmers could not get help. Thousands of their sons had marched off to join the Nation's armed forces. They could not get equipment, tractors, trucks, or combines; but old men went back into the fields, even women and children pitched in, and by working long hours, patching up old equipment, and getting along as best they could, the farmers harvested an all-time record crop of approximately 162,000,000 bushels of wheat in 1944. The following year, 1945, they did even better.

One hundred and sixty-two million bushels of wheat. I wonder how many Senators have any conception of what that amount of grain represents in volume, or in the number of people for whom it will provide bread. Perhaps I can help Senators have in their minds a clearer picture of why North Dakota is known the world over as the breadbasket of the Nation.

A few weeks ago, it will be remembered, the Friendship Train started out from the west coast. As it rolled along eastward, communities along the way collected contributions of food for shipment overseas to those in need. By the time the train reached New York, it was 214 boxcars long.

Now let us suppose we decided to make up another Friendship Train with a North Dakota wheat crop of 162,000,000 bushels.

That train would be 900 miles long.

With the caboose at Fargo, N. Dak., this train would extend clear across the State of Minnesota, clear across the State of Wisconsin, through Chicago, clear across the State of Indiana, and halfway into the State of Ohio, and the engine of the 900-mile train would be chugging into the railroad yards at Columbus, Ohio.

It would be a train of 108,000 boxcars.

It would be the equivalent of 500 Friendship Trains of the size that pulled into New York the other day. And that represents only 1 year's wheat production in North Dakota.

Take another illustration. Suppose we were to put all that wheat into one big bin. We would need a bin 1 mile long, 1 mile wide, and 7½ feet deep.

If we built three more Washington monuments and used these and the old one as corner posts for our bin, it would be 555 feet high, a mile long, and 70 feet wide—filled to the brim with 1 year's crop of the finest wheat grown anywhere in the world. Our 162,000,000-bushel wheat crop would provide bread for more than 46,000,000 people for a whole year.

Argentina has been much in the news lately as a big wheat producer. And rightly so, but let me point out in passing that my State of North Dakota alone produces more wheat than the whole nation of Argentina.

In the last 8 years, since the beginning of the war, the farmers of North Dakota have poured into the world's grain bin 1,174,000,000 bushels of wheat, more than the total production of wheat in the United States in the record year of 1945.

These illustrations will give a graphic idea of the big and important part the North Dakota farmer has in the program for aiding Europe—and in helping to relieve the hunger, suffering, and misery so rampant in the world today.

Lest Senators get the idea that wheat is the only thing we produce in the land of the long furrow, let me say that until this year North Dakota led the United States in the production of flax, another crop vital to the Nation's economy. Since the war there has been a world-wide shortage of fats and vegetable oils. To help meet this need the country called upon the farmers to raise more flax. Flax is used in making linseed oil.

How the farmers of North Dakota responded to that call is told in statistics prepared by the Department of Agriculture. They almost tripled their production. The average crop between 1934 and 1943 was 4,500,000 bushels. Last year it jumped to eleven and a half million bushels. Only our neighboring

State of Minnesota exceeded that production.

North Dakota produces more barley than any other State. Until 1943 it ranked first in the production of rye. It is rapidly coming to the fore as a corn-producing State, but we must acknowledge that the farmers of Iowa and Illinois are champions in that field.

North Dakota is the Nation's largest producer of certified seed potatoes, and it ranks third among all the States in total potato production.

In 1946 our dairy farmers put 74,000,000 pounds of butter on the Nation's tables. Before the war, only three other States produced more turkeys than we did, and in 1946, our contribution to Thanksgiving and Christmas dinners totaled 961,000 birds. Our sheep and wool industry is also an important contributor of food and clothing. Out on our western ranges where once the buffalo roamed—and not so many years ago, at that—our farmers and ranchers now have herds of cattle totaling 1,800,000 head.

From this record of diversified agricultural production it can be seen that North Dakota can be counted upon to do its share of the big job ahead—the job of filling Europe's empty stomach, and of keeping our own people well fed and well clothed.

This record of agricultural production is really amazing when we stop to think of it, and when we realize that North Dakota is such a young State. There are many men in the Senate who are older than the State of North Dakota. My young friend and colleague, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER] was 25 years old and just getting started on his newspaper career in Topeka, Kans., when North Dakota was admitted to the Union back in 1889.

North Dakota's progress can be attributed to two things: First, we have some of the finest people in the world living out there. They are a courageous people—men and women who, in spite of hardship and adversity like the droughts of the 1930's, have conquered a raw prairie wilderness in three generations to build their homes, churches, and schools. I may add that a few years ago the Saturday Evening Post, in an article dealing with religion in this country, stated that in Trail County, N. Dak., there were more rural churches than there were in any other place in the United States. There were 12 churches in 3 townships—all of them country churches.

The people there are a progressive-minded, hard-working people, with the proud heritage of northern European countries in their blood—Norway, Sweden, Germany, Russia, Poland, England, France, and others.

North Dakota's roster of notable men includes such names as the late Dr. E. F. Ladd, president of our agricultural college, later a member of the United States Senate, and the man who pioneered the Nation's pure food and drug laws. Because of the fact that Professor Ladd had been president of the agricultural college, today all over the United States we have pure food and drug laws, and,

for that matter, all over Europe, because even the League of Nations sent for him.

Vilhjalmur Stefansson, the famous explorer, grew to young manhood in North Dakota. So did Maxwell Anderson, the noted playwright and Pulitzer prize winner.

When the Government gets into a really tight place it sends for a North Dakota man to help out. When Woodrow Wilson was President he suddenly discovered that the men who were buying the supplies for the Navy were a bunch of crooks and grafters. The President of the United States wanted an honest man to take charge of the buying of billions of dollars' worth of property for the United States Government, so President Wilson came out to North Dakota, to the little town of Emerado, a town of less than 100 people. There he picked out John M. Hancock. Mr. Hancock did the job so well that he was one of the few men decorated by both the Army and the Navy.

When President Roosevelt took office he found that all the banks in the United States had to be closed, and he declared a bank holiday. In Detroit Henry Ford alone had \$164,000,000 in one bank and could not get it out. Hundreds of thousands of men in the State of Michigan were out of employment. The President of the United States looked all over the country and picked out J. F. T. O'Connor, a young man reared in the State of North Dakota. To show the sterling character of this man, when he was a young man his family was so poor that when he went to school he carried his shoes in his hands until he got within a short distance of the schoolhouse, when he put them on. At that time he stuttered. Like Demosthenes, he placed a pebble in his mouth and learned to speak. He went out into the pasture and cured himself of the habit of stuttering, to such an extent that shortly after he graduated from the University of North Dakota he was employed as professor of oratory at Yale, and made an outstanding record there.

I repeat that when President Roosevelt had to find a man who could solve the problem confronting the banks of our country he sent for Mr. J. F. T. O'Connor. Mr. O'Connor, former Comptroller of Currency and now a Federal district judge in California, is a graduate of the State University of North Dakota and practiced law in that State. John Burke, three times Governor of the State, was United States Treasurer under Woodrow Wilson. Sveinbjorn Johnson, former justice of the North Dakota Supreme Court, was later professor of law at the University of Illinois.

Then there is Dr. H. L. Bolley, of the North Dakota Agricultural College, the man who developed the variety of wilt-resistant flax which benefited farmers by millions of dollars in reducing crop losses. John Hancock, the well-known New York banker and partner of Barney Baruch, is a graduate of the University of North Dakota.

Brig. Gen. Albert Hartl, who distinguished himself in the Aleutian campaign and later in the Pacific theater, was a North Dakota farm boy. A. C. Townley, the man who organized the Nonpartisan League back in the early

twenties and who led the farmer's battle for economic justice in a movement that swept through a dozen States, was a citizen of North Dakota, as was Daniel F. Bull, president of the Cream of Wheat Corp. in Minneapolis.

I might mention Lynn J. Frazier, who served with distinction in this Chamber for many years; Usher L. Burdick, his colleague in the House of Representatives; Carl Ben Eielson, the noted Alaskan aviator; and many other citizens of North Dakota who became leaders in their chosen fields—education, science, medicine, engineering, music, the law, and in other lines of endeavor.

Mr. President, whether it be in the arts or the sciences, medicine, or newspaper work, almost invariably there will be found at the very top of the ladder a North Dakota man. If today one of the Senators upon the floor should become ill and no one knew what was wrong with him, and he should go to the Mayo Brothers Hospital at Rochester, Minn., where so many people go, if there the doctors were baffled regarding the disease from which he might be suffering, if they did not know what kind of an operation to perform, a boy from North Dakota, born on a little farm in that State, would be the one who would make the ultimate decision as to whether there should be an operation or should not be an operation. He would be the man who in the last analysis would make the diagnosis.

Again, Mr. President, if one should go to the General Motors Company to buy a truck upon which he could absolutely depend to haul enormous loads, or a truck which might be expected to be sent across the sea in time of war, where would he go? The head of the truck division is a man who was born in Fargo, N. Dak., a young man by the name of Grant, who, when this magnificent truck was built by the General Motors Co., called it after the town in which he was born, the Fargo truck.

Population considered, more North Dakota men received the Congressional Medal of Honor in the Spanish-American War, than did men from any other State of the Union.

When World War I was over and France sent here a committee to choose the typical American nurse, the committee went to each one of the 48 States, and when they got all through they selected a little 18-year-old girl, Frances Lauder, of Wahpeton, N. Dak., the daughter of a district judge. If today, any of us should go to Paris he would find in the public square a life-sized statue of that little 18-year-old North Dakota girl.

That is not all, Mr. President. I want to show to the Senate the type of young women we produce in the State of North Dakota.

A few years ago, in the month of March, an unexpected blizzard occurred. It became bitterly cold. There is a little schoolhouse approximately 8 miles from Center, N. Dak. The teacher of that school, because of the blizzard, dismissed the pupils about 3:30 p. m., and among the pupils was a little girl named Hazel Minor, 16 years of age. She had with

her her brother and sister, both very much younger than she. They started home and were caught in the blizzard. They were not found that night, but the next day their overturned sled with one horse disengaged was discovered. It was then disclosed that the little girl had taken off her overcoat, her rubbers, and her cap and had placed most of her clothing over the bodies of the little brother and sister, and then she lay down, knowing that she would freeze to death. But she saved the lives of her little brother and sister. Today if one should go to Center, N. Dak., he would find in the public square a statue raised to the memory of that little 16-year-old girl, paid for by the school children of the State of North Dakota.

Recurring to the ability of the men of North Dakota, if today one's wife wishes to buy a first-class refrigerator or a first-class car, such as the Nash, she would in all probability purchase it from the Nash-Kelvinator Co., the president of which is George Mason, born at Valley City, N. Dak., who was reared and educated there and whose mother still lives in that town.

North Dakotans are a patriotic people. I have told the Senate something about the tremendous contribution of food they made to help win the war, and the contributions they are continuing to make to help win the peace.

Their patriotism was demonstrated even more emphatically in the number of North Dakota men who answered the call to the colors in this country's hour of need, and in the record the State made during the Victory loan drives.

North Dakota, as is well known, is a land of wide-open spaces. We have plenty of elbow room there. There is room to expand. In 1940, the population of the entire State was only 640,000. Yet in the last World War a total of 58,500 young men marched away from our farms, towns, and cities to join the Nation's armed forces.

I point proudly to the fact that of those 58,500 men, almost one-third of them went into the service by enlistment, without waiting to be drafted. There were 42,380 North Dakota men in the Army, 14,069 in the Navy, 1,785 in the Marine Corps, and 275 in the Coast Guard. There were 607 North Dakota women in the WAVES, and several hundred more enlisted in the women's corps of the Army and Marine forces.

Many North Dakota men made outstanding records while in the service. Many have been awarded medals and have been cited for bravery beyond the call of duty. Of the thousands who flocked to the colors at the Nation's call, 1,938 of them marched away never to return. They laid down their lives on the shell-torn beaches of Normandy and the steaming jungles of the far Pacific. I pray, with you, Mr. President, that they may not have died in vain, that the supreme sacrifice which they have made in the cause of freedom will help to bring a secure and lasting peace for all the world.

I should like also to mention at this time another outstanding accomplishment of the people of North Dakota of which I am inordinately proud. I refer

to the State's record in the various Victory loan and war bond drives.

Not another State in the Union can match that record. North Dakota led the Nation in oversubscribing its quota of war bonds in three of the six drives. North Dakota ranked No. 1 among all the States in the third and fourth war bond drives and in the Victory loan drive. It ranked second among all the States in the fifth and sixth war bond drives.

In the sixth war bond drive, the people of North Dakota bought more war bonds per person than the people of any other State. They ranked second in per capita purchases during the Victory loan and the fourth war bond drives. They exceeded the national average of per capita purchases in every single one of the six drives in which there were State quotas.

North Dakota's quota in the Victory loan drive was \$10,000,000. The people oversubscribed that quota by \$9,000,000, almost double the goal and 189 percent of the State quota. In the fourth and sixth war bond drives, E bond purchases in the State were 181 percent of quota. Its quota in each of these drives was \$11,000,000; sales mounted to more than \$20,000,000. It was 128 percent of quota in the third, 148 percent of quota in the fifth, and 114 percent in the seventh.

Altogether, the people of North Dakota bought more than \$128,000,000 worth of war bonds, and that figure represents the issue prices of the bonds, not the maturity value.

Fine people—and good soil. Those are the two biggest factors which have contributed to North Dakota's progress. Our black prairie loam is the richest and most fertile soil to be found anywhere in the country. Give our farmers plenty of rain, and we will match our grain production with that of any other part of the globe. At the North Dakota Agricultural College, in Fargo, we have a little experimental plot on wheat research. On that piece of ground they have raised a crop of wheat every year, for 65 years, without using one pound of commercial fertilizer.

I expect that our gross farm income in North Dakota this year will approach the billion-dollar mark. I have heard some complaining about that fact, from people who think that farmers are getting rich, from newspaper columnists and radio commentators who blame the farmers for the high cost of living. Let me say a word or two about that. It is true that the farmers are making more money than they ever did before. But so, it seems, is everybody else. The salaries of newspaper editors and radio commentators are up. The workingman's wages are up. The doctors' and the lawyers' charges are up. The profits of the businessman are up. Senators' salaries are up. Everything is up. The other day I saw some figures on 1947 profits of American corporations. They were fantastic, almost unbelievable, up 200 or 300 percent in some cases. If the farmers were making as much money as some of these corporations are, Mr. President, perhaps those who criticize the farmers would have something to be critical about. But to say that the farmer is more to blame

for the high cost of living than anyone else simply is not true. It does not jibe with the facts.

First let me say that it is not the farmers' fault that you have to pay 90 cents a pound for butter, 85 cents for a dozen eggs, 89 cents a pound for beefsteak, 12 cents for a pound loaf of bread, 60 cents for a pint of cream, 90 cents a pound for bacon. In the first place, the farmer did not have anything to do with setting these prices. In the second place, he does not get prices like that when he sells his products. No; the farmer does not set the prices he gets for his products. If he did he certainly would not have let the price of wheat drop to 19 cents a bushel at Bismarck, N. Dak., in 1933. The farmer has to take what he can get.

But in between the farmer and the consumer is a whole row of middlemen—commission men, transportation men, processors, jobbers, wholesalers, retailers—and obviously they are not there for the fun of it. They are there to make a profit. They render a legitimate service, and they get paid for what they do. Some of them, in my opinion, get too much.

At any rate, by the time they get through tacking on a few cents here and a few cents there, the relationship between what the farmer got and what the consumer paid is a rather distant one. Generally speaking, the price to the consumer is almost twice what the farmer got. Many people, when they start complaining about high food prices, forget that fact. The farmer gets all the blame but only half of the consumers' food dollar. The middlemen in between get the other half, without any of the blame, the latter probably due to the fact that they hire lobbyists and fancy propagandists to point out the poor farmer as the culprit.

I have here some interesting figures from the National City Bank of New York. They throw some additional light on this question of who is to blame for the high cost of living.

The net profits of the 23 largest baking companies in the United States jumped from \$29,000,000 in 1945 to almost \$61,000,000 in 1946—an increase of more than 100 percent in a single year.

Last year the Nation's 16 leading companies handling dairy products made a net profit of \$65,454,000, as compared with \$38,989,000 profit the year before—1945—a profit gain of 68 percent.

Remember that the figures I am giving you are for net income, after deducting taxes, depreciation, interest, and reserves.

The year 1946 was the year of the meat shortage and the year when the National Association of Manufacturers sounded taps over the dead body of OPA. I remember well the scene at the grave, the solemn vows and the pious promises that prices were going to be kept down.

Let us see what the big meat packers did that year, when Government price controls went off. In 1945, the net profit of 17 leading meat packers was \$34,825,000. In 1946, that profit jumped to \$70,461,000—another gain of more than 100 percent. I do not think I can be

accused of jumping to conclusions when I say that that gain might have had just a little to do with the high price of beef-steak.

Here are the figures on chain-store profits: The 19 leading food chains chalked up a net profit of \$20,898,000 for their stockholders in 1945. But in 1946, after OPA had died a lingering death, the stockholders were able to split a profit melon of \$45,446,000. That is a profit gain of 117 percent in a single year. It is just possible that that, too, might account for part of the rise in the cost of living.

Remember, Mr. President, these are the profit figures for just one set of middlemen, the processors. In addition, the farmers' products pass through four or five other handlers before they reach the consumer, and each one of them has to get paid and make a profit, too.

To those who think the farmer is largely to blame for the high cost of living, and think that the farmer is making an exorbitant profit, I want to point out this fact, taken from a report of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics: Out of the average dollar that the consumer spent for food in 1947, the farmer got only 53 cents. The other 47 cents went to somebody else—to processors and distributing agencies.

All right; the farmer gets just a little better than half the price the consumer pays for food. Let us consider for a moment what the farmer has to do with the 53 cents he gets out of each food dollar. Like anyone else who works, he is entitled to a fair wage. Nobody should expect him to put in 12 to 14 hours a day just for the fun of it, or to get up at 5 o'clock on a frosty morning to milk the cows just for the pure joy of it. So out of his 53 cents, the farmer has to get his own wages and pay the wages of his help. He finds that the hired man will not work today for what he would a few years ago. His wages are three times what they were a few years ago.

The farmer wants to buy a tractor. The tractor that he could have bought for around \$1,100 back in 1939 now costs \$1,600 or more. A two-bottom tractor plow that used to cost \$120 now costs \$170. He pays \$350 for a corn binder that he used to buy for \$230. He pays \$253 for a grain drill, instead of \$163.

A 10-gallon milk can costs \$7.43, although it used to cost \$4.75. If the rope on his hay sling wears out, he pays 51 cents a pound for it, instead of 25 cents a pound. His hardware dealer now charges \$8.80 for a leather horse collar that used to cost \$4.85. If his well goes dry and he needs new pipe, he cannot get it. But if he could, he would pay 30 cents a foot for it, instead of 18 cents. A spool of barbed wire now costs \$6.50, compared to \$3.40 a few years ago.

The farmer's wife also finds out that she needs a lot more money to run the house and keep the children clothed and fed. She pays \$5 for a pair of shoes that used to cost \$2.50. A 9 by 12 rug for the living room that used to cost \$31.60 now costs \$67. The same mattress that she paid \$9.92 for in 1939 now costs her \$22.80. A dining-room set costs

\$184 now, instead of \$56. A 10-pound bag of sugar is \$1.04, instead of 55 cents.

Work socks are priced at 27 cents a pair compared to 13 cents a few years ago. Bedsheets which she used to buy for 97 cents now cost \$2.78. A pair of overalls today costs \$2 more than they did in 1939. Seventy-cent work shirts are now \$1.85. A washing machine costs \$129 compared to \$59 a few years ago. Paint is \$5.20 a gallon instead of \$2.92.

So it goes, all down the line. Farm prices are up, but so is everything the farmer has to buy. He pays more taxes, more for upkeep and repairs, more for operating expenses generally.

It cost the North Dakota farmer \$10.50 to raise an acre of wheat in 1940.

In 1945 his production cost per acre was \$18, and for 1947 it probably amounted to around \$20 per acre.

Translating that into production costs per bushel of wheat, in 1939 it cost the farmer 84 cents a bushel, but in 1945 the cost had jumped to an average of 95 cents a bushel.

So it can be seen that when we take everything into consideration, the farmer is not the bloated profiteer he has been painted. As I pointed out, he has nothing whatever to say about the price he gets for his product. He has to take just what he can get, come depression or boom, supposedly in accordance with the old law of supply and demand. When that law operates to ship thousands upon thousands of tons of food out of the country, when it operates to triple our exports of wheat in a single year, obviously the prices are going up, just as the price of any other commodity would rise in a comparable situation.

A word now to the ladies and gentlemen of the press and radio corps before I leave this particular phase of my subject. I hope I have not bored them with my facts and figures. I hope they will join me in righting the grave injustice that has been done to the American farmer in trying to saddle him with most of the blame for the high cost of living. I hope they will use the facts and figures I have given them in their news and radio dispatches, to counteract the misrepresentations and the distortions that have gone out, and to give the American people the true picture of the situation as it actually exists.

In this connection, Mr. President, I may say that every Senator on this floor, I am sure, is aware of the fact that my distinguished colleague the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Young], time and time again has risen in the Senate and has called the attention of his colleagues to the fact that as a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry he has made investigations abroad. He has made visits to other countries investigating the conditions in those lands, so that as a result of what he learned on his trips opportunities for farmers in the United States might be better. It can readily be seen that one who is a farmer himself, and is intimately acquainted with the conditions existing in this country, can go abroad and make a more thorough examination of agricultural conditions in the countries he happens to visit than could a man who had not had that hard personal experience.

I desire now to give the facts behind the story of prices, and also to point up the fact that the man who is shouldering the greatest responsibility in our current program for aiding Europe is the American farmer.

The people of North Dakota have every right to be proud of the record they have made, of the food, men, and money they contributed toward the winning of the war, and the help they have given since the war in feeding the hungry people of the world.

I want to emphasize, however, that North Dakota is not living in the glories of the past. Her people are looking forward to an even greater future. They are looking forward to the day when they will play an even larger part in contributing strength and greatness to our country.

A moment ago I mentioned North Dakota's incomparably rich soil as the State's greatest natural resource. I now wish to call attention briefly to two other State resources which are of vital importance in our long-range planning for a better America.

The first of these resources is our tremendous deposits of lignite coal, more than 600,000,000,000 tons.

Our second great natural resource is a mighty river, the Missouri.

North Dakota has lagged behind other western States in the development of her water resources, due partly to the reluctance of Congress in granting the necessary funds required for such development. We North Dakotans have realized for a long time the possibilities of developing the Missouri and other rivers in the State. We never gave up hope that some day others would see the value of such development. I remember, for example, that when I was Governor of North Dakota, back in the early 1930's, I appointed the State's first water conservation commission, and got the State legislature to make an appropriation to start work on the survey and construction of small irrigation projects. At that time, as I remember, my distinguished colleague was a member of the Senate of North Dakota, and of its committee on appropriations.

Before 1941, when I came to the Senate, not one single dollar of Federal money had been appropriated to build a major dam in North Dakota. The only Federal funds we got for that purpose came from the WPA to build small dams for stock-watering ponds. Up to that time, 1941, not one large dam had been built in the entire State of North Dakota.

I am very happy to say that that situation has changed. Today there are four major dams under construction, or on which work is about to start. One of these dams, the Garrison Dam, will be the biggest dam ever built anywhere in the world. The others are smaller dams—Baldhill Dam, Park River Dam, and Heart River Dam.

We are grateful that the "go ahead" sign has been posted on these four projects, and on behalf of the people of North Dakota I wish to thank the Members of the Senate and the House who have made it possible to undertake these developments.

Garrison Dam, in addition to providing the water for ultimate irrigation of more than a million acres of land in North Dakota, will speed the industrial development of the State through the generation of low-cost power. It will also do much to eliminate the disastrous floods which have ravaged the lower valley, with losses running into millions of dollars.

From the standpoint of future industrial development, however, our most valuable natural resource is coal. Imagine, if you can, 600,000,000,000 tons of coal. That is more than one-fifth of our total coal reserve in the whole United States. It is more coal than can be found within the borders of any other State.

It is enough coal to take care of the coal requirements of the United States for 1,000 years.

At the present time we have barely scratched the surface in developing this big coal deposit. But I make a prediction here this afternoon that the day is coming when that coal will be more precious to the people of the United States than gold. That it will become the foundation for the establishment of a great many new industries, and help this country to maintain its position as the greatest power on earth. That development will not come about in my lifetime, and probably not in the lifetime of anyone else in this chamber. But I am certain it will come eventually.

Already the experts are becoming alarmed at the rapid rate at which our reserves of petroleum, gas, and hard coal are being depleted. There is a shortage of gasoline and fuel oil in several parts of the country. We may have to go back to a rationing system for these commodities. In some sections of the country there is also a shortage of electric power to meet the expanding needs of industry and farm electrification.

That is where our North Dakota lignite coal comes into the picture, and why some day it is going to be of such vital importance to the Nation's economy. From lignite coal we can make gasoline, we can make fuel oil, we can make power alcohol.

C. Girard Davidson, Assistant Secretary of the Interior, tells me that our lignite is one of the most promising sources for synthetic liquid fuels that we have in this country. He said that the coal fields of North Dakota, South Dakota, and Montana could be converted so as to yield more than 500,000,000,000 barrels of gasoline. We get a better idea of what that means when we remember that our present total proved reserves of petroleum in the United States amount to only about 21,000,000,000 barrels.

I can foresee the day when western North Dakota will be dotted with giant extraction plants over our big coal beds, converting lignite into gasoline, fuel oil, power alcohol, and other products. I can foresee the day when another big-inch pipe line will tap this buried treasure in North Dakota to bring oil and gasoline into the heart of industrial America.

The products we can get from lignite coal are almost endless. It can be converted into gas for use in firing huge fur-

naces. It can be used to make plastics of all kinds. It can be made into nylon, into activated carbon and hydrogen gas. It will be used in developing sponge iron from the low-grade ores in the Minnesota iron range. It can be pulverized, and made into briquettes that have just about the same heating value as eastern hard coal. From lignite coal we can manufacture synthetic ammonia for fertilizers. Lignite can also be processed into a whole series of coal tars for use in making paints, creosote, disinfectants, dyes, and many other products.

Scientists at the University of North Dakota have done a great deal in lignite research, aided by the United States Bureau of Mines, which has several laboratories and experimental plants working out various processes for the development of our lignite resources.

No one realizes better than the American petroleum industry that we are rapidly reaching the bottom of our oil barrel in this country, and that our coal reserves will become increasingly important as a source of synthetic liquid fuels. Just last spring, the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey announced tentative plans for the construction of a \$120,000,000 plant for the conversion of bituminous coal. An experimental pilot plant is also going to be built near Pittsburgh.

So Senators can see why North Dakota, with 600,000,000,000 tons of coal in the bank, looks forward to the future with such confidence. It will continue to be "the breadbasket of the Nation," but it is also destined to become of tremendous importance in sustaining the Nation's industrial economy.

As I have said, North Dakota is a young State. We have been so busy plowing up our prairies that we have not had much time to think about industrial development. Neither have we had the capital required. And it has been only in recent years that the country has come to realize the importance or the need for industrial expansion in the west.

Some who have never been out to North Dakota may be thinking to themselves that I should not be promising all this coal for industrial development. From the various stories they have read in the newspapers, they may be thinking that we are going to need all that coal ourselves, to keep us warm during the winter months. I should like to say a few words about that.

Many persons, particularly here in the East, have a great many simply fantastic ideas about North Dakota weather. Most of them get those ideas from the fact that it sometimes gets a little cold there. The newspapers carry a story once or twice a year that the temperature at some North Dakota point dropped to 25 or 30 degrees below. People say "B-r-r-r-r," and jump to the conclusion that it is that way all the time, that from November through May North Dakota is just one big ice box, with snow drifts 20 feet high.

Personally, I believe that many persons in the East nurse along such ideas because they want to, because they want to think that we are worse off in North Dakota, because it is the only way they can reconcile themselves to the lousy winter weather that Washington, Phil-

adelphia, New York, and Boston have to put up with.

It is going to come as something of a shock to these persons when I reveal that we really have some lovely winters in North Dakota. Our cold is a dry, crisp cold that sets the blood tingling. It is not the damp, soggy, bone-chilling cold that is experienced on the Atlantic Coast. I have seen many a winter day out in North Dakota with the temperature in the forties, a gentle chinook wind blowing and the sun brightly shining, when a jacket or light topcoat was plenty warm enough.

To be sure, there are generally 3 or 4 days of freak weather every winter, when it gets cold enough to get into the papers. And every once in a while a rip-snorting blizzard comes whipping in off the prairies. These extremely cold days and occasional winter storms are, however, the exception rather than the rule. But unfortunately, like the man who bit the dog, it is these exceptions that make the news. We publicize divorces in boxcar letters, but the only way a happily married couple every gets any publicity is by winning a quiz program.

Weather records kept at Bismarck, the State capital, for a 71-year period show that the average snowfall per winter amounts to only about 31 inches. The average January temperature varies from 14 above in the southwestern part of the State to 2 below in the extreme northeast corner. At Bismarck, on the average, the temperature is above zero on all but 17 days in January, all but 13 days in February, 5 days in March, 3 days in November, 11 days in December.

One thing we can always count on in North Dakota is plenty of sunshine—winter, summer, spring, and fall. We practically have a guaranteed delivery of sunshine at the rate of about 2,800 hours a year. Other States which compare very favorably with North Dakota on that score are California, Florida, and Texas. The average annual hours of sunshine in most parts of these States is about the same as that we get in North Dakota.

The people for whom I feel sorry are those who feel sorry for us. We North Dakotans marvel at the strength of character and the endurance of the people of New York, Philadelphia, and Washington. We marvel at how well they have managed to survive all their dreary, dark, and drizzly winter days, and how stoically they accept their fate of living in a land of wet feet and perpetual sniffles. For our part, we will take clean white snow and a dazzling sun, thank you.

The fact is—and the record proves it beyond the slightest shadow of a doubt—that North Dakota has one of the most zestful, healthful climates of any State in the Union. Anyone who is lucky enough to be born in North Dakota and live there has a pretty good chance of living to a ripe old age. Our death rate and infant mortality rate are among the lowest in the Nation.

North Dakota is a grand State, a State of wide horizons. Our people live close to nature. They are not too busy to enjoy the beauties of nature and the simple

things of life. And let me say that there is no more beautiful sight in all this world than a North Dakota sunset, or the moon coming up over a waving field of grain on a quiet, peaceful summer night.

I think that James W. Foley, our North Dakota poet, has come closer than anyone else to putting into words the spirit of our people and the love they have for their State. Here is the way he expressed it in his poem A Letter Home, telling the story of a young man in North Dakota who writes back home to his father in the East:

A LETTER HOME

Like to come and see you, daddy, and perhaps
I will some day;
Like to come back East and visit, but I
wouldn't care to stay.
Glad you're doing well, and happy; glad you
like your country best,
But, for me, I always hunger for the free-
dom of the West.
There's a wholesomeness about it that I
couldn't quite explain;
Once you breathe this air you love it and
you long for it again;
There's a tie you can't dis sever in the
splendor of its sky—
It's just home to you forever and I can't
just tell you why.
It's so big and broad and boundless and its
heaven is so blue;
And the metal of its people always rings so
clear and true;
All its billowed acres quiver like the shudder
of the sea
And its waves roll, rich and golden, in upon
the shore for me.
Why, your farm and all the others that we
used to think so fine
Wouldn't—lump 'em all together—make a
corner lot of mine;
And your old red clover pasture, with its
gate of fence rails barred,
Why, it wouldn't make a grass plot in our
district schoolhouse yard.
Not a foot has touched its prairies but is
longing to return,
Not an eye has seen the sunset on its western
heavens burn
But looks back in hungry yearning, with the
memory grown dim,
And the zephyr of its prairies breathes the
cadence of a hymn
That is sweet and full of promise as the
"Beulah Land" we knew
When we used to sit together in the queer,
old-fashioned pew,
And at eventide the glory of the sun and
sky and sod
Bids me bare my head in homage and in
gratitude to God.
Yes, I love you, daddy, love you with a heart
that's true as steel,
But there's something in Dakota makes you
live and breathe and feel;
Makes you bigger, broader, better; makes
you know the worth of toll;
Makes you free as is her prairies and as
noble as her soil.
Makes you kingly as a man is; makes you
manly as a king;
And there's something in the grandeur of
her seasons' sweep and swing
That casts off the fretting fetters of your
East and marks you blest
With the vigor of the prairies—with the
freedom of the West!

Mr. President, I hope that in the 45 minutes I have taken this morning I have been able to emphasize once more the great State whose people I have tried faithfully to describe. I believe Senators will know them better, as the result of what I have said about them.

I hope my remarks will make every Senator zealous in seeing to it that one State out of the 48 States is not discriminated against in the matter of appointments. I hope it will be conceded, in view of the fine record North Dakota has made during 57 years of statehood, that certainly the people of that State are entitled to recognition by the executive department.

In conclusion, I simply repeat what I said on a former occasion, that no matter what the future may bring forth in this great Nation, the people of the State of North Dakota may always be counted upon by the President, whether or not they ever get a Federal appointment.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I should like to say to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota, I think his desire to have some appointments made from North Dakota is a very laudable and proper one, but I also want to remind him that the appointee under discussion, Mr. Morse, comes from New Jersey. The Senator has a very lovely daughter, who is now married and lives in New Jersey, and is one of my constituents; so that if the Senator does not get the appointment first-hand, he gets it second-hand.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR—DAVID A. MORSE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of David A. Morse, of New Jersey, to be Under Secretary of Labor?

The nomination was confirmed.

JOHN T. KMETZ

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John T. Kmetz, of Pennsylvania, to be Assistant Secretary of Labor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the confirmation of the nomination? The Chair hears none, and the nomination is confirmed.

HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE ADMINISTRATOR

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Raymond Michael Foley, of Michigan, to be Housing and Home Finance Administrator.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

FEDERAL HOUSING COMMISSIONER

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Franklin D. Richards, of Utah, to be Federal Housing Commissioner.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

NOMINATIONS IN THE ARMED SERVICES

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, the Senate Armed Services Committee has this morning approved the nominations of junior officers in the armed services, all below the rank of general or admiral. I ask unanimous consent for immediate consideration of the nominations, without printing their names on the Executive Calendar.

Mr. WHITE. As I understand, the nominations come to the Senate with the unanimous report of the Armed Services Committee?

Mr. GURNEY. The nominations are unanimously approved by the Armed Services Committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request made by the Senator from South Dakota? The Chair hears none, and, without objection, the nominations in the armed services are confirmed without printing the names on the Executive Calendar.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Abe Murdock, of Utah, to be a member for a term of 5 years, pursuant to Public Law 101, Eightieth Congress.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination?

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, the nominations of members of the National Labor Relations Board, and of the general counsel, which are before this body for action today prompt me to make some observations germane to the policy of the Senate in the performance of its constitutional duty in "advising and consenting to" or rejecting Presidential appointments. I also intend to say something about the President's action in making these appointments.

First, let me assure the Senate that I am not going to fight the confirmation of the nominations. I do not consider it my duty to do so, nor is it advisable for reasons which will appear in this statement. But I do want to speak my mind on the way matters of this kind are disposed of by the Senate and the manner in which these nominations were handled by the President.

I hope it will not be thought that in doing so I am without respect for the President, for this great deliberative body, or for the men who make up its membership. I have respect for all.

I have been disturbed, and not a little chagrined, at the vehemence of the criticism which has been leveled at the Senate—or probably it is more accurate to say at some of the Members of the Senate for their conduct in considering Presidential appointments.

In commenting on the famous Lillenthal case which was before the Senate at the last session a leading newspaper of the United States carried a highly critical editorial, from which I quote pertinent statements:

The Lillenthal affair has become something more than a Senate squabble over affirmation of a Presidential appointment. It is a national disgrace and has placed this country in a dangerous international position. The entire perfection and promotion of America's vital atomic-energy program has been held up by the idiotic jockeying of a small group of Senators who are putting personal and political advantage ahead of the welfare and safety of the Nation. * * * Led by an irresponsible Member of the Senate, MCKELLAR, of Tennessee, a willful minority is holding up the appointment of a man whose qualifications have been certified by leaders in all parties. * * * Federal and State authorities are being roundly condemned for failure to close down unsafe coal mines until disaster struck at Centralia. How much more culpable are these Senators who are fiddling while a world catastrophe draws ever near. * * * These headstrong Senators are playing the enemy's game, whoever that enemy may turn out to be. They are killing time while the fate of

the Nation—of the whole world—hangs in the balance.

That, Mr. President, is very strong language. Numerous other newspapers in the United States were equally outspoken, and biting criticism from all sides poured in on the Senate of the United States, and, I may add, on the party which was in control of the Senate at that time.

I had heard statements of this type before I became a Member of this body. I had heard denunciations of the so-called senatorial courtesy custom of the Senate; that it was of more importance to Senators than the actual welfare of the Nation; that the Senate was a sort of a gentlemen's club and that Members of the Senate would stand by each other come what may; and that senatorial courtesy was extended to former Senators as well.

The editorial from which I have just quoted aroused in me a determination to find the truth of the matter, and if the charges proved to be true, what, if anything, could be done about correcting conditions. As a result I wrote a statement on the subject which I intended to deliver in the Senate, but never did. I now ask unanimous consent to have that statement placed in the Record at the conclusion of my present remarks. It contains my findings which indicated that the editorial writer was not acquainted with the record. If he had been, he would not have made such statements.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the statement will be printed, as requested.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. WATKINS. I found that there were more witnesses for Mr. Lillenthal than there were against him. The time consumed at the hearings before the Atomic Committee was about evenly divided between those in favor of Mr. Lillenthal and those against him. The role played by the senior Senator from Tennessee was greatly overemphasized by the press because it was a colorful story.

Apparently the committee considered its function to be that of a jury which was to hear the evidence presented by the prosecutor and by the defendant, and from this determine the qualifications of the nominee. Under this theory, the senior Senator from Tennessee was the prosecutor, and Lillenthal, the defendant.

That my conclusions are correct is borne out by the following quotation from a very effective speech by the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] made in behalf of Mr. Lillenthal. Said the Senator:

Since it is impossible for all Senators to know the record developed in 7 weeks of utterly exhaustive hearings, I respectfully suggest that fair-minded men cannot wholly ignore the impact of the cold hard fact that eight out of nine of the Senate's own jury, commissioned by the Senate to pass upon the facts, report, regardless of party lines, in favor of confirmation.

That illustration was carried out to a great extent in subsequent language in the speech to which I have referred.

It will be noted that the Senator said to "pass upon the facts." Had the com-

mittee made its own investigations, the "prosecutor" in this case would have been relegated to a very minor role indeed.

May I respectfully suggest that if there is to be any jury role played at all it should be by the entire Senate, and not by one of its committees.

As it was, the senior Senator from Tennessee carried the burden of the investigation apparently because no one else was willing to do so. He was permitted to set the pace and the direction of the hearings, although it should be said in fairness that he and his witnesses used no more time than did the friends of the nominee. But what he did had a big influence on the time used by the so-called defendant in the case.

What were the net results of the long-drawn-out wrangling? Lillenthal was confirmed at last, the Republican Party got a black eye because it controlled both the Atomic Committee which held the hearings and also the Senate; and the Senate itself, I regret to say, sunk to a new low in public esteem if we can believe newspaper accounts and editorials.

On the state of this record, then, is it unfair to say that in the consideration of the Lillenthal nomination that undue extension of senatorial courtesy, both in committee and in the Senate interfered with public welfare? I am convinced that the public thought it did.

Then there was the Gordon Clapp case. It will be recalled that Mr. Clapp was nominated for the position of Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority. This case largely paralleled that of Lillenthal—the same witnesses, the same methods, the same result.

I sat as a member of the Public Works Committee, and I know that the members of that committee were trying to do a good job; but it seemed that we were following the custom which had been established in the Senate of letting someone else bring in the evidence, and letting the man who was under charges meet the evidence. We did very little on our own initiative. I say that without any desire to criticize the chairman or the members of that committee, or the other committee, for that matter.

Over the years there have been other cases. The issues were different, but the methods of considering the nominations were the same.

Now we come to the present nominations in the labor administration. Men's memories are short, so a little background may be helpful. That these offices are important we all agree. The Taft-Hartley bill has been enacted after a long, bitter fight. The President says the law is one of the most important adopted in generations. He has condemned it as a shocking piece of legislation, one that will destroy our democratic institutions; in fact, no President, in my opinion, has ever denounced a measure in such harsh terms as the labor law has been denounced by the President. And no President ever fought harder to have a veto sustained than has the President.

Under such circumstances the President within a very few days before the day set for adjournment of Congress,

last July, sent the names of the nominees now before us to the Senate for confirmation.

Only one of the appointees was known to me, former Senator Murdock, of Utah, and I had no advance information that he was to be appointed. Although my personal acquaintance with him was slight, I knew something of his record as a public official.

I made a statement before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of the Senate, to which the nominations were referred. In that statement I said:

After a long, bitter struggle, the American people, through more than two-thirds of their Representatives in Congress, have enacted the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947, but our job is only half done. Our time and effort will be utterly wasted and the people will be without relief unless we see to it that the law is properly interpreted and successfully enforced. That we can do by approving only such appointees who have ability and who can act fairly and impartially.

I say "we," meaning Congress, advisedly, for the reason that it should be abundantly clear by now that the President, by his bitter denunciation of the law, his gross misrepresentation of its provisions and its effects, and his implied prediction that it will end in failure, has largely disqualified himself as a fair-minded and sincere administrator of the law.

If he succeeds now in enforcing the law, and it should be a success after his bitter fight against it, he will be proving to the world that he was utterly mistaken and he will be injuring his chances for reelection.

To act completely in a disinterested manner, and without bias under such circumstances is too much to ask of human nature.

In a special sense under the circumstances, then, Congress must exert its full power to the end that the law shall be given a fair opportunity to succeed.

One of the first and most important steps in that direction is to see to it that the members of the Board and its chief counsel are sympathetic to the law, believe in its purposes, and are convinced that it is workable. Members with any other points of view would be under a handicap too heavy to overcome.

The duties of the Board under the new law are largely judicial, and in keeping with that fact, its members should be free from any bias or prejudice for or against either labor or management. They must not be men who are against the union-labor movement, and they must not be men who desire its destruction or who have a record of having worked for the repeal in toto of the Wagner Act.

On the other hand, and for the same reasons, Board members should not be radically and strongly pro-labor. Open-mindedness, the ability and desire to act fairly and impartially in the discharge of their duties under the law, should be prime and essential qualifications of Board members, and to these, of course, should be added character, learning, and the proved ability to act in a judicial capacity.

I told the committee that I thought Mr. Murdock was disqualified to act as a Board member by reason of his strong pro-labor bias and the heavy obligations he was under to the labor-union leaders because of the campaigns they had conducted for him. I felt that his record, which I gave the committee in some detail, showed clearly that he was unsympathetic with many provisions of the new labor law. I made it clear I opposed him as a matter of principle and not for any personal reasons.

Here I should like to digress to state that I informed Mr. Murdock in person that had the President nominated him for any office having to do with the administration of an act with which his record justified the conclusion that he was in full sympathy I would not only vote for his confirmation but would help to get him the appointment. I want to make it clear that I oppose him as a matter of principle and not for any personal reasons. He was not and is not now personally obnoxious to me. I specifically disclaim any such feelings in my mind and in the statement which I am now making.

I also seriously questioned the qualifications of Mr. Denham and Mr. Gray. These positions in my judgment require men of outstanding ability and fairness. Without intending to reflect on these men at all, I felt that they failed to measure up to the standards required for these extremely important offices. I was convinced the President had not given sufficient weight to the high requirements of these offices in making his appointments.

Congress adjourned without confirming the nominees. The President then made interim appointments of the same nominees.

Mr. President, I did not appear when the Senate committee again took up these appointments. I consider that I had done my full duty when I appeared before the Labor Committee on the occasion of their first appointment, and gave to that committee the statement that I then made. I refuse to be cast in the role of a prosecutor. I have no personal feud with any of these men. I have not changed my mind at all on the wisdom of these appointments or on the manner of their designation.

True, they have been in office for several months and have now a record by which a partial judgment of their ability to carry on may be made. This is only a partial record. Lack of time has prevented me from studying that record. I am told, however, by persons in whom I have confidence, that there is nothing objectionable in it, but I am also reminded that decisions of the Board up to date are mostly on minor matters and that decisions on more important provisions of the law involving highly controversial questions are yet to be made.

I am also reminded, as are all other Senators, of the great importance of this law and the place which it may occupy in the years to come. I think we have all been made conscious of the fact that two or three or four organizations in the United States are planning to raise vast sums of money—more money, perhaps, than has ever before been used in elections—to defeat the men who helped to enact the Labor Relations Act of 1947. So it will assume more importance in the years to come.

Since the committee has reported the nominations favorably, I assume they will be consented to forthwith. I cannot in good conscience vote for them for the reasons stated, but I do not urge anyone else to vote against confirmation, unless they wish to do so without any urging. I shall not ask at this time for a record vote.

Mr. President, I think that before I conclude this statement that I should at least suggest how I believe committees can greatly improve the procedure in considering Presidential appointments.

In making such a suggestion I do so in humility becoming a freshman Senator, and I respectfully submit it in that spirit. The suggestion is this: All investigations should, in actual fact as well as in theory, be made by and through the committee on its own initiative rather than a trial between two or more opposing factions; and a professional staff of investigators should be used to obtain proper information for committees on any appointments that might be questioned.

Under the Reorganization Act we have been given the means to set up such a staff. We can make the appropriations and the Senate can proceed in a dignified manner to make investigations on its own motion and relegate those who are fighting appointments to a minor role where they belong.

Mr. President, I extend publicly my best wishes for a successful administration to the new Labor Board members, Mr. Gray and Mr. Murdock, and to Mr. Denham, the general counsel.

I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD the statement which I made to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

STATEMENT OF HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS, A UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF UTAH

Senator WATKINS. I am here today to discuss with the committee the Presidential appointments to the enlarged National Labor Relations Board.

Because one of the appointees is a resident of Utah, it has been suggested, as a courtesy to me, no doubt, that I make a comment on the appointments and particularly the one from Utah.

As a preliminary and background to my main statement, may I observe that it is one thing to enact a law, but quite a different matter to have it successfully interpreted and enforced. It is trite, but true, nevertheless, that laws do not interpret and enforce themselves.

After a long, bitter struggle, the American people, through more than two-thirds of their Representatives in Congress have enacted the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947, but our job is only half done. Our time and effort will be utterly wasted and the people will be without relief unless we see to it that the law is properly interpreted and successfully enforced. That we can do by approving only such appointees who have ability and who can act fairly and impartially.

I say "we," meaning Congress, advisedly, for the reason that it should be abundantly clear by now that the President, by his bitter denunciation of the law, his gross misrepresentation of its provisions and its effects, and his implied prediction that it will end in failure, has largely disqualified himself as a fair-minded and sincere administrator of the law.

If he succeeds now in enforcing the law, and it should be a success after his bitter fight against it, he will be proving to the world that he was utterly mistaken and he will be injuring his chances for reelection.

To act completely in a disinterested manner, and without bias under such circumstances, is too much to ask of human nature,

and the President has proven that he is very human.

That Mr. Murdock has always been an ardent pro-labor advocate and that he was in full harmony and cooperation with his colleague, the senior Senator from Utah, Mr. THOMAS, and supported the senior Senator's stand against any remedial labor legislation, is borne out by the statement issued by the senior Senator from Utah and published in this same labor paper, Utah edition, on October 12, 1946.

The speech of the senior Senator from Georgia, Mr. GEORGE, on the Taft-Hartley bill in the closing days of the debate on this question will be remembered, I am sure, wherein the Senator said, in substance, that it had been impossible to get any amendments to the Wagner Act, although it was recognized that amendments were needed because of the opposition of the chairman and members of the Labor Committee of the Senate.

Senator HILL. Whom are you referring to? Senator WATKINS. I am referring to the President of the United States.

In a special sense, under the circumstances, then, Congress must exert its full power to the end that the law shall be given a fair opportunity to succeed.

One of the first and most important steps in that direction is to see to it that members of the Board and its chief counsel are sympathetic to the law, believe in its purposes, and are convinced that it is workable. Members with any other points of view would be under a handicap too heavy to overcome.

The duties of the Board under the new law are largely judicial, and, in keeping with that fact, its members should be free from any bias or prejudice for or against either labor or management. They must not be men who are against the labor-union movement and they must not be men who desire its destruction or who have a record of having worked for the repeal in toto of the Wagner Act.

On the other hand, and for the same reasons, Board members should not be radically and strongly pro-labor. Open-mindedness, the ability and desire to act fairly and impartially in the discharge of their duties under the law, should be prime and essential qualifications of Board members, and to these, of course, should be added character, learning, and the proved ability to act in a judicial capacity.

The question now is, Do these appointees named by the President meet these standards?

Two of the old Board members reappointed by the President have been active in fighting against the enactment of the law. They have declared it unworkable. This is not the proper function of judicial officers, and it must be remembered that at the time they made the fight they were holding at least semijudicial offices under the unamended Wagner Act.

In addition, these two members, by their strong pro-labor bias in the administration of the Wagner Act, were largely instrumental in bringing about the public demand that the act be amended in the public's interest.

Clearly these members are disqualified to act under the law.

Mr. Gray, one of the new appointees, appears to be without a public record in this field on which he can be judged. His qualifications should be thoroughly and fairly scrutinized; and if he does not measure up to the necessary standards, he, too, should be rejected.

In the discussion of the qualifications of Mr. Murdock, of Utah, I want to emphasize as strongly as possible that my objection to him as a member of the Board is based entirely on principle and on his record as a

public official, and not on personalities or any unpleasantness growing out of the late political campaign.

The Utah contest in which Mr. Murdock was my opponent was a hard, cleanly fought affair, on well-defined issues.

Personalities in the sense of mud slinging were not involved, and all the principals in the contest, so far as I know, were on cordial speaking terms when the election was over.

In no sense, then, am I opposing Mr. Murdock for confirmation because he is personally obnoxious to me, as the term is used. I specifically disclaim any such objection.

But while he is not personally obnoxious to me, I want to emphasize that, knowing his record as an ardent pro-labor public official, and knowing that during the recent campaign he and the labor union of Utah which strongly supported him were against any labor legislation whatever, even in the way of amendments to the Wagner Act, that I was greatly shocked, as I am sure the majority of the people of Utah were, when the announcement of the appointment of Mr. Murdock appeared in the newspapers.

That appointment by the President of a judicial officer to interpret and enforce a law the enactment of which he had opposed, not only at the last election but for most of the time during the many years he served in the Congress, seemed incredible. And the statement of the President that Mr. Murdock was in sympathy with the new law was still more astounding.

In support of what I have just said, let me cite Mr. Murdock's record:

Mr. Murdock was elected as Congressman from the First Congressional District in Utah in the election of 1932. He almost immediately became the champion of labor. He voted for the Wagner Act.

In 1941 a committee of the House was appointed to investigate the operations of the National Labor Relations Board. Mr. Murdock was on that committee. All through that investigation, as the record reveals, he rallied to the defense of the Wagner Act and resisted to the utmost any proposal to amend it. In fact, when the committee, under Congressman SMITH of Virginia, recommended 12 amendments to the act, 7 of which have been in substance adopted in the present 1947 act, Mr. Murdock, with one of his colleagues, wrote a strong report against any such amendments.

In the Democratic primary campaign in which Mr. Murdock sought the senatorial nomination as against the incumbent, William H. King, Mr. Murdock was strongly supported by labor and won that contest. His campaign speeches on the subject were all pro-labor. The labor unions and labor press supported him almost unanimously, and they gave him that support partly on his record of opposition to any change in the Wagner Act.

In the 1946 campaign he stood on his record, and that record, of course, included his opposition to any amendments to the Wagner Act or any new legislation.

During the contest over the Case bill, Mr. Murdock opposed that legislation and voted against it. His record from beginning to end was a complete support of every measure desired by labor unions and against every measure which they were against. In the 1946 campaign a paper named Labor, published by the various railroad brotherhoods in Washington, D. C., stated in a special Utah edition which was sent out to thousands of Utah union members that Mr. Murdock "has been 100 percent right on every legislative proposal which involved the welfare of the workers and their families." The paper praised his opposition to the Case bill and to all acts to which labor was opposed.

This same labor paper issued a special Utah edition supporting Mr. Murdock, which likewise was sent to thousands of Utah union members in the 1940 election.

This opposition prevented any bill from being considered on labor by the Senate which would make such amendments possible. While the senior Senator from Georgia did not say so, I am sure every Senator who knew the history of what had gone on in the past few years in the Senate Labor Committee knew he had in mind the senior Senator from Utah as one of those opposed to any labor legislation. That Mr. Murdock was in full agreement with the senior Senator from Utah in his stand is attested by the statement referred to above and which in part is as follows:

"What do you think of Senator Abe Murdock?" a representative of labor asked Senator ELBERT D. THOMAS. In response, the great Utah progressive prepared the following statement:

"Senator Murdock and I were elected on the same ticket and came to Washington together in 1933. It is, therefore, not hard for me to say that Senator Murdock ought to be reelected. His program and mine for the party and the country have been identical. We have been voting together on the same issues for the past 14 years. I have always supported him in his committee stands, and he has always supported me in mine.

"PROVED FRIEND OF LABOR

"When the House of Representatives started its investigation of the National Labor Relations Board, Senator Murdock was put upon the committee. He proved himself a friend to labor from the time of his first utterance until the committee made its report.

"The work that he did then was crucial work for labor and when we consider the number of times that attempts were made during the war to remove the rights which laboring men and women had gained and to use the war as an excuse for abolishing standards, Senator Murdock's work stands out.

"He not only helped in obtaining, but also in maintaining, every gain which the ordinary worker received as a result of democratic legislation.

"In the last session of Congress no one in the Senate battled more valiantly for causes which are close to labor than Senator Murdock.—From Labor, October 12, 1944, issue."

No one probably knows more about the views of Mr. Murdock than does the senior Senator from Utah. From the statement above quoted it would appear that the senatorial delegation from Utah prior to 1947 and since 1932 was in full harmony and saw eye to eye in legislative matters. This quotation gives us further light on the acts and views of Mr. Murdock with respect to his views on legislation similar to the Labor-Management Act of 1947. That Mr. Murdock was on the side of all labor unions and their leaders in Utah is so notorious that no one in Utah would question it. Since that fact may not be so well known here, I am submitting a copy of Labor special Utah edition published in Washington, D. C., on Saturday, October 12, 1946.

I also submit a copy of a Labor broadcast, the official organ of the Utah Federation of Labor in the State of Utah, October 14, 1946, edition, and particularly the page carrying the statement "Workers work and vote for your best friend, United States Senator Abe Murdock" which appears on a copy of the Utah State Federation of Labor letterhead, and also contains a copy of a letter addressed by William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, to the Honorable Abe Murdock, which letter was by Fullmer H. Latter, president of the Utah State Federation of Labor, sent out to all members of the Utah State Federation of Labor.

I also submit a copy of the Salt Lake Tribune under date of Friday, October 11, 1946, showing a picture of Mr. Murdock with labor leaders of Utah and a story in which union labor is reported to be pledged to Mr. Murdock.

With respect to Mr. Murdock's views on labor legislation, and particularly amendments to the Wagner Act, which were proposed by the Smith committee of the House of Representatives in January 1941, I refer the committee to the Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, House Report No. 1902, part II, containing the minority views on the National Labor Relations Board, a report which was signed by the Honorable Abe Murdock and Arthur D. Healey, who were then Members of the House of Representatives. I offer for the record a copy of this report.

Also for the record I offer a statement of the minority views signed by Mr. Murdock and Arthur D. Healey under date of January 21, 1941, as a part of the proceedings of a special committee to investigate the National Labor Relations Board. I direct attention to the fact that this report and the preceding one are expressions of Mr. Murdock's views on labor legislation and particularly amendments to the Wagner Act of the type which have been approved and incorporated into law in the so-called Taft-Hartley bill.

Senator AIKEN. Without objection they will be received for the files of the committee.

Senator WATKINS. There is no contention whatever that Mr. Murdock did not have a right to make the record which he made, and I am not attempting to pass on the merits of the legislation which he favored and which he voted against. My only purpose in bringing these matters before the committee is to show how completely Mr. Murdock was tied up with labor leaders and the union movement. I think it is a fair statement to say that he has been generally regarded as labor's spokesman both in the House and in the Senate during his terms here. I believe it is fair comment to say that, had the election in Utah returned Mr. Murdock to the Senate, he would have been during the contest over the Management-Labor Relations Act of 1947 found fighting against enactment of the bill. Of this I think there can be very little doubt, and for this reason I am very much confused as to what the President meant when he said his appointees "including Mr. Murdock" are in sympathy with the act.

From the foregoing record it will be noted that over the years, because of the strong support labor leaders and unions have given Mr. Murdock, he is heavily obligated to them, even though their support was not sufficient in the last election to return him to the Senate.

The exhibits which I have placed in the record will no doubt suggest to the minds of the committee problems which may arise in connection with the interpretation and enforcement of the Labor Act. These labor endorsements published in their magazines and newspapers without expense to the candidate probably are the type of thing which has been banned by the new Labor Act. Having been the recipient of such benefits for so many years, how can Mr. Murdock fairly and without prejudice interpret such activities? And if they are found to be unlawful, how can he with good grace enter judgments against those who may possibly violate the law in the future? That I am not alone in my views on the President's appointments is shown by an editorial which was published in the Washington Star, Sunday, July 20, 1947, in which this comment was made:

"Abe Murdock has served four terms in the House and one in the Senate, having been beaten in last year's election. His record is that of a consistent New Dealer, who has been an honest and ardent pro-labor man. As a Member of the House in 1940 he helped write a minority committee report vigorously opposing the proposed Smith amendments to the Wagner Act. Many of those amendments, in substance if not in form, have been adopted in the new labor law. Hence, there arises the question whether Mr. Murdock is

still opposed to them, or, if he has changed his views, when did he do so, and why? This is important, because if he does not believe without reservation in the new law, then he should not be a member of the Board charged with the duty of administering it."

And also in an editorial from the *Standard-Times* published in New Bedford, Mass., the editorial is as follows:

"In selecting members of the reconstituted National Labor Relations Board, President Truman has been influenced by his bitter hostility toward the Taft-Hartley law which he vetoed, and by resentment because it was passed over his veto.

"He has reappointed all three members of the old Board. Two of them took part in the fight to prevent enactment of the new law by preparing a memorandum which assailed it as unworkable. When this document was inserted in the *CONGRESSIONAL RECORD*, its authorship was not revealed. It came out, however, in the heat of debate, when Senator TAFT pointed out the similarity between it and the President's veto messages.

"One of these two Board members who sought to influence the action of Congress, Paul M. Herzog, has been named as chairman of the new Board. Of the two new appointees, Abe Murdock is a lame-duck New Dealer who was defeated for reelection as Senator from Utah at the 1946 election. Murdock has been rated as a supporter of Mr. Truman's policies, and his position on labor matters while he was in Congress makes it fair to believe he shares the President's detestation of the Taft-Hartley Act.

"As chosen by the President, the new NLRB is weighted 3 to 2 in favor of the ideas and policies of the old Board which contributed greatly to the abuses that led the people, last November, to demand a revision of Federal laws relating to labor.

"This newspaper has said before, and says again, that officials who have condemned and misrepresented the new law are not qualified to administer it with zeal, impartiality, and good judgment.

"The Board should be composed of men free from the handicap of bias against the law. The President, after his denunciation of the Taft-Hartley bill, said it would be efficiently administered, but his nominations belie his words.

"Fortunately, the Senate has the power to confirm or reject these appointments. It has justifiable grounds for refusing its consent to Mr. Murdock, and to Mr. Herzog and Mr. Houston of the old Board. Its power should be exercised to the end that the new labor-management policy decreed by Congress may have a fair test."

In conclusion I would like to make these observations. I am not opposing the confirmation of the President's appointees on the ground of politics. I voted for David Lillenthal and for Gordon Clapp because these men had been appointed to positions to carry on policies with which they were in full sympathy. I believed from the evidence presented at the hearings that the men were capable, and I felt that the President was entitled to have appointees who were in sympathy with the law and who would faithfully carry it out. As a matter for the record, I have never voted against any of the many hundreds of appointments the President has sent to the Senate for confirmation.

From all that has been presented here, I am convinced that a complete study of the records of Mr. Herzog, Mr. Houston, and Mr. Murdock will clearly show that these men do not meet the standards which I believe should be maintained by the members of the Board and by its general counsel. I have refrained from any discussion of the general counsel for the reason that his public record seems to be well known, and there seems to be no valid objection to him. Probably no more important court—and as a matter of

fact the National Labor Relations Board is in effect a labor court—has been set up by the Congress for many generations, and only the most able and fair-minded men should be chosen to act in carrying out the provisions of the law.

It should be kept in mind that under the law the Labor Board is not an arbitration commission. Ordinarily under arbitration each side chooses someone to represent it, and they in turn choose the third, or whatever members are necessary to make up the commission. This is not that kind of law. Yet, the President seems to have had this in mind in making his appointments.

Finally, I want to make it clear that one of the principal issues in the Utah senatorial campaign last November was whether or not there should be amendments to the Wagner Act which would help work out methods whereby labor disputes might be settled without recourse to strikes and in which the labor-union members, employers, and the public would be protected and each would be able to enjoy, under the protection of the law, the rights guaranteed to them by the Constitution. The unions and Mr. Murdock, their candidate, were adamant against any amendments to the Wagner Act, or to any new labor law whatsoever. I took the opposite position and favored the enactment of amendments to the Wagner Act such as have been adopted in the present law. This issue was before the voters of my State. They sent me to the Congress under a pledge that I would do everything I could to help secure the enactment of such a law and that I would also carry on to see that under the law the people were given the relief they expected. It seems inconsistent to them and to me at this time that the President, after the people of the State have spoken, should now appoint a man who was defeated and who fought the enactment of such a law as is now upon the statute books to interpret and enforce the law which he opposed.

It has been suggested, and there is some substance for such a view, that the President might just as well have appointed John L. Lewis, William Green, or Philip Murray, or Lee Pressman to the Board as to appoint Mr. Murdock.

Mr. WATKINS. I also ask unanimous consent to place in the *RECORD* a statement made by David Lawrence, as published in the *Evening Star*, of Washington, on Friday, July 25, 1947.

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

LABOR LAW MAJORITY HELD OUTMANEUVERED
BY BOARD CHOICES
(By David Lawrence)

There is a good deal of chuckling in administration circles over the way the two-thirds majority which enacted the Taft-Hartley law has been outmaneuvered.

Waiting till the last few days of Congress when it seemed certain there would be a disinclination to block any nominations, President Truman appointed as the two additions to the National Labor Relations Board one man who is supposed to be friendly to management but who is not rated as big enough for the job, and another man who is the known champion of the labor-union bosses.

Former Senator Murdock, of Utah, who owed his election to the upper House largely to the political activity of labor unions, is well liked by Members of the Senate in the Senatorial Club sense, and it was the belief of the administration that, of course, the Senate would not turn down one of its own Members.

QUESTION IS NOT PERSONAL

But the question that has arisen is not personal at all. It is whether the majority

in the Senate are going to close their eyes to the fact that Mr. Truman has appointed a labor-union partisan whose record in the House of Representatives and in the Senate showed clearly that he has been unsympathetic with the major provisions of the new labor law. It is not generally known but those who follow legislative matters know that the principal sections of the Taft-Hartley law were proposed by Representative HOWARD SMITH, Democrat, of Virginia, in 1940 and 1941 and that Mr. SMITH was chairman of a committee which investigated the Labor Board. Mr. Murdock was a Democratic member of that committee and acted virtually as the spokesman of and defender of the board. In the final report of the House committee he gave the very same reasons for opposing any amendments to the Wagner law as have been given by President Truman in his veto message and by labor-union pronouncements.

There would be more logic, according to some expressions from Senators on Capitol Hill, in appointing either John L. Lewis or William Green to the new labor board. At least they would represent the labor-union viewpoint forthrightly, though, to be sure, Congress did not intend to divide up the board's membership with a certain number of partisans of management and labor, respectively.

If the Senate confirms the new nominees it will not have another chance to review its action, and the damage will have been done. Mr. Truman gave Mr. Murdock a 5-year appointment so that he could not be detached from the board in the event that a Republican President comes into power.

"COURT PACKING" DEVICE

It is a curious turn of events which finds all the work of the Members of the House and Senate who favored a change in our labor-management law brought into jeopardy through a "court packing" device. This is because interpretations of the statute are about to be placed in the hands of a majority on the board who are fundamentally out of sympathy with what Congress has done, though they publicly claim they will do everything they can to interpret it impartially.

Persons who start with a preconceived prejudice cannot win the trust of those who seek justice from them. It is a tragic misuse of public power and a flat contradiction of the President's pledge to the people which finds him appointing for the two vacancies a labor-union partisan and a fifth member who has scarcely been heard of in labor-management circles. Senator Ives, Republican, of New York, who is an expert in labor relations and who conducted a legislative inquiry for the New York Legislature on labor problems, is reported to have said he never heard of the appointee from his State chosen by Mr. Truman, namely, J. Copeland Gray.

Will the Members of the Senate surrender at the last minute to senatorial courtesy and be made ridiculous or will they defer action till the next session when there will be more time, perhaps in the autumn, to give full consideration to the qualifications of the new members? It is taken for granted that the new general counsel will be confirmed. Then, with the three existing members of the board, the work of interpreting the law can go on anyway, even if the nominations of the additional two members are not acted on at this session of Congress.

EXHIBIT A

STATEMENT ON LILIENTHAL HEARINGS PREPARED
BY ARTHUR V. WATKINS

By way of introduction to what I shall say today, I call the Senate's attention to an editorial which appeared in a leading daily newspaper of the United States on Wednesday, April 2, the day before the vote cast by this body on the motion of the junior Senator

from Ohio to recommit the Lillenthal and other atomic appointments to the Atomic Energy Committee for further investigation. The editorial published in the paper, which I shall not name, is typical of the views of a large part of the press of the United States and should give food for thought to this body. The editorial is as follows:

"The Lillenthal affair has become something more than a Senate squabble over affirmation of a Presidential appointment. It is a national disgrace and has placed this country in a dangerous international position. The entire perfection and promotion of America's vital atomic energy program has been held up by the idiotic jockeying of a small group of Senators who are putting personal and political advantage ahead of the welfare and the safety of the Nation.

"Uranium producers have suspended operations because of the uncertainty. A large number of scientists engaged in this important project are discouraged and threatening to resign. Led by an irresponsible Member of the Senate, MCKELLAR, of Tennessee, a willful minority is holding up the appointment of a man whose qualifications have been certified by leaders in all parties.

"Two months have passed since President Truman submitted the name of David E. Lillenthal to the Senate as Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. For obvious reasons Senator MCKELLAR opposed the appointment. But this would not have been serious except for the fact that several other Senators, seeing political advantage to be gained added their voices to the opposition. In spite of this, the Senate committee after 6 weeks of investigation approved Mr. Lillenthal by a vote of 8 to 1.

"Since that time nothing has been done by the Senate. Time after time action by the upper House has been postponed. In the face of warnings by military men and despite danger signals on the international horizon these representatives of the American people have delayed. Federal and State authorities are being roundly condemned for failure to close down unsafe coal mines until disaster struck at Centralia. How much more culpable are these Senators who are fiddling while a world catastrophe draws ever nearer?"

"Other nations are not awaiting action by the United States Senate. Their scientists and nuclear experts are pressing forward in their quest for the secrets known already to our atomic energy specialists. These headstrong Senators are playing the enemy's game whoever that enemy may turn out to be. They are killing time while the fate of the Nation—of the whole world—hangs in the balance.

"The time is short and without American unity of the atomic energy program no world solution is possible. If the United Nations are ever to reach an agreement on the control of this dangerous power it will be when this country has perfected its own program and has appointed its own duly constituted authority to direct activity and policies."

Before I proceed to comment on the charges and biting criticisms contained in this editorial, I would like to state that I have been one of those Senators who had not made up his mind on the Lillenthal appointment but who had been waiting until the investigations have been completed and the arguments made. In other words I have been in a neutral position and have been neither for nor against Lillenthal or any of the other members appointed by the President to form the Atomic Energy Commission. I have tried to consider the matters presented on both sides of the issue in a calm, judicial light.

I am a member of the Committee on Public Works, which has been investigating the appointment of Gordon Clapp as board member of the Tennessee Valley Authority. I heard most of the evidence in this matter, which for the most part paralleled the evi-

dence given before the Atomic Energy Committee. I have also read most of the record in the Lillenthal hearing, and I have listened to much of the debate on both sides for and against Mr. Lillenthal. I have checked chronological records to ascertain just what has happened in this matter to bring on such caustic criticism as contained in the editorial just read. This record shows the following order of events:

1. January 10: The President sent the Lillenthal nomination to the Senate.

2. January 20: It was referred by the President pro tempore to the Committee on Atomic Energy.

3. January 27: Hearings by the committee on the nomination began.

4. March 4: Hearings before the committee concluded.

5. March 10: The committee reported the nomination favorably to the Senate.

6. March 24: Debate on the nomination began, and on April 3 there was a vote on the recommendation to refer the nomination back to the committee.

The President appointed Mr. Lillenthal and his associates to the Atomic Energy Commission in October 1946, but it was not until January 10 that he sent the nominations to the Senate. The record which I have just read shows the order of events with respect to these nominations. The report of the committee, which was 8 to 1 favoring the nominees' approval, certainly indicated that the committee was friendly to the nominees. So far as I have been able to determine, there was no report of any investigation by the Executive when the nomination was sent to the Senate. Owing to the reorganization of committees, apparently the Atomic Energy Committee was not ready to receive the appointments until January 20, on which day the reference was made to the committee. Even then a week elapsed before the hearings began.

From the very day the President sent the nominations to the Senate to the date when the hearings on the nominations began before the Senate committee, there is not the slightest evidence that the enemies of Mr. Lillenthal were in any way influencing the delay. The matter was taking its regular course, and so far as I have been able to learn that course was not affected in the slightest degree by those opposed to Mr. Lillenthal.

The hearings which began on January 20 took 24 days, or parts of days. The committee at all times during these hearings was in the control of those who were friendly to Mr. Lillenthal. His friends were in full control of the committee and had the power to direct the investigation being made. This committee could have closed the hearings at any time. There is no privilege of unlimited debate in a committee hearing.

The record also discloses that no Senator other than Senator MCKELLAR appeared before the committee in opposition to Mr. Lillenthal. The record also discloses that 49 witnesses testified before the committee. Thirty-seven of the forty-nine testified for Lillenthal and his associates.

It is worthy of note at this point that very little testimony was received in behalf of the other members of the Commission other than Mr. Lillenthal. Twelve witnesses were called by Senator MCKELLAR or at his suggestion. These could all be classed in opposition to Mr. Lillenthal, although only a few of them expressed any hostility toward him. The record fails to disclose that the committee itself made any special investigation that was not first suggested by Senator MCKELLAR.

It has been charged repeatedly by the press of the country, as in the editorial which I have just read, that Senator MCKELLAR and a willful minority were holding up the appointment of Mr. Lillenthal and his associates. Just who the willful minority is is

not disclosed in the editorials, but the record shows that only Senator MCKELLAR of the 96 Members of this body, appeared in opposition. It has been charged that the Senate committees in both the Lillenthal and the Clapp hearings were overly generous in time allowance to the opposition because of senatorial courtesy. I am not saying that this charge is not true, but if it should be granted that it is true, then who is responsible? Surely not the enemies of Lillenthal. The Atomic Energy Committee is made up of veterans of the Senate with one exception. They could have had a short hearing if they so desired. They could have limited the testimony. They could have said to any objecting Senator, or anyone else, at any time, that the hearing would close; that the welfare of the Nation transcends any obligation of senatorial courtesy. There are many critics who felt that they should have taken this stand. I am not going to pass judgment on that, but I do say emphatically that the opposition to Lillenthal did not have it in its power to delay the hearings before the committee.

When the appointment finally came to the floor of the Senate, it was set aside several times, but in every instance by unanimous consent in order to consider pressing emergency legislation.

During the debate which was interrupted at times with emergency matters, the time consumed by the proponents and opponents of Lillenthal was fairly divided. There were more speakers against Lillenthal than there were for him. If the time consumed by the senior Senator from Tennessee should be deducted, the time consumed by the other opponents and proponents would be substantially in balance. Evidence was brought to the floor by the opposition which apparently had not been considered, or at least had not been placed in the record, by the committee holding the hearings. This evidence having to do with the record of Mr. Lillenthal raised a number of questions in the minds of many Senators and suggested at least that further investigation should be made. There was other evidence brought to the floor by the opposition which in my opinion clearly indicated the necessity for further investigation. It seemed to me that the motion made by the junior Senator from Ohio for a recommittal of the appointments was fully justified. I came to that conclusion not only because of the new evidence which was brought before the Senate, but by my consideration of how the hearings were conducted by the Atomic Energy Committee. Frankly, I have been amazed at the way the senatorial committees consider Presidential appointments, and particularly those that are seriously questioned. The hearings seem to degenerate into a contest between the proponents and the opponents of the appointees. Instead of the committee making an independent investigation of its own so that it may intelligently bring light on the appointees to the rest of the Senate, it leaves the matter almost entirely to those who are either for or against the nominees. And this custom apparently has been going on for a long time.

That I am not unfair in making the statement that the hearings are more in the nature of a trial than they are of a dignified investigation by the committee for and in behalf of the people of the United States, I quote from the able argument made by the senior Senator from Michigan before this body on April 3. Said the Senator:

"Since it is impossible for all Senators intimately to know the record developed in 7 weeks of utterly exhaustive hearings, I respectfully suggest that fair-minded men cannot wholly ignore the impact of the cold, hard fact that eight out of nine of the Senate's own jury, commissioned by the Senate to pass upon the facts, report, regardless of party lines, in favor of confirmation. I remind the Senate that these jurors consisted of the Senator from Iowa, the Senator from

Colorado, the Senator from California, the Senator from Connecticut, the Senator from Texas, the Senator from Georgia, the Senator from Colorado, and the senior Senator from Michigan. At least in respect to the others, Mr. President, I am surely entitled to say that a more representative or competent Senate jury could not have been impaneled. It seems to me that it would be highly improbable that such a jury would almost unanimously go wrong."

You will note from that quotation that the Senator says the jury was commissioned to "pass upon the facts" instead of getting the facts. From my experience on two other committees of this body, and from what investigation I have been able to make, I feel that I shall be substantially correct in saying that very little, if anything, was actually done by the Atomic Energy Committee on its own initiative to investigate the records of Mr. Lillenthal and his associates. It was actually what the distinguished Senator from Michigan said it was—a jury which sat and listened to the case as it was presented by those who favored and by those who opposed. It was not an investigating body in the sense that it did anything on its own initiative.

I am not making this statement just to be critical but to bring to the attention of this body a procedure which I sincerely believe needs to be reformed. The President, who makes the appointment, certainly is not a jury passing on the facts. He must get at the facts; he must know about the nominees. The Senate by the Constitution is given the duty of advising the President and finally consenting to his appointments if upon fair investigation the body feels the appointment shall be confirmed.

The senior Senator from Michigan described the hearings as utterly exhaustive, and to emphasize what he meant he stated:

"I repeat that I recall no such thoroughness of inquiry by a Senate committee in all my 19 years of service here. I am unable to believe the process has not been adequate or that we would be warranted in prolonging it."

The record discloses that much time was consumed by the statements and examination of witnesses who were brought in by the parties. In that sense it was thorough. But upon getting the facts on the initiative of the committee it was anything but thorough and certainly not exhaustive, as new evidence on the nominees brought in opposition by Senators to the floor of this Senate demonstrated.

Mr. President, I voted for the motion to recommit, because I sincerely believed further investigation of the nominees should be made. That motion was defeated. I am now confronted with the necessity of voting on the confirmation of the nominees without having all the facts before us, which I think would help in arriving at an intelligent decision.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I desire to make a brief statement on the pending nomination. I make it because last summer when the nomination came before the committee, in spite of my friendship and respect for our former colleague, Abe Murdock, of Utah, I vigorously opposed confirmation of the nomination. There was nothing personal in my position. I did so because I had observed him here in the Senate and I had studied his record in the House of Representatives, and I found that he had vigorously opposed virtually all the major provisions which were in the new law which he was appointed to administer. So I found it very difficult to believe that under those circumstances Mr. Murdock could, even if he desired to do so, give us a fair and impartial administration of the act.

Since that time, and during his service on the Board under an interim appointment, it has been the function of the Joint Committee on Labor-Management Relations, of which I am chairman, which was set up by the act, to watch closely the operations of the National Labor Relations Board. The committee itself has had several sessions with members of the Board. Our staff has followed every case and decision and the various rules and regulations promulgated by the Board. I am very happy to report to the Senate, and I wish to do so for the RECORD, that that experience and that observation have convinced me that I was mistaken, and that Mr. Murdock is doing a very fair and impartial job in his present position—in fact, he is one of the strongest and ablest members of the Board.

I am happy to make that statement for the RECORD, and say that I am now supporting strongly confirmation of his nomination.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to state what I should like to have the RECORD show as my reasons for favoring the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Murdock.

I think we should keep in mind the fact that no question has been raised at any time as to the intellectual honesty of Abe Murdock. I wish to lay that down as the criterion of prevailing importance in passing judgment upon the qualifications of any man, I care not who he is, who is nominated for a quasi-judicial or a judicial office or for any other office. Is he intellectually honest? If we start with that premise, then there is a rule of legal ethics, I submit, Mr. President, which removes any doubt as to whether that individual as a lawyer is going to participate in an impartial administration of the law. Lawyers are ethically bound by the great trust imposed on them of administering justice impartially in accordance with the law applied to the facts as shown by the record of a case. I think it would be most unfortunate if the Senate should ever take the position that when it comes to pass judgment, by way of confirmation or nonconfirmation, upon lawyers who are recommended and nominated for judicial office, we should be influenced because of the position they took as legislators on what they considered to be the social and economic merits of given pieces of legislation. We should recognize very clearly that the functions of a legislator and the functions of a judge are as different as opposites can be.

Hence, at no time have I ever shared the criticism of some so-called liberals—who violate principles of liberality—when they oppose the confirmation of men nominated for judicial office who as legislators were considered as conservative in their legislative point of view on pieces of social and economic legislation.

Mr. President, I deny premise that both political liberals and conservatives are not equally qualified for judicial appointment. I do so because of the principle of legal ethics previously referred to in these comments. Lawyers, both liberal and conservative, if intellectually honest, will rise to the trust of impartial administration of justice when elevated to the bench. Give me a man

who I am convinced is intellectually honest, and then I have a man who also will carry out to the highest of standards the high ethics of my profession, for he knows that when he takes the oath of office, as a judicial officer, to uphold the law and to apply the law as it is found in the statute books, he has been given a trust of such importance that we need have no doubt as to the impartiality of the justice he will administer.

Mr. President, I say Abe Murdock is a man who is intellectually honest. He is a lawyer and he understands the ethics of our profession. I am satisfied that under his administration we shall receive an impartial administration of the Taft-Hartley law in accordance with the law as he finds it applied to the record in the cases presented to him.

During the war, as a member of the National War Labor Board, I had an interesting experience, Mr. President. I saw men sit on that great quasi-judicial tribunal of this Government, representing a clear cross-section of American points of view in the field of social and economic legislation. Let me say here, because I do not wish to rise a second time today, that on the list of nominations now before us is the name of one of the employer members of the War Labor Board to whom I wish to pay tribute. I refer to Cyrus Ching, who has been nominated to head the new Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service. In serving with me on the War Labor Board, he represented industry. I wish to say that I consider him to be one of the great industrial statesmen of America, and a man who when sitting on the War Labor Board applied the two criteria of judicial judgment to which I am referring today, namely, intellectual honesty and the ethical obligation of applying the law impartially to the facts as shown by the record of a given case. I served as the enforcement officer of the War Labor Board, and I wish to say to the everlasting credit of Cyrus Ching that, although we did not always agree as to the decisions in cases, nevertheless, once we reached a decision on a case, he never failed to take the position that all members of the Board, employer and labor members, as well as public members, should unite in support of enforcing the decision. I mention that in passing only because I think it is so important, Mr. President, that we have our recollections refreshed now and then as to the differences between judicial functioning and legislative functioning. I think men such as Abe Murdock and Cyrus Ching recognize those differences.

Hence I think that as we approach the question of confirmation of these nominations and other nominations in the future, we should always ask ourselves the questions, "Are we satisfied as to the intellectual honesty of the nominee? Next, are we satisfied that the nominee—be he liberal or conservative or non-descript in political philosophy recognizes and appreciates the ethical obligation that must be maintained by our judicial officers if we are to preserve government by law in this country—namely, the obligation of handing down even-handed, impartial justice based on the judicial

record made before the tribunal in the trial of a case.

Because of my personal acquaintance with and high respect for Abe Murdock and Cyrus Ching and because I know they meet the tests of the true criteria for impartial administration of justice to which I have referred, I am happy to join in voting for confirmation of their nominations today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Abe Murdock, of Utah, to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board?

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the next nomination on the calendar.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of J. Copeland Gray to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Robert N. Denham to be general counsel of the National Labor Relations Board.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

FEDERAL MEDIATION AND CONCILIATION SERVICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Cyrus Stuart Ching to be Federal Mediation and Conciliation Director.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

FEDERAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Oscar R. Ewing to be Federal Security Administrator.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

CALIFORNIA DEBRIS COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Col. Joseph S. Gorlinski to be member and secretary of the California Debris Commission.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed, and, without objection, the President will be notified immediately of all confirmations made this day.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House insisted upon its amendment to the bill (S. 1770) to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. WOLCOTT, Mr. GAMBLE, Mr. SMITH of Ohio, Mr. KUNKEL, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. BROWN of Georgia, and Mr. PATMAN were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 4627) to authorize an appropriation for the immediate re-

lief of the Navajo and Hopi Indians, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

PROCUREMENT OF TEMPORARY OR INTERMITTENT SERVICES OF EXPERTS OR CONSULTANTS—CONFERENCE REPORT

As in legislative session, Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I submit a conference report on House bill 4469, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The conference report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The Chief Clerk read the report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4469) to amend the Act of July 7, 1947, so as to authorize the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government to procure the temporary or intermittent services of experts or consultants or organizations thereof, 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 amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"(b) Service of an individual as a member of the Commission or employment of an individual by the Commission as an attorney or expert in any business or professional field, on a part-time or full-time basis, with or without compensation, shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such individual within the provisions of section 109 or 113 of the Criminal Code (U. S. C., 1940 edition, title 18, secs. 198 and 203), or of section 19 (e) of the Contract Settlement Act of 1944, or of any other Federal law imposing restrictions, requirements, or penalties in relation to the employment of persons, the performance of services, or the payment or receipt of compensation in connection with any claim, proceeding, or matter involving the United States."

And the Senate agree to the same.

GEORGE D. AIKEN,
JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

CLARE E. HOFFMAN,
CLARENCE J. BROWN,
CARTER MANASCO,

Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

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

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator in charge of the report what happened to the Senate amendment which the Senator from Vermont and the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] accepted when the bill was under consideration by the Senate.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the conference committee approved the bill as it passed the Senate with the exception of the proviso which was suggested by the Senator from Wyoming, which provided that the attorneys and experts who

might be selected by the Reorganization Commission would have to be approved by the Committees on Expenditures in the Executive Departments of both the House and Senate before they could be employed by the Commission. The conference committee unanimously decided that the Commission could do much better work if it did not have to come before the two Houses of Congress before it could employ a man to go to work for it. Therefore that provision was deleted, and the House unanimously approved the conference report yesterday.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course, Mr. President, I am not surprised at the answer given by the Senator from Vermont. I had already conferred with him privately, and he had told me what the answer would be. In fact, I got the impression from what he said that the Senate conferees, who so graciously accepted the amendment which was proposed on the floor of the Senate, did not make much of a battle to sustain the amendment in the conference.

The situation, therefore, is a very simple one. In this conference report we are being asked to say that lawyers and experts employed by the Commission who may be directly or indirectly interested in claims against the Government of the United States shall be exempted from the provisions of the Criminal Code, while all the persons who are so interested, if they are employees of the Government, will be guilty of a criminal offense and subject to the penalties imposed by the Criminal Code.

If the Senate adopts the conference report, it should be clear to all concerned that we are saying that the Commission may employ lawyers who are themselves vigorously prosecuting claims against the Government of the United States, and that such lawyers shall be exempt from the provisions of the Criminal Code of the United States.

Mr. President, the amendment which was offered by the Senator from Wyoming was designed merely to provide that any person occupying the dual position of being an employee of the Government of the United States and an attorney representing claimants against the United States, or an expert in the same category, should not become an employee of the Commission until his application had been passed upon by the committees of the Congress to whom the jurisdiction of examining expenditures in executive departments is delegated.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator will recall that during the course of the original debate I expressed myself as being against this particular provision and I am still against it. The Senator was speaking of other lawyers and employees of the Federal Government being subjected to pains and penalties if they accepted employment of the kind specified, but is it not a fact that employees of some departments, notably, the Treasury Department, are prohibited for a period of 2 years after they leave the employment of the Government from accepting employment in connection with claims involving the particu-

lar department in which they were employed? They are barred for 2 years after their employment ceases.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is quite correct. Here we have a statute—because it will be a statute—setting up a commission to make a report to the Congress on reorganization of the whole executive branch of the Government of the United States, and the conference report as it is now written, the conferees having rejected an amendment approved on the floor of the Senate, makes it possible for attorneys who are interested personally in prosecuting claims against the Government of the United States to serve as lawyers and as experts in reorganizing the Government.

Mr. President, it seems to me that the mere statement of the case shows how utterly outrageous it is. I know that the members of the conference committee are making such a recommendation only because it is a rather annoying thing to require an applicant for appointment to subject himself to an investigation by a personnel officer of the Commission and the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Department of each House of Congress. That is extremely annoying, but it is rather in the interest of safeguarding the Government of the United States that we erect some barrier to the employment of persons who might do what is contemplated. The annoyance which would be visited upon the Committees on Expenditures in the Executive Departments is nothing compared with the precedent which will be set if the conference report shall be approved in its present form.

Mr. President, it is the norm that the principles of legislative procedure place upon the conferees of either branch the responsibility of making a fight to sustain the branch they represent. In this instance, when I offered the original amendment, it provided that the applications of such persons should be examined by the Civil Service Commission. The Senator in charge of the bill was unwilling to accept that, and I made a concession here upon the floor when the Senator from Vermont and the junior Senator from Michigan suggested that this safeguard would be acceptable to them if instead of the Civil Service Commission, the amendment should provide that the second examination of the record should be made by the Committees on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. The Senator from Vermont is chairman of the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. We are now dealing with establishing a precedent. Let it be understood that, of course, with the concentration of economic power there has come about a great growth of government; and during the war when we were using all our resources and all our manpower and all our wealth to fight the war, exemptions were granted; but now we are preparing to establish a streamlined executive branch of the Government, and, by the elimination of the amendment, the conferees come before us and say, "We want this to be so free from the criminal law that lawyers and experts, whose personal interests may be

in direct contradiction to the interests of the people of the United States, may be employed by the Commission."

Mr. President, I shall ask that the full text of the criminal provisions from which exemption is granted by the conference report be printed in the RECORD. I feel deeply about this, because if we pass the bill now, then another Congress within 2 years will be extending the blanket agreement. Heretofore Congress has granted such exemptions, except during the war, to particular individuals, when they were retained, as former Justice Roberts was retained to prosecute the Teapot Dome investigation. Congress properly exempted Mr. Roberts, who was then a practicing attorney, from the provisions of the law, because it was clear that Mr. Roberts would do nothing that would bring him within the purview of the criminal code, and that it was in the public interest that, though his firm might have some case which technically would come within the jurisdiction of the statute, he himself would be engaged merely in prosecuting a particular offense against the United States, and that there would be no violation. But that is not the case now. We are asked to say, as a legislative body, that anybody whom the Commission may employ shall be so exempt. We do not know who they are.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a correction?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. The provision applies only to experts and attorneys. The amendment which came originally from the House covered everybody.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I meant to say lawyers and experts. If I said "anybody" of course I was going beyond the terms of the amendment.

Mr. AIKEN. Perhaps the Senator was right, for today everybody is an expert.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Lawyers are experts; that is correct.

Mr. President, I am going to ask that the statutes be extended in full in the RECORD. As I was about to say, I feel so deeply about the matter and about the unwisdom of setting such a precedent, when the amendment provided only that applicants should also be subject to review by the Committees on Expenditures in the Executive Departments in the Senate and in the House that, if the Senator from Vermont intends to ask for action upon the report this afternoon, I shall have to call for a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wyoming to print certain statutes in the RECORD?

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

UNITED STATES CODE 1940 EDITION, TITLE 18, SECTIONS 198 AND 203

SEC. 198 (Criminal Code, sec. 109). Officers interested in claims against United States: Whoever, being an officer of the United States, or a person holding any place of trust or profit, or discharging any official function under, or in connection with, any executive department of the Government of the United States, or under the Senate or House of Representatives of the United States, shall act as an agent or attorney for prosecuting any

claim against the United States, or in any manner, or by any means, otherwise than in discharge of his proper official duties, shall aid or assist in the prosecution or support of any such claim, or receive any gratuity, or any share of or interest in any claim from any claimant against the United States, with intent to aid or assist, or in consideration of having aided or assisted, in the prosecution of such claim, shall be fined not more than \$5,000, or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both. Members of the National Guard of the District of Columbia who receive compensation for their services as such shall not be held or construed to be officers of the United States, or persons holding any place of trust or profit, or discharging any official function under or in connection with any executive department of the Government of the United States within the provision of this section.

SEC. 203 (Criminal Code, sec. 113). Receiving pay by Members of Congress in matters affecting United States: Whoever, being elected or appointed a Senator, Member of or Delegate to Congress, or a Resident Commissioner, shall, after his election or appointment and either before or after he has qualified, and during his continuance in office, or being the head of a department, or other officer or clerk in the employ of the United States, shall, directly or indirectly, receive, or agree to receive, any compensation whatever for any services rendered or to be rendered to any person, either by himself or another, in relation to any proceeding, contract, claim, controversy, charge, accusation, arrest, or other matter or thing in which the United States is a party or directly or indirectly interested, before any department, court-martial, bureau, officer, or any civil, military, or naval commission whatever, shall be fined not more than \$10,000, and imprisoned not more than 2 years; and shall moreover, thereafter be incapable of holding any office of honor, trust, or profit under the Government of the United States.

CONTRACT SETTLEMENT ACT OF 1944, SECTION 19 (E)

(e) It shall be unlawful for any person employed in any Government agency, including commissioned officers assigned to duty in such agency, during the period such person is engaged in such employment or service, to prosecute, or to act as counsel, attorney, or agent for prosecuting, any claim against the United States, or for any such person within 2 years after the time when such employment or service has ceased, to prosecute, or to act as counsel, attorney, or agent for prosecuting, any claim against the United States involving any subject matter directly connected with which such person was so employed or performed duty. Any person violating any provision of this subsection shall be fined not more than \$10,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, if there is to be action on the report at this time—

Mr. AIKEN. I request action on it this afternoon. If action on the conference report is delayed, it means that the important Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government will be unable to function for several weeks yet, because it will be unable to employ any expert or legal talent to assist it. The Senator from Wyoming is correct when he says that the Senator from Michigan and the Senator from Vermont accepted his recently proposed

amendment. We accepted it for the purpose of taking it to conference because, as the Senator will recall, we were crowded for time, and, knowing the propensity of the Senator from Wyoming to discuss amendments at length, it was felt that time would be saved by taking it to conference and then bringing it back.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, in view of the personal remark by the Senator from Vermont I now suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator yield for that purpose?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield for that purpose, because I think we ought to have more Members of the Senate present when I discuss the subject.

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

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

Alken	Green	Maybank
Baldwin	Gurney	Millikin
Ball	Hatch	Moore
Barkley	Hawkes	Morse
Bricker	Hayden	Murray
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Myers
Brooks	Hill	O'Connor
Buck	Hoey	O'Mahoney
Bushfield	Holland	Revercomb
Butler	Ives	Robertson, Va.
Byrd	Jenner	Robertson, Wyo.
Cain	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Capper	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Chavez	Kem	Smith
Connally	Kilgore	Sparkman
Cooper	Knowland	Stennis
Cordon	Langer	Stewart
Donnell	Lodge	Taft
Downey	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Dworshak	McCarran	Thye
Ecton	McCarthy	Tobey
Ellender	McClellan	Umstead
Ferguson	McFarland	Vandenberg
Flanders	McKellar	White
Fulbright	McMahon	Williams
George	Martin	Young

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

The question is on the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the conference report ought to be approved because it will make it possible for the Commission on Reorganization of the Executive Branch of the Government to do a creditable job without any hindrance or handicaps.

The bill, as it is now, exempts the technical and legal assistants from certain laws which would prohibit them from being connected with any firm which might have cases involving the United States, or whose members might have such cases. As the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] so aptly pointed out a few minutes ago, we do not want to require our experts who are employed by the Commission established by the legislative branch of the Congress to be prohibited from taking any case against the Government for 2 years thereafter. It goes without saying that we simply cannot employ a lawyer from any of the responsible law firms to take work with the Commission on that basis.

As to this amendment setting a precedent, that is not in accord with the facts, because many times in the past we have exempted certain employees or persons from the acts which are referred to in the amendment. Probably one of the more notable exceptions was the exemption from such laws of all persons serv-

ing under the National War Labor Board in per diem employment. So this proposal does not constitute a precedent. If any precedent exists, the precedent would be in the Congress of the United States establishing a commission of this importance, appropriating \$750,000 for its work, and then failing to provide the Commission with the tools it needs to do a good job.

The Commission unanimously requests the Congress to amend the bill as provided for in the conference report, because the Commission feels that the results would be more satisfactory if it were permitted to hire persons or firms already established—management concerns or firms of accountants—to do some of the work of the Commission. It is obviously impossible to employ an accounting firm to do a piece of work for the Commission if all the members of that firm must stop work for anyone who happens to have a case against the Government of the United States.

The result of failing to approve the conference report would be effectively to prevent the Commission from doing the kind of work which Congress expects it to do in making a study of the executive branch of the Government and making recommendations for improving that plan.

It seems incredible to me that the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], or anyone else, should think that this Commission would hire anyone who would work for and against the Government at the same time. I should like to read the names of the members of the Commission. There are six Democrats and six Republicans. Four were appointed by the President of the Senate, four by the Speaker of the House, and four by the President of the United States. They are prohibited from making any report of their findings or any recommendations until January 1, 1949, so the study cannot in any way enter into the election campaign.

As everyone knows, the Commission is headed by Hon. Herbert Hoover, chairman. Hon. Dean Acheson, former Under Secretary of State, is vice chairman. The other members are Secretary of National Defense Forrestal; Civil Service Commissioner Flemming; former Ambassador Joseph Kennedy; Professor Pollock, of the University of Michigan; Mr. Mead, one of Ohio's prominent industrialists; Mr. James Rowe, assistant to the late President Roosevelt; and the four congressional members are Representative Brown, of Ohio, Representative Manasco, of Alabama, the Senator from Arkansas, Mr. McClellan, and myself.

If I did not believe that the members of the Commission could be trusted to do the very best job possible in the employment of attorneys and experts, or if I thought for a moment that they would engage anyone who would use his position with the Commission to make profit for himself from any information he might obtain as an employee of the Commission, I would not want to be on the Commission.

The Congress unanimously approved the bill introduced by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LONCE] and Representative Brown, establishing this Com-

mission. As I recall, both Houses approved it unanimously. If the Congress wants the Commission to do a good job, it will exhibit faith in the members of the Commission and give them the means to do that job. We cannot do it if we are handicapped in the employment of lawyers and experts, because they simply will not give up their time if they are to be put in jeopardy, or if all the members of their firms are to be put in jeopardy. So I ask that the Senate approve the conference report. It was unanimously approved in the House last night.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the issue which is now presented is very simple and clear. It will not take me very long to make the record.

The Senator from Vermont says that it is unthinkable that the Commission—which, of course, is composed of men of very high character—would employ any lawyer or expert who had a claim against the Government, and who would thereby be in violation of one of the sections of the Criminal Code. Yet while saying that the Senator asks the United States Senate to pass a waiver of the Criminal Code. What is the sense of bringing in this amendment waiving the Criminal Code if it is not intended to open the door to the employment of men—

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I resent the implication that the Commission intends to open the door for any such purpose.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I withdraw any implication against the Senator from Vermont. I am merely pointing to the fact that he is asking for an exemption from the Criminal Code.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Why does he ask it? So that persons whose employment would otherwise be in violation of the Criminal Code may be employed.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, that is not true. It is not intended to hire anyone in violation of the Criminal Code.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If that is not the intention, it seems to me quite clear that no exemption is needed.

Mr. AIKEN. I think the implications of the Senator from Wyoming are unworthy of his high office.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am speaking plainly of the facts. Of course, I do not cast any reflection whatever upon the character of the Senator from Vermont or of the other distinguished gentlemen whom he has named; but I know, as the Senator knows, that there will be a Personnel Section of the Commission. The employment will be handled, in all probability, by employees of the Commission. Every employee of the Senate and every Member of the Senate is bound by the provision exemption which is now being sought to be extended to the employees of the Commission. It boils down simply to this proposal: A commission has been set up by law to reorganize the executive branch of the Government. An amendment was adopted on the floor of the Senate, accepted by the Senator from Vermont, and carried to conference, which had the effect of providing that persons against whom the Criminal Code could be invoked should not be exempt until their applications had been

passed upon by the Committees on Expenditures in the Executive Departments of the Senate and the House. That amendment has been rejected. The Senator from Vermont, with great frankness, told the Senate immediately before the quorum call that the amendment was accepted merely to save time, so it could be knocked out in conference. I admire the frankness of the Senator from Vermont. But what the Senate is to decide now is whether we by our votes will indicate that we are willing to commit the task of reorganizing the executive branch of the Government to lawyers and experts who may be directly interested in claims against the Government of the United States. To me it is unthinkable that by a formal action of the Senate of the United States a provision of law of that kind could be accepted.

I shall content myself, Mr. President, by merely saying that I shall ask for a yea-and-nay vote upon this conference report. I hope that the conference report will be rejected, so that it may go back to the conferees in order that they may agree upon an amendment which will be in some harmony with the amendment adopted by the Senate which will erect a safeguard against the employment by this Commission of persons as lawyers or experts who are interested directly or indirectly in making claims or prosecuting claims and aiding and assisting in the preparation of claims against the Government of the United States. It is unthinkable that we should, by a formal vote, say that employees of the Government may also be employees against the Government.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. As I understand the Senator's position, it is that he would not object to the retaining of lawyers and experts to do the work of this Commission, provided both the Senate and House Committees on Expenditures in the Executive Departments certify that it is necessary and in the public interest. Is that correct?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Or desirable. "Desirable" is the word.

Mr. McMAHON. Does the Senator in his amendment provide that any contracts which such persons might have or any retainers they might receive shall be registered with the clerk of the committee?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Unfortunately I did not provide that in my amendment. I say to the Senator that the bill was reported to the Senate one afternoon when only a few Senators were present. No quorum call was made. I hastily glanced over the proposal of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and saw that there was no safeguard. So I hastily wrote down an amendment. My amendment, as I originally suggested it, provided that the Civil Service Commission should examine the applications of persons having an interest, directly or indirectly, in claims against the Government. That was objected to, and I consented to withdraw that portion of the amendment and to substitute the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

That substitution was accepted by the other side. The Senator from Vermont accepted it, but, after accepting it, he took it to conference and abandoned it.

Mr. McMAHON. He gave it the "gas."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes.

Mr. McMAHON. I want to emphasize the Senator's position, as I understand it, which is that he does not dispute the necessity of retaining men who are experienced in these matters but who might possibly be interested in claims against the Government. The Senator does not take that position, does he?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No; I do not.

Mr. McMAHON. He merely says that if it is found to be necessary, there should be some ratification by the proper committee of this body and of the House of Representatives. Is that the fact?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Precisely.

Mr. McMAHON. So that the Senate and the House will not issue a blanket exemption in a matter of this kind. Is that the Senator's position?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator has stated my position precisely.

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

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, in the light of what I have said and in the light of the argument which has been made by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], I wish to say that I am opposed to this proposed exemption. The Senator from Vermont argues that we should adopt the conference report because of the high character of the members of the Commission and in order to express our faith and confidence in their character and their integrity. In substance, that is the argument which has been made by the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. President, I say that I have a very high regard for the Senator from Vermont and great confidence in his character and integrity, and the same statement applies to every member of the Commission. It is not a question of faith or confidence in the Commission. Were it so, Mr. President, every commission appointed, every official who has in charge the employment of persons, could come before us and ask for an exemption from the criminal laws upon exactly the same grounds and say, "If you refuse to grant the exemption it will be an expression of lack of confidence and lack of faith in our integrity."

That is not true. We are not acting on this proposition because of lack of confidence in the Commission. We are acting today on the proposition of whether we shall exempt attorneys and experts from the criminal laws because the Commission feels that it can more expeditiously transact its business if such an exemption should be granted. Again I say that that argument can be made by every commission which is appointed, by every official of Government who employs experts and lawyers. They can say "Give me a free choice. I am going to hire honest men who will not violate the law. If you have confidence in me, you will grant the exemption."

If that is to be the rule we might just as well repeal the law and have no such law applicable to anyone. Of course no one will advocate that, because the law is

written and designed to apply to abuses and evils which creep and have crept throughout the years into commissions and departments of Government. If we will not repeal it generally, why should we repeal it in this particular instance? If it is a good law to have for one commission it is a good law for this Commission. It is a dangerous and a bad precedent to say to this particular Commission, "You are exempt from the law and we will establish a privileged class, a special few to whom the criminal laws of the land do not apply."

I want to assure the Senator from Vermont that what I am saying is no reflection upon him or his committee or upon their integrity or ability. I say the same thing for all of the responsible officials of Government. I do not think we should have one law for one group and another law for another group. For that reason, Mr. President, I shall vote against the conference report.

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

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I do not know whether any law should be repealed or any special privilege given for the benefit of this Commission. The Commission believes that in order to permit it to obtain the best possible assistants, this concession must be made, for the reason that probably some of the best qualified persons whose services will be needed will fall in this category, and thereby will not be eligible for appointment by the Commission unless this exemption be granted.

I do not know about that, Mr. President; perhaps there are plenty of experts and attorneys and others whose services might become available to the Commission, and who would not come under this ban. If so, no exemption whatsoever should be made. In other words, unless it is necessary for the Commission to employ some persons who come within this category, if the Commission is to do the best possible job in connection with the task which it has been commissioned and delegated to do, perhaps no such exemption should be made. The matter is immaterial to me; I am interested in no person who might seek appointment by the Commission.

Mr. President, that objection is not the real issue before us. I have heard no one object for that reason. But now it is said, "We must have someone check on the Commission." I do not care whether that is done under the amendment or without the amendment.

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

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. KILGORE. Should we not also bear in mind the fact that if the amendment is not adopted the result will be to deny to an American citizen the right to employ counsel of his own choice, because under those circumstances no American citizen would be able to employ as counsel an attorney who was barred by this prohibition.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Certainly, although no one is objecting for that reason to the general ban.

Mr. President, it was first voted that the Commission be required to obtain the

approval of the Civil Service Commission. Of course, a member of the Civil Service Commission serves on this Commission. So I do not understand that when the Congress creates a special commission to do a special job, and entrusts it with the power and authority to do it and charges it with the duty of doing it, then in granting a legal exemption for the benefit of the Commission, the Congress should proceed to do so by way of re delegating the power to a three-member commission. It seems to me that it is far safer to use a 12-member commission.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Arkansas has forgotten that the provision respecting the Civil Service Commission was eliminated during the proceedings on the floor of the Senate, and the amendment which was rejected by the conference provided only for the examination of such applications by the Committees on Expenditures in the Executive Departments of the two Houses.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The Senator from Wyoming is quite correct, except I had not forgotten. I said that it was first proposed in connection with consideration of the bill, and it was proposed by the Senator from Wyoming. Then it was proposed to have the matter come back to the two congressional committees directly concerned, and be handled by them. That would mean that it would come before the committee of which I am a member and of which the able Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is a member. So in that case it would be placed in the hands of four members of the committee.

Mr. President, I feel confident that if the Senator from Vermont and I reported to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments that the services of a certain man were needed by the Commission and that the Commission felt they were needed, and that the corresponding House committee approved his appointment, then the Senate committee would approve the appointment.

Let us consider how much investigation they would make. I know what I would do under similar circumstances. I would take the word of my colleague, who is in a better position to know than I am. That is what the committee will do, at any rate. This proposal, if adopted, will simply slow down the process. I know of no precedent for the step now proposed; but if this step is taken, it certainly will constitute a precedent in the case of similar situations arising in the future.

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

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Let us let the RECORD show that both the House and the Senate Committees on Expenditures in the Executive Departments considered the original bill and recommended that it be adopted without any crippling amendments. However, when it was found that the law was not sufficiently broad to permit the Commission to function

in the way that a Commission must function in order to do the greatest good, the committees began to consider broadening the law, and they unanimously approved broadening it in the way now proposed. If the committees wished to have every employee of this Commission come before them for investigation and approval, they certainly would have made provision for that in the law, to begin with.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I have no objections to the proposed method of procedure; but the real issue now before us is whether it is necessary for the Congress to provide that some persons or some organization or agency shall check on the operations of the Commission, now that the Congress has set up the Commission and has charged it with a tremendous duty and responsibility. Of course it is perfectly proper for Senators to say that those who advocate the making of such a check are not trusting the Commission. Senators may say that if they wish to do so. I do not think any personal reflection is intended by anyone; but I say that those who advocate the proposed step are simply saying that it is necessary to have someone check on the Commission and protect and guard against the perpetration of some grievous wrong by the Commission.

Mr. President, personally, I have no interest in the matter. The report can be rejected, if that is the desire of the majority of the Senate. But I think the members of the Commission and most other persons believe that if the Commission is to do the best possible job, it may very likely be necessary for it to employ certain persons who otherwise would come within this category, and that the present ban, if it remains in effect as to the Commission, would require it to use for its work persons who would be regarded as second choice. Obviously the Commission would take the position that it could not afford to incur the risk of violating the law by employing persons who would come within the proscribed category, so the Commission would refuse to employ such persons, regardless of the desirability of their employment.

Mr. President, it seems to me that either this entire proposal should be rejected, with the result that no exemptions would be granted and the Congress would require a rigid observance of the law, or else we should let the responsibility rest where the Congress originally placed it, so that the Commission would be free to do the best possible job in the reorganization of the executive branch of the Government.

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

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is it not true that the law creating the Commission specifically provides that one-third of the membership of the Commission is to be appointed—as it was—by the President of the Senate and, similarly, one-third by the Speaker of the House?

Mr. McCLELLAN. The Senator from Florida is quite correct. The law also provides that one-third is to be appointed—as was done—by the President

of the United States. Every possible precaution has been taken, both in connection with the writing of the law and in its administration thus far and in the organization and establishment of the Commission, to make it nonpartisan. I assume that the three appointing officers—the President of the United States, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives—undertook, in making these appointments, to select men whose integrity could not be questioned, and who would be just as faithful and diligent in the protection of the Government of the United States against wrong as would any member of either the Senate or House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, or all of them collectively. I do not believe there is a member of the Commission who would take any chance whatsoever, knowingly, in the appointment of any person to assist the Commission. If the Congress feels that there should be some higher supervisory power over the Commission's action, then I submit it should be the President of the United States.

Mr. HOLLAND. Will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does the Senator think that the fact that the two Houses of Congress reposed in their respective presiding officers the appointment of two-thirds of the membership of the entire Commission makes the Commission and the situation so different from that which would prevail in the case of an ordinary commission that there is no validity to the claim that we would be establishing a precedent by adopting the bill in the form now before us?

Mr. McCLELLAN. It so occurs to me. I can appreciate others may entertain honestly a different opinion, but it occurs to me that if the Congress creates a body to do a job for it, and names the personnel, and then decides by amendment that we had better delegate some power over and above the Commission to supervise its acts, to see that it does not commit a crime against the Government or permit one to be committed, it does reflect upon the Commission, though it may not intend to do so.

Mr. HOLLAND. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is it not a fact that in the exercise of the discretion granted to the President of the Senate by the bill authorizing the appointment of the Commission, under which he appointed four members, the President of the Senate did appoint the chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and the ranking minority member, and that in the exercise of similar discretion the Speaker of the House did appoint as members of the Commission one of the ranking majority members of the similar committee in the House and the ranking minority member of that committee, thus placing on the Commission four of the ranking members of the two Committees on Expenditures in Executive Departments? Is not that correct?

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is correct. It is really immaterial to me what the Senate does, but I should say defeat the bill or permit the Commission to perform the mission which has been delegated to it.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Is it not true that the body of the bill, which exempts the employees of the Commission from sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code, was adopted by both the House and the Senate without a dissenting vote?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I think that is correct. I do not recall that there was a dissenting vote.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Is it not true that the only present difference between the Senate and the House is over the amendment adopted by the Senate providing that the employees of the Commission must be approved by the House and Senate Committees on Expenditures in the Executive Departments?

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is the only difference.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. The Senate adopted that amendment, the House rejected the amendment, the conferees agreed to the House position, and we are now called upon either to adopt the conference report, which embodies the bill which was unanimously approved by both the Senate and House committees, or reject the conference report, and instruct the Senate conferees to go back and insist that the House agree that no one can be employed by the Commission until the members of the Senate and House Committees on Expenditures in the Executive Departments approve the appointment. Is that not correct?

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is correct.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Is not this likewise true; is not the chief difficulty which confronts the Commission in securing satisfactory employees to do its essential work the fact that any person the Commission employs, who may not serve them more than 30 days, cannot for 2 years thereafter take a case involving any claim against the Government?

Mr. McCLELLAN. That applies in some instances. I am not sure about it; I have not referred to the statute. That may be correct.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I am satisfied that the question is not so much of employing someone who is now prosecuting a claim against the Government; it is the inhibition which later develops, that for 2 years after one has served the Commission for 30 days, 60 days, 90 days, he cannot go out and practice the legal profession, or do the business he had been ordinarily doing. It puts the Commission in an absurd position when it tries to get the best talent possible. How many times have we tried to reorganize the Government?

Mr. McCLELLAN. We have made many attempts, but I call the Senator's attention to the fact that we hear a great

deal now about the inability of the Government in all the executive branch to get the best talent and the ablest men to serve the Government because of many of these restrictions.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. How many times have we failed to do the job?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I do not think we have ever had a successful reorganization of the Government.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Is not this about the last call to do something with respect to the overpowering governmental set-up that is so expensive, and in many instances so inefficient?

Mr. McCLELLAN. We must pin our hopes to this Commission for any relief in the immediate future.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. As I understand, we are now called upon to reject the conference report, and insist to the House that before the Commission can become organized and employ anyone, the committee of which the Senator and I are members—and we have not time to examine any of the employees—must examine those employed, they must then go to the House committee, and the members of that committee must examine them, and I assume a majority of both the committees must unite, and if a majority does not vote favorably, I do not suppose an employee would be approved. We do not really have sufficient time to do the legislative work that comes before us, but we will have to approve an amendment compelling the Commission to do the work of examining these employees, or we will be called upon to send the report back to the House.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, if the Senator from Arkansas will yield, I may say that the proposed study of the executive branch of the Government has the wholehearted approval of President Truman.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I understand it does.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, as the Senator who was the author of the bill which set up the Commission on Reorganization of the Executive Branch, I think it is perhaps incumbent on me to say a word about the discussion which is now taking place.

It is a matter of satisfaction to see that this is an entirely nonpartisan issue. The debate this afternoon has shown that, and the history of the basic law has shown it, because the measure passed the House and the Senate at the last session unanimously, it was reported by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments unanimously, it was reported by the subcommittee of that committee unanimously.

The members of the Commission, as has been said, consist of six Republicans and six Democrats, and within the two divisions will be found Republicans and Democrats of various schools of opinion. In spite of that fact, the members of the Commission have been working very well together. They have made a very auspicious start on what I think we all agree is a very important and challenging task. They have begun to study the matter of Federal finance. They are making a very basic inquiry

into Federal public works. They are looking into the matter of setting up new and modern standards of personnel management and procurement. They are trying to throw some light on the subject of Government corporations. A great deal of thought is being given to reorganization of the Presidential office, which now presents such a baffling and bewildering problem for any man who is President. They are seeking to introduce methods of administrative management into the departments, so that they will be responsive to the leadership of the department heads instead of being sprawling and unmanageable.

I think all agree that there is nothing more important in the long run than to have a Federal Government which is not only economical in the way in which it is run and which saves the dollars of the people, but above all a government which is effective and efficient in terms of translating into action the aims and aspirations of the people. Senators who have studied what has happened abroad and who have seen the downfall of democratic governments one by one, and who have sought to ascribe a cause for the downfall of those governments, know very well that I am speaking the truth when I say that the reason those governments in the Old World have collapsed is that they were no longer able to translate into effective action the aims and the aspirations of their people. The day that our Government becomes so clogged and so inefficient and so full of cobwebs and dust and monkey wrenches in the machinery that it cannot translate into action the aims and aspirations of the people, on that day this form of government will disappear. Therefore, in contemplating the reorganization of the executive branch, we are not engaged merely in a little cheese-paring hunt for the purpose of saving a nickel here and a nickel there; we are engaged in a great effort to keep the Government the source of national strength and national morale and national enthusiasm that it has always been and must be in the future if the country is to be true to its promise.

The point has been made here that we do not need to worry about the proposed power being misused, because the 12 members of the Commission are such eminent and distinguished men. They are eminent and distinguished men. I do not think it would be possible to select in the entire United States 12 men who are more distinguished and more responsible and of higher character. But, as was said here a few weeks ago—I think by the Senator from Wyoming—to recur to that argument is to say that we believe in a government of men rather than in a government of laws. Of course, we do not want to do that, and we do not have to do that, because even if the members of the Commission were not men of the character and distinction they are, there would still be found within the intrinsic provisions of the original act all the safeguards that could possibly be wanted to protect us against any possible abuse of the exemption which is contemplated. When these men were appointed, partly by the President, partly by the President of the Senate, and partly by the Speaker of the House, with a 50-50

division between the two parties, there was set up an automatic check. The mind of man cannot devise a greater check or a more effective safeguard than that.

The Senator from Wyoming, as he always does, has made a very able statement. In all the years that I have been here—and I came here as a Member in 1937, having been before that in the press gallery for many years—I do not think I have ever heard a Senator who excelled the Senator from Wyoming in eloquence and ability, and I have heard very few who equaled him. He is clever, he knows the law, he has great facility for expressing himself. When he addresses himself to an important question he can move men very deeply. He can also make a very substantial impression when he addresses himself to something that is not so extremely important. When he says that we are doing something very serious when we plan to do something that we have done many times before, he would almost make one believe that such was the case, if it were not for the fact that we would be doing something far more serious if we should hamstring and shackle the Commission so that it could not discharge the duty which has been imposed upon it by the Congress and the President.

If we reject the conference report—and that is what we are being asked to do; we are not being asked this afternoon to agree or to disagree to a certain amendment, we are being asked to reject the whole report—if we make it difficult, if not impossible, for the Commission to function; if we make it difficult, if not impossible, for them to obtain the services of the engineers and management experts required to give the American people the quality of governmental service they desire, then we are, indeed, doing something serious. Therefore I hope the conference report will be agreed to.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, if the Senator from Massachusetts will yield for a question, is it not true that, if the bill is not passed, and the Commission could find qualified experts who are so interested in economy in government that they would give their services gratis to the Commission, the Commission could not employ them without a penalty being incurred by those men, namely, that for 2 years after their employment they could not practice in any Government department? Even if they were to work for nothing, would not the 2-year penalty apply to them if the bill is not passed?

Mr. LODGE. I believe the Senator from Virginia is correct. It is an essential thing to do.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Massachusetts almost completely disarms me, but not quite. I shall trouble the Senate now only to read a few words from the statute, exemption from which is demanded by those who are urging the adoption of the conference report. This is the criminal law:

Whoever, being an officer of the United States, or a person holding any place of trust or profit, or discharging any official function under, or in connection with, any executive department of the Government of the United States, or under the Senate or House of Rep-

resentatives of the United States, shall act as an agent or attorney for prosecuting any claim against the United States, or in any manner, or by any means, otherwise than in discharge of his proper official duties, shall aid or assist in the prosecution or support of any such claim, or receive any gratuity, or any share of or interest in any claim from any claimant against the United States, with intent to aid or assist, or in consideration of having aided or assisted, in the prosecution of such claim, shall be fined not more than \$5,000, or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both.

Senators who are defending the conference report have studiously refrained from reference to the provision with respect to which they ask exemption. The Senator from Massachusetts asks the Senate to believe that this great and able commission of distinguished men cannot undertake to reorganize the executive branch of the Government without employing or having the opportunity to employ persons who, but for the exemption, would be guilty of a crime. The only provision in the amendment I offered was that before the exemption became effective, the Committees on Expenditures in the Executive Departments should review the cases.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. If the Senator's amendment were agreed to and incorporated in the law, the exemption the bill now grants with respect to all the things contained in the statute which the Senator read would still be granted, though the matter would then be subject to review by the two committees, would it not?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. But we would know that the persons employed in the work would have been scrutinized at least twice, and we would have a safeguard. There is not a Member of this body who does not know that the law offices of Washington are filled with men who are prosecuting claims against the Government of the United States. There is not a Member of either House of Congress who does not know that a lawyer who, by some chance, might be employed to help reorganize the Government of the United States and still be exempt from any penalty for prosecuting claims against the United States, would be in a pretty position to make excellent fees.

I think the report should be rejected, and I ask for the yeas and nays on the adoption of the conference report.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the adoption of the conference report. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. WHITE. I announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] are necessarily absent.

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

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] is detained on official committee business, and is paired with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER].

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] is absent by leave of the Senate because of the death of his father David E. Wherry.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are unavoidably detained on official committee business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Maine, the Senator from Indiana, the Senator from Utah, the Senator from Nevada, the Senator from Kansas, the Senator from Nebraska, the Senator from Wisconsin, and the Senator from Iowa would each vote "yea."

Mr. BARKLEY. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. McGRATH], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] is absent on official business at one of the Government departments.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], who is necessarily absent, has a general pair with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED].

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 26, as follows:

YEAS—51

Aiken	Ecton	Martin
Baldwin	Ellender	Millikin
Ball	Ferguson	Moore
Bricker	Flanders	O'Connor
Bridges	Gurney	Revercomb
Brooks	Hawkes	Robertson, Va.
Buck	Hickenlooper	Robertson, Wyo.
Bushfield	Hoey	Saltzstall
Butler	Holland	Smith
Byrd	Ives	Stennis
Cain	Jenner	Taft
Capper	Kem	Thye
Cooper	Knowland	Tobey
Cordon	Langer	Vandenberg
Donnell	Lodge	White
Downey	McCarthy	Williams
Dworsnak	McClellan	Young

NAYS—26

Barkley	Johnson, Colo.	Murray
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Myers
Connally	Kilgore	O'Mahoney
Fulbright	McCarran	Russell
George	McFarland	Sparkman
Green	McKellar	Stewart
Hatch	McMahon	Thomas, Utah
Hayden	Maybank	Umstead
Hill	Morse	

NOT VOTING—19

Brewster	O'Daniel	Wagner
Capehart	Overton	Watkins
Eastland	Pepper	Wherry
Lucas	Reed	Wiley
McGrath	Taylor	Wilson
Magnuson	Thomas, Okla.	
Malone	Tydings	

So the conference report was agreed to.

AUTHORIZATION TO REPORT A JOINT RESOLUTION

As in legislative session,

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following the recess of the Senate today the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] be authorized to report from the Committee

on Banking and Currency Senate Joint Resolution 167, to aid in the stabilization of commodity prices, to aid in further stabilizing the economy of the United States, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I shall not object, but at this time I wish to introduce a bill dealing with the same subject, which I presume will be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

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

STABILIZATION OF COMMODITY PRICES

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to introduce the bill to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1888) to provide for the temporary control of prices on certain vital commodities in short supply that basically affect the cost of living or agricultural or industrial production, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. BARKLEY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to make a very brief statement in regard to the bill which I have just introduced. This is the bill which has been in process of preparation for several weeks, to carry out the message of the President with regard to inflation and the high cost of living. Yesterday the bill was sent to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], chairman of the committee on Banking and Currency, by the Secretary of Commerce, who has been acting in the capacity of chairman of the administrative agencies which have been working on this proposed legislation. The Senator from New Hampshire was temporarily absent from the city and did not receive it until today. I had hoped that the Senator from New Hampshire would himself introduce the bill as chairman of the Committee, but I am informed that he does not feel disposed to do so, or has not done so.

I am also advised that the Committee on Banking and Currency has today taken action, or authorized action, in regard to this subject, in the form of another proposal. I sincerely trust that before any effort is made to take up the bill which the committee is to report, it will give consideration to the bill to which I have referred, and which I have introduced. I presume that the bill will be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I think the minority leader misunderstands the proposal which is being made by the majority. There is no disposition whatever to exclude consideration of the bill which the Senator is introducing.

When the President submitted his message, with 10 points, I was referred to the Secretary of Commerce as the one who would present the matter to the Joint Committee on the Economic Report and other committees, or would designate members of the administration who would testify in behalf of the various points. I discussed the subject with

Mr. Harriman, and he designated various members of the administration. Mr. Eccles appeared in connection with one point. Mr. Anderson appeared in connection with others, and Mr. Harriman himself appeared in connection with certain points. It was then agreed that they would not present their case for price control and rationing during the special session, because I told Mr. Harriman that the subject presented such a substantial controversy that it would be impossible to handle it at this session, but that if he would present the other proposals, which were less controversial, we would try to handle them; and that has been done. We have now had testimony covering 6 of the 10 points, and part of a seventh.

The question we have had to consider is, How far can we deal with the points with respect to which there is, at least, less controversy? The program which is to be offered tomorrow in the Senate proposes to go as far as we can on these points at this session. It is not intended to exclude further consideration of other points, or more definite compulsions.

The first of the 10 points is:

To restore consumer credit controls and to restrain the creation of inflationary bank credit.

The Committee on Banking and Currency is reporting a bill to restore consumer credit controls. We hope that we may reach it tomorrow. Restraining the creation of inflationary bank credit is a matter which was presented by Mr. Eccles. He has an elaborate plan which has the opposition of nearly all the bankers in the United States. It presents very fundamental questions relating to the manner in which bank credit may be restrained without restraining it too much.

Mr. Eccles himself has stated that there is no hurry, because during the next 3 months approximately \$5,000,000,000 of Government bonds will be retired. Almost all the surplus of the Government for the fiscal year will occur in the next 3 months, and the retirement of the bonds will furnish a restraint on bank credit. In the meantime, we shall have time to consider the more fundamental questions relating to that very difficult problem.

The second point is:

To authorize the regulation of speculative trading on the commodity exchanges.

That subject has been considered by our committee. It has not been considered by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, which will have to submit recommendations. It presents a direct issue of what shall be done. I myself am in favor of some extension of such controls, but it seemed to be impossible to handle the subject at this session, except on a voluntary basis, as is proposed in the bill recommended by the Committee on Banking and Currency, which will be on the calendar tomorrow.

The third point is:

To extend and strengthen export controls.

That proposal is in the bill which will be before us tomorrow.

The fourth point is:

To extend authority to allocate transportation facilities and equipment.

That proposal is in the bill which will be before us tomorrow.

The fifth point is:

To authorize measures which will induce the marketing of livestock and poultry at weights and grades that represent the most efficient utilization of grain.

Mr. Anderson testified that none of the methods proposed was satisfactory to him, and that he had nothing to propose unless there were general price control, in which case that might be used as a method of controlling the weight of livestock and poultry.

The sixth point was:

To enable the Department of Agriculture to expand its program of encouraging conservation practices in this country, and to authorize measures designed to increase the production of foods in foreign countries.

Those matters are in a bill which the distinguished minority leader presented. We are perfectly willing to pass it, but we came to the conclusion, after legal advice, that no authorization bill was necessary. As I understand, the appropriation bill coming over from the House will contain additional funds necessary to expand the program of encouraging conservation practices, which means conservation of grain in feeding, and other measures designed to increase the production of foods in foreign countries.

The seventh point was:

To authorize allocation and inventory control of scarce commodities which basically affect the cost of living or industrial production.

That presents a very fundamental and controversial question: Whether the Government shall be given unlimited power to allocate materials in every industry in the Nation. We felt that should not be done. What we are proposing is to authorize the President to work out such inventory control and allocation on a voluntary basis by voluntary agreement.

We state very clearly in the policy statement adopted by the majority conference—and I state very clearly here—that it is not intended to exclude any additional measure that may be sought when it is shown that voluntary measures have not worked and cannot work. It is in no sense presented as an alternative to the proposal of the Senator from Kentucky. It will have full consideration when presented. But certainly such a proposal of all-out price control or even price control of a particular product is something which will take many days more to debate than we can possibly have at this special session. I think it is a perfectly fair thing to say to the administration, "Here is the power. Use it on a voluntary basis. Give certain exemptions under the antitrust laws. Place some limitation on the use of steel for nonproductive purposes; some limitation on distillers in the use of grain. Here is the power to do it voluntarily." If it cannot be done, we will consider at the regular session any specific control that may be sought.

That is the proposal in substance.

The last three points are not dealt with.

They are:

8. To extend and strengthen rent control.
9. To authorize consumer rationing on products in short supply which basically affect the cost of living.
10. To authorize price ceilings on products in short supply which basically affect the cost of living or industrial production, and to authorize such wage ceilings as are essential to maintain the necessary price ceilings.

Rent control should be before the committee as soon as we return. It will require some weeks. What I have indicated is as much as I think we can do without raising some great issue tomorrow.

I want to correct the Senator's impression that it is intended to forestall the bill which he has introduced.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not recall that I said anything about forestalling anything. I might have said it with some justification, in view of the fact that Congress has been in session for a month; that on the 17th of November the President made his recommendations with regard to the question of inflation legislation and set out 10 points which he deemed advisable and necessary in order properly to deal with the subject.

The Senator from Ohio and all the other Senators realize that notwithstanding the fact that these recommendations were made by a Democratic President, the Republican Party is in control of both Houses of the Congress, and we being practical men realized that we could not pass the legislation ourselves unless we had the cooperation of the majority.

Since the Senator from Ohio has referred to the action of the majority policy committee I will say that the minority policy committee also dealt with the question and decided that it would not undertake to initiate legislation until the Republican policy committee and the Republican majority had been given a reasonable opportunity to introduce legislation in accordance with the President's recommendations, if they should see fit to do so. We have waited for that event to transpire, but it has not yet done so.

In the House of Representatives a four-point bill was introduced and reported rather hastily from a committee and was defeated yesterday. The Senator from Ohio introduced a similar bill in the Senate carrying out four points, and it was referred yesterday, I believe, to the Committee on Banking and Currency which, I understand, has agreed to act upon it with some modifications, at least as to one of the points.

We are now, it seems, in the very closing days of the session. There have been hearings for a month before the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, which is not a legislative committee, and before which Mr. Harriman was invited or requested to appear and did appear as a witness. He also appeared before the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House of Representatives, and the chairman of that committee complained because Mr. Harriman had no bill; that the administration had not submitted a bill, and that

Mr. Harriman himself had not submitted a bill. I think Mr. Harriman very properly took the position that if they were too hasty in submitting a bill, or if, without the hope of cooperation with the majority, they had submitted a bill, as heretofore they would be charged with trying to cram something down the throats of Congress or bringing forward a "must" bill without giving an opportunity to the majority to work out in cooperation with the executive branch a specific piece of legislation.

On the bill which was presented yesterday to the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, and which I am now introducing because the chairman indicated that he did not wish to introduce it or did not feel like introducing it and had not done so, I have no way of knowing what the action of the Congress will be. I know what the President recommended. I know that the four-point bill introduced by the Senator from Ohio, which was a copy of the bill introduced in the other branch by the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, is not adequate to deal with the situation. Whether we regard it as wise to deal with it piecemeal, a point or two at a time, is a matter over which I have no control. I have tried to keep reasonably well informed through the reports of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, by reading the hearings on both sides of the Congress, by newspaper articles, and advertisements of the National Association of Manufacturers, and other public benefactors who are anxious to barge in at the last minute in order to get some sort of legislation for the benefit of the people. But regardless of what we do the remainder of the week, certainly the proposal which has been called for time and time again by official representatives of the two Houses of Congress is entitled to be introduced and considered. I have introduced a bill for the consideration of the Congress. I understand it has been introduced in the House also. It is introduced for the consideration of the Committee on Banking and Currency. I am sorry that that committee was in such haste that it could not give consideration to the part of the program which it has voted out today. But, be that as it may, certainly if we are not prepared to have any legislation between now and the date of adjournment the country is entitled to consider the whole subject.

I have submitted this bill in the hope that it will be considered by the committee and by the Congress as a bona fide effort to deal with the subject, recognizing the controversies that exist and the differences of opinion which may lie at the basis of any legislation that may be enacted.

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

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I hope the Senator will consider that with regard to both the proposals which have been made they are not intended to foreclose the other matters. I happen to disagree with the bill which the Senator is introducing, because it sets up an OPA with complete power of price control. But it certainly

is entitled to consideration, and there is no effort in what we propose to do tomorrow—

Mr. BARKLEY. In the first place, it does not set up another OPA. It authorizes the President to use existing agencies.

Mr. TAFT. It gives full power of price control. The Senator knows the tremendous difficulties he and I had in trying to get an OPA measure through at different times, and he knows that this measure cannot be considered to a conclusion at this session.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think I had more difficulty in trying to get an OPA measure through than did the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. I cooperated with the Senator.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator did cooperate.

Mr. TAFT. I did not agree entirely with what the Senator wanted.

Mr. BARKLEY. It was not exactly what I wanted. It was possibly a little more than the Senator wanted. At least we worked together.

Mr. TAFT. In order that something may be accomplished when we consider very seriously the proposals which will be in the bill tomorrow—

Mr. BARKLEY. The bills which I introduced earlier today give the Secretary of Agriculture greater power in connection with the regulation of commodity markets under the Commodity Exchange Act. I do not know whether the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to which I suppose the bills were referred, will have time to consider each bill before we take a recess or adjournment.

Mr. TAFT. They have not started, and I am afraid they will not. As a matter of fact, at the present time the measures which the Secretary wishes to impose are in effect and will stay in effect until we start on this measure.

Mr. BARKLEY. They will stay in effect only if the authorization now in existence is carried out, but they can be reduced back to the 10 percent which they were before they were increased to 33½ percent. There is no way by which the Secretary can compel those margins to be continued.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I feel that some differences might arise because of dissension among us as to the matters which have been under consideration in the last few minutes. Therefore, as in legislative session, I shall move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock.

SUSPENSION OF RULE AS TO NOMINATIONS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold that motion, and yield to me?

Mr. WHITE. I do.

Mr. GURNEY. I ask that the motion to recess be withheld, for the reason that this morning the Committee on Armed Services voted unanimously to hold in the committee numerous nominations of high rank in the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps. So it is my purpose to ask unanimous consent that the committee or the Senate hold these nominations during the coming recess. I

thought I would ask consent today, so that if there were any objection, I could give notice that I was asking for a suspension of the rule.

So, if the Senator from Maine will yield for that purpose—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. What is the request of the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. GURNEY. My present request is that the numerous nominations held by the Committee on Armed Services be allowed to remain with the committee during the coming recess. So I ask unanimous consent that paragraph 6 of rule XXXVIII be suspended, so that the nominations presently with the Committee on Armed Services may remain with the committee and be considered in the second session of the present Congress.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. Without objection, the order is made.

RECESS

Mr. WHITE, Mr. President, as in legislative session, I now renew my motion that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 52 minutes p. m.), as in legislative session, the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, December 17, 1947, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 16 (legislative day of December 4), 1947:

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

David A. Morse to be Under Secretary of Labor.

John T. Kmetz to be Assistant Secretary of Labor.

HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE ADMINISTRATOR
Raymond Michael Foley to be Housing and Home Finance Administrator.

FEDERAL HOUSING COMMISSIONER

Franklin D. Richards to be Federal Housing Commissioner.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

MEMBERS

Abe Murdock to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board for a term of 5 years.

J. Copeland Gray to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board for a term of 2 years.

GENERAL COUNSEL

Robert N. Denham to be general counsel of the National Labor Relations Board for a term of 4 years.

FEDERAL MEDIATION AND CONCILIATION SERVICE
Cyrus Stuart Ching to be Federal Mediation and Conciliation Director.

FEDERAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

Oscar R. Ewing to be Federal Security Administrator.

CALIFORNIA DEBRIS COMMISSION

Col. Joseph S. Gorlinski to be member and secretary of the California Debris Commission.

IN THE ARMY

APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

Lt. Col. Charles Russell Broshous, Army of the United States, to be professor of military topography and graphics at the United States Military Academy, with rank from date of appointment.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY IN THE ARMY NURSE CORPS AND THE WOMEN'S MEDICAL SPECIALIST CORPS

The nominations of Ada M. Bowers et al., for appointment in the Regular Army in the Army Nurse Corps and the Women's Medical Specialist Corps, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on December 15, 1947, and are shown in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Ada M. Bowers appearing on page 11381 and ending with the name of Olga A. Zanella appearing on page 11382.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

Medical Service Corps

To Be Captain

Charles S. Gersoni, Medical Service Corps, with rank from October 27, 1947.

The nominations of Sam Foster Seeley and others for promotion in the Medical Corps of the Regular Army of the United States which were received by the Senate on December 15, 1947, were confirmed today and shown in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for December 15, 1947, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Sam Foster Seeley appearing on page 11377 and ending with the name of Charles Edwin Robinson appearing on page 11381.

Army Nurse Corps

To Be First Lieutenants

Mary Magdalene Matlavage, with rank from October 26, 1947.

June Florence Berryman, with rank from October 30, 1947.

Clara Mary Sullivan, with rank from November 20, 1947.

Regina Claire O'Donnell, with rank from December 1, 1947.

Women's Medical Specialist Corps

To Be First Lieutenant

Myrtle May Bates, with rank from December 5, 1947.

IN THE NAVY

APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY

Appointment to the permanent grade of captain in the line and staff corps of the Navy

Officers of the Line

Robert W. Cavenagh	Charles A. Buchanan
Elton W. Grenfell	Joseph B. Stefanac
Frederic A. Graf	Karl J. Biederman
John C. S. McKillip	John F. Newman, Jr.
John B. McLean	Charles Adair

Officers of the Medical Corps

Warren G. Wieand
Albert R. Behnke, Jr.

Officer of the Supply Corps

Blon B. Bierer, Jr.

Officer of the Civil Engineer Corps

Elmer B. Greey

Appointment to the permanent grade of commander in the line and staff corps of the Navy

Officers of the Line

Robert C. Sleight	Jewett O. Phillips, Jr.
John Baumeister, Jr.	William G. Holman
Allen R. Faust	Henry C. Schwaner,
Jonathan L. W. Wood-	Jr.
ville, Jr.	Thomas S. King, Jr.
Walter F. Schlech, Jr.	James S. Gray, Jr.
Robert L. Neyman	John F. Ryder
Dayton A. Seiler	Donald W. Wilson
David S. Brown	William B. Parham
Albert B. Furer	Herbert V. Burkart
Sydney R. Miller, Jr.	David C. Richardson
Dallas M. Lazure	

Officers of the Medical Corps

Charles S. Hascall, Jr.	Edward P. Irons
George L. Tabor, Jr.	Joseph J. Timmes
Lester J. Pope	Lynn S. Beals, Jr.

Officers of the Supply Corps

Richard L. Myers
Randolph Meade, Jr.

Officer of the Chaplain Corps

Harry C. Wood

Officer of the Civil Engineer Corps

Raymond B. Krum

Officers of the Dental Corps

Aaron N. Bowers, Jr.
William B. Johnson, Jr.

Appointment to the permanent grade of lieutenant commander in the line and staff corps of the Navy

Officers of the Line

James J. McMullan	Robert P. Pierson
Clifford E. Caton	George B. Stewart III
Daniel W. Abercrombie	John M. Maloney
James L. Cook, Jr.	Paul L. Vissat
Douglas G. Ewen	Manuel D. Vincent
John D. Brink	James J. McDonald
Lamar S. Taylor	Laurence R. Naegely
Leonard J. Opeil	William D. Biggers
John F. Peterson	John B. Jorgensen
Phillip G. Saylor	Clifford E. Fanning
John S. Weiler	Edward V. D. David-
Jack L. Lowentroun	son
John R. Dierker	Joseph D. Brummett
Gordon E. Hartley	Leo W. Mullane
William W. Powell	Ralph E. Elliott, Jr.
Alfred F. Blair	William W. Kelly
Lyle R. Hays	Carl D. Krantz
John McLaughlin	Albert K. Earnest
Frederick L. Yeo	Charles U. Walkley
Wilson B. Robertson	

Officers of the Supply Corps

Leonard G. Honey	Lawrence D. Wornom
Chester E. Beaver	John R. Arnzen
Alan M. Hamerslag	Horace W. Blaine
John D. Custer	

Officer of the Chaplain Corps

John Novick

Officer of the Civil Engineer Corps

Daniel E. Connolly

Officer of the Medical Service Corps

George A. Miller

Appointments to the grades indicated in the line of the Navy

Lieutenant Commander

Thomas E. Delate

Lieutenants (Junior Grade)

Donald H. Nitz
Bruce W. Robertson
Julius A. Striso

Appointments to the grades indicated in the Medical Corps of the Navy

Commander

Christopher C. Shaw

Lieutenant Commanders

Henry W. Miller
Walter R. Taylor

Lieutenants (Junior Grade)

Oliver L. Babcock	Charles L. Lear
Preston H. Bandy	Charles J. Molnar,
David D. Bennett,	Jr.
Jr.	John S. Neill
Leonard B. Burgess	Marion E. Nune-
Donald L. Burnham	maker
John D. Capehart	Edward E. Parker
John J. Carty	Joseph E. Rankin
Avery L. Cotton	Ernest S. Redfield
James A. Dugger	William S. Reed
Robert J. Fahrner	Leslie W. Sederstrom
Robert R. Garison	Fred A. Valusek
Hamlin G. Habib	William A. Viele
Newman A. Hoopin-	Clay N. Wells
garner	Harold E. Wood, Jr.
Rupert S. Hughes	Harold S. Wright, Jr.
Roland W. Jones	Norman F. Wyatt

Appointments to the grades indicated in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy

Lieutenants

Harold M. Cohn
John D. Plawchan

Lieutenants (Junior Grade)

Lawrence H. Eding Dean K. Marquardt
 Frank M. Laurenzano Albert R. Marschall
 Bernard L. Hansen William B. Stephen-
 John J. Manning, Jr. son
 Benjamin T. Dibble Allen S. Waters
 Robert B. Jarvis Joe E. Wilson

Ensigns

George E. Livingston Donald G. Iselin
 Vershall A. Roy Albert M. LaLande,
 James T. Acuff Jr.
 Earl I. Boyd Edward M. Saunders
 Robert J. Farley Nelson C. Simonson
 Charles J. Forquer Walter W. Vander
 William J. Franczy Wolk, Jr.

Appointments to the grades indicated in the
Dental Corps of the Navy

Lieutenant Commanders

Gus J. Jerkofsky
 Harry E. Pump

Appointment to the grade indicated in the
Medical Service Corps of the Navy

Lieutenant (Junior Grade)

Woodrow C. Manley

Appointments to the grades indicated in the
Nurse Corps of the Navy

Lieutenants

Mary R. Anderson Edna A. Reeves
 Anna M. Dillon Ida A. Thompson
 Edith M. Macha Adelyn M. Yankowski
 Mary F. Parker

Lieutenants (Junior Grade)

Elois M. Duffy
 Kathryn E. Lopartz
 Celia Z. Pipkin

Ensign

Edith M. Devoe

Appointment to the commissioned warrant
grade indicated

Chief Boatswain

John Buday

To be ensigns in the Navy with rank from
June 4, 1948

Charles W. Hallagan Edward F. Krueger
 Thomas M. Hopkins Joseph J. Paulis, Jr.
 To be ensigns in the Supply Corps of the
 Navy with rank from June 4, 1948

Warren W. Barker
 George A. Murphy

To be lieutenants (junior grade) in the
Medical Corps of the Navy

Leon A. Adams David G. Doane
 Thomas A. Anderson William C. Drennan
 Robert J. Audet Arthur B. Dubois
 Charles E. Bancroft Merlin K. Duval, Jr.
 Paul E. Barber George S. Ellis
 Jack Barrow Jerome C. Evanson
 Frederick B. Becker Richard S. Farr
 Paul B. Bender John S. Featherston
 Jack C. Berger John C. Filkins
 Richard C. Bishop Donald R. Fitch
 Walter L. Blackadar, Jr. Gregory E. Flynn
 Ralph V. Ford
 Billy R. Blackburn Richard Foulk
 Russell S. Boles Nathaniel E. Fowler
 Murdock S. Bowman George R. Frempter
 Thomas A. Boyd Robert E. Fultz
 Gurdon L. Bradt Paul J. Fuzy
 Byron L. Brown Aubrey D. Gantt
 John B. Bryan Charles R. Gardipee,
 Robert G. Busboom Jr.
 John L. Butler Thomas H. Garth
 Dee W. Call Albin Gedarovich
 David B. Carmichael Albert B. Giknis
 Herman E. Carr, Jr. Paul J. Goodwin
 William S. Carter Orville M. Graves, Jr.
 James P. Clarke James W. Greer
 Dayton A. A. Cooper Donald W. Grimes
 Robert R. Cooper, Jr. Lawrence K. Groves
 Earl E. Correll John S. Guerrant
 John C. Country James R. Hamilton
 Elgin C. Cowart, Jr. Paul K. Hamilton, Jr.
 Donald R. Cruse Duke E. Hanna
 Alfred O. Davies John W. Hanni
 Delbert E. Dickson Richard H. Hardin
 Milan Diklich, Jr. Kenneth L. Hardy

Byron F. Harper, Jr. William C. Owsley
 Wiley H. Harrison William F. Park
 Edward G. Haskell, Jr. William T. Patton
 Earl A. Hathaway Donald F. Percy
 Milford D. Hayden Samuel R. Penn
 John S. Hayes James C. Peterson
 Edwin A. Henck Charles A. S. Phillips
 Ray A. Henn Leonard V. Phillips
 Carl M. Herbert, Jr. William H. Piesscher
 John T. Hicks, Jr. John R. Pollock, Jr.
 Raymond W. Hillyard Jack W. Pou
 Harland V. Hippen- James M. Poynter
 steel, Jr. Lyle H. Prenzler
 Robert R. Hirst Elmer M. Purcell, Jr.
 Bert J. Hoefflich John W. Reece
 Richard F. Hoffman Walter D. Reese
 John W. Hollowell Robert N. Reynolds
 Alden V. Holmes Stanley T. Robinson
 Roy W. Holmes Matthew P. Romeo
 Charles C. Houghton, Robert C. Rossberg
 Jr. Albert G. Rowe
 Marion B. Howorth, Paul W. Scanlon
 Jr. Peter W. Schneider

James B. Hutcheson Morgan E. Scott
 William Ingram, Jr. Martin A. Seidell
 Harry S. Irvine, Jr. Robert R. Sexton
 Lyle F. Jacobson Edwin P. Shanks
 Paul A. Jarand Daniel M. Shook
 Alvin C. Jensen Harrison "H" Shoul-
 Ralph A. Jessar ders, Jr.
 Morton Johan Thomas A. Sinclair
 Harold G. Johnson Ronald B. Slater
 Lawrence W. Johnson Edward M. Smith, Jr.
 Robert L. Justice Jullien L. Smith
 John A. King David J. Stahl
 William E. King, Jr. Carl C. Stanford
 Lindsay J. Kirkham Marshall K. Steele, Jr.
 Robert J. Kleinhenz Marshall P. Stonestreet
 Martin Koeck III Fred Sutliff
 Donald R. Koerner John E. Sweeney
 Walter P. Kosar Richard E. Symmonds
 Michael J. Langan Lloyd McC. Taylor
 William E. Larsen George V. Teter, Jr.
 Thomas B. Leberherz George W. Thoma, Jr.
 John R. Lee, Jr. Clayton L. Thomas
 Harvey L. Lehman, Jr. Edwin M. Tomlin
 Oliver S. Leinart, Jr. Willard W. Tornow
 Thomas H. Lewis Lockland V. Tyler, Jr.
 Robert H. Lister Frank H. Voelz
 Richard E. Luehrs John S. Walker
 Dennis P. McCarthy Herbert L. Walter
 Francis C. McMains Stephen H. Ware, Jr.
 Charles D. McMillan Charles J. Watkins
 Dan G. McNamara Alan D. Watson
 Gordon B. Magill Lorrain E. Watters
 Joseph K. Maloy Robert N. Webster
 Isaac V. Manly John P. Welborn
 James H. Manly, Jr. Peter F. Wells II
 "C" "L" Manning, Jr. John F. Wetegrove
 Francis Marshall James E. Whiteside
 Allen L. Miller Frederick G. F. Wie-
 Lewis C. Mills gand
 William D. Misbach Harry K. Wieman
 Charles W. Moffett Stewart A. Wilber
 Robert P. Moore Chester A. Williams,
 James F. Morrell Jr.
 Samuel L. Moschella Robert G. W. Williams,
 Thomas J. Murphy Jr.
 Lincoln D. Nelson James "K" VanA. Will-
 Claude R. Nichols, Jr. son
 Donald J. Nollet Frank W. Winters
 Leon L. North Edwin P. Woodward
 Robert W. O'Brien Wayne "L" Wright, Jr.
 Donald O'Hanian Louis C. Zang
 James S. O'Hare Edwin R. Zartman
 Jack S. Oney George G. Zorn, Jr.
 Joseph Oshman

Robert F. Hause to be an ensign in the
Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy.To be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Civil
Engineer Corps of the Navy

James E. Delehanty, Francis B. Peacock
 Jr. Robert T. Sinnott
 Albert W. Draves, Jr. Charles L. Souder
 William A. Mueller

To be lieutenants (junior grade) in the
Dental Corps of the Navy

Richard M. Batchelder Paul W. Boudreaux
 Theodore M. Behrman Floyd G. Dixon
 Gordon G. Bennett Floyd G. Evans
 Lambert A. Benson Edward S. Flynn

Spencer A. Gedestad James H. Snyder
 Charles E. Gleason Meyers Thornton
 Frank E. Grogman George Ulrich
 Melvin L. Hermsmeyer Curtis J. Vague
 Everard F. Jones John R. Waggner
 Frank J. Kratochvil, Jr. Harvey P. Webre
 Howard T. Williamson

Donald E. Parry

To be ensigns in the Nurse Corps of the Navy

Mary F. Barrett Dorothea M. Johnson
 Elaine H. Baumann Mary L. Kleckner
 Bettie L. Beach Floy G. Mangold
 Eleanor C. Beste Ruby L. Morden
 Anna Birardi Lola M. Paulie
 Virginia I. Brown Wanda E. Pizorka
 Ann M. Chamblin Marie Poljanac
 Shirley A. Dobbs Mary M. Rhodes
 Ethel C. A. Eusenbio Annette Rutkosky
 Grace E. Hall Nellie J. Smoogen
 Imogene Hathaway Alice M. Taraskas
 Annie V. Hopple Irene D. Walker
 Mary E. Howard

IN THE MARINE CORPS

To be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps
from June 6, 1947

Carl R. Dennis
 Harold K. Thompson, Jr.
 Jack Westerman

To be a second lieutenant in the Marine
Corps from June 4, 1948

Donald R. Hughes.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 16, 1947

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.
 Dr. Clarence W. Cranford, Calvary
 Baptist Church, Washington, D. C., of-
 fered the following prayer:

We thank Thee, O God, for this mo-
 ment of prayer. It may seem unim-
 portant to take time to pray in a world
 in which there is so much to do. But
 help us to believe it is never unimportant
 to seek the Divine Will—that unless we
 give attention to those spiritual matters
 that make for character and good will,
 we may succeed in building a world in
 which our very cleverness may be the
 means of our undoing. We pray in
 Jesus' name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yes-
 terday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr.
 Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that
 the Senate disagrees to the amendment
 of the House to the bill (S. 1770) entitled
 "An act to amend the National Housing
 Act, as amended," requests a conference
 with the House on the disagreeing votes
 of the two Houses thereon, and appoints
 Mr. TOBEY, Mr. BUCK, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr.
 MAYBANK, and Mr. TAYLOR to be the con-
 fererees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the
 Senate agrees to the report of the com-
 mittee of conference on the disagreeing
 votes of the two Houses on the amend-
 ments of the Senate to the bill (H. R.
 4469) entitled "An act to amend the act
 of July 7, 1947, so as to authorize the
 Commission on Organization of the Exec-
 utive Branch of the Government to pro-
 cure the temporary or intermittent serv-
 ices of experts or consultants or organi-
 zations thereof."

The message also announced that the Senate had adopted the following resolution:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and extreme regret the announcement of the death of Hon. Arthur Walsh, who served in the United States Senate from the State of New Jersey from November 2, 1943, to December 6, 1944.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased, together with a transcript of remarks made in the Senate in praise of his distinguished service to the Nation.

SIGNING OF ENROLLED BILL

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that, pursuant to the authority granted him on December 15, 1947, he did on that day sign the enrolled bill of the Senate, S. 1774.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McDONOUGH (at the request of Mr. Boggs of Delaware) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article relative to taxation.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

THE LATE ARTHUR B. JENKS

Mr. COTTON. 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 Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. Speaker, in the necessary absence of my colleague the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. Merrow], I feel that it is my duty to call the attention of the House to the fact that Arthur B. Jenks, a former Representative of the First District of New Hampshire, who served in this body three terms, passed away yesterday. Mr. Jenks, a successful businessman in private life, served usefully in this body. He was a humble and unassuming gentleman, and he would be the last to desire a long and glowing eulogy to be delivered in his behalf here. But, as a Representative from New Hampshire, I wish to take this opportunity to pay to him the tribute that a Christian gentleman, a fine American, and a former Member so richly deserves.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. RAMEY. I remember with a good deal of respect and admiration the Honorable Arthur B. Jenks. A great many Members will remember him during the crucial time of his election contest. He was serene throughout the entire proceedings, and his district triumphantly

returned him to Congress after he was unseated. He took the whole matter as a Christian, forgiving his enemies at all times. He was a man that was loved by every Member of the House, and as a businessman he was altruistic.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COTTON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. I want to say a word in behalf of Mr. Jenks. I remember him as he stood here in the House trying to do the things that were essential and necessary for his district. He was a gentleman and a scholar. Everything he did seemed to be with the idea of trying to make this country better. I not only knew him in the House but I played golf with him, and he was just as earnest and zealous in trying to win a game of golf as he was in doing his duty here in Congress for the best interests of the American people. I loved him, and I think we shall all miss him. I feel confident he is being rewarded in heaven for the work he did for his fellow men.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Quincy Herald-Whig.

Mr. BRAMBLETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial by Col. Allen Griffin, publisher of the Monterey (Calif.) Peninsula-Herald, on universal military training.

Mr. TWYMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article about the national system of interstate highways prepared by the Honorable Fred R. White, highway engineer of the State of Iowa.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

SPECULATION ON COMMODITY MARKETS

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Pauley, of Nation-wide fame, states that he intends to resign when he gets ready to resign. I demand that he resign at once, Mr. Speaker, because he has violated a trust of the American people. I trust Mr. Pauley will resign immediately, which he should do.

Mr. Speaker, there may be others in our Government who have been violating their trust. In order to have a full and complete investigation of the matter, I am today introducing a resolution directing the Committee on Agriculture to conduct a full and complete investigation as to the operations of speculators, both Government and others, in the futures commodity markets of the country. This investigation is necessary in order to pro-

tect the economy and integrity of our country and its public officials. I hope the Committee on Rules and the leadership will immediately approve this resolution so that we can go forward with the investigation during the holidays and bring to light some of the ill-advised activities that are taking place in our Nation today.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. I do not think Mr. Pauley did anything that was wrong so far as the law is concerned, but being a Government official he should have disposed of all of his commodities before he took office. He should not make a profit nor should anybody else in this country be permitted to make a profit on the grain sales today when they raise the price of food to the American people.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman is right, but the Commodity Credit Corporation, which buys all these billions of dollars worth of food for the Government, dominates the market. Any Government official who has inside information, which I know some of them have, can go into the market and make hundreds of thousands of dollars, yes, millions of dollars on information received from some Government official.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman is absolutely right.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That should be uncovered, and the House should direct a committee to proceed with the investigation.

RESTRICTIONS ON CONSUMER CREDIT

Mr. DONDERO. 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 Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, Pontiac, Mich., in my district, is a city of about 80,000 people. The Buckner Finance Co., one of the oldest financial institutions of the city, is taking a poll on the question of whether or not the people desire the reestablishment of wartime Federal restrictions on consumer credit. Of the first 352 ballots received, this is the record: 49 were in favor of the reestablishment of Government controls and 299 were opposed to it. Four were neutral. But the interesting part of this poll is the fact that of the 352 ballots received, 203 came from factory workers, 27 from truck drivers, 21 from housewives, 18 from city and county employees, 12 from farmers, and 11 from salesmen—and a few scattering. It would appear from the record that the people back home are not in favor of the reestablishment of consumer-credit controls similar to wartime controls.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MATHEWS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the death of Dr. Charles Browne, of Princeton, N. J., a former Member of the House of Representatives.

CURING INFLATION

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for half a minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Speaker, the President's philosophy for curing inflation while ignoring the causes reminds me of that of the woman who eats and eats, grows fatter and fatter, then looks at herself in the mirror and says, "Goodness gracious, this is bad; this is dangerous. Something must be done about it. Quick, Daddy, run out and buy me a tighter girdle."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MUNDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address delivered by him on the subject of a consistent American foreign policy.

FUNDS FOR FINNISH FREEDOM

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the little Republic of Finland once again faithfully fulfilled its obligation by paying its annual interest payments to the United States. I take the floor today for the purpose of announcing that in conjunction with a number of Members of the other body, I have introduced a resolution stipulating that the payment made yesterday and all subsequent debt payments made by Finland shall be set aside in a special fund to pay scholarships, tuition fees, and expenses for people from Finland coming to the United States to study the ways and processes of freedom, and the educational and industrial developments of this country. This is in conformity with traditional American policy established during the days of the Boxer indemnity and during the days of the Hoover relief mission in Belgium, and it would afford the people of Finland the same opportunity which similar funds have so fruitfully and satisfactorily provided for the Chinese and the Belgians.

May I point out that while the body of Finland is today behind the iron curtain, the spirit of Finland is with the West. Through the integrity, honesty, and intense constructive energy displayed by the people of Finland in paying their annual payments on their war debts, Finland being the only country that has done so, it seems to me that this Republic has amply earned such consideration as we now propose on the part of the United States. Such action on our part will tend further to cement to the West those sturdy people of Finland who have so meticulously fulfilled every obligation that they have ever made. It will also be a gracious and effective method by which the United States can proclaim to the world its respect and affection for a country which pays back what it borrows.

THE GOOD ROAD

Mr. WADSWORTH. 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. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I hope that the announcement I am about to make will prove to be agreeable to the Members. Certainly it does not involve anything of a controversial character. On Wednesday, Thursday, Friday, and Saturday, December 17 to 20 of this week, at 8:30 p. m., there will be presented at the Lisner Auditorium, at Twenty-first and H Streets NW., a musical review entitled "The Good Road."

May I say that this review is the work of an organization known as the Moral Rearmament Organization. It has had extraordinarily favorable receptions in other cities, including Boston and New York, and is to be presented here on the days I have mentioned.

I think every Member of the House has received an invitation to apply for tickets. In order that the Members may be more easily served, I suggest that those who desire to apply for tickets do so at room 1031 of the New House Office Building. May I also add that there is no admission charge.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. In Caux, Switzerland, last summer a number of us had the privilege of seeing that tremendous drama, The Good Road. I recommend it to every Member of Congress. It is well worth seeing.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I am sure it will make a very, very strong, as well as agreeable, appeal to the better instincts of those who attend.

Mr. MUNDT. There is no question about it.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I thank the gentleman.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I asked unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a letter on the Marshall plan. I am advised by the printer that it is an extension of four and one-half pages and will cost \$319.50. Notwithstanding the additional cost, I ask unanimous consent that the extension may be made.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD with regard to a bill he is introducing today.

Mr. COLE of Missouri asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a poem entitled "Not the Nation's Wish but the Will of Washington," by Horace C. Carlisle.

Mr. RAMEY asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article entitled "Thinking Toward Peace."

EGGS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a statement from a mathematician.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, planned scarcity must share in the blame for high prices.

This is the sound conclusion reached by an eminent mathematician of my congressional district, Prof. Charles W. Watkeys, whose acumen is by no means confined to the academic field. He has sent to me what he describes as "A little problem in arithmetic," which, pursuant to leave granted, I set forth below.

I commend it to the thoughtful consideration, particularly of those who seek to regulate our lives primarily for the benefit of the regulators:

A LITTLE PROBLEM IN ARITHMETIC

Suppose each one of the 140,000,000 inhabitants of the United States skipped an egg on Thursday. (Not all eat eggs, some eat two or more at a meal and some do not eat eggs on Thursday, but for the sake of the argument let us make use of the above assumption.) Dividing by 12, this will give approximately 11,000,000 dozen eggs. The hens will not listen if we tell them not to lay the Thursday eggs. The eggs cannot be placed on sale on another day without reducing the price, so our Government has to buy these eggs at the market price of say, 70 cents a dozen (to be conservative).

This makes \$7,700,000 that must be taken from the tax pile for the Thursday eggs, each Thursday.

Dividing \$7,700,000 by 140,000,000 gives 6 cents as the amount that each inhabitant, on the average, gives to the Government for the privilege of skipping an egg on Thursday.

If we go to the grocery store and buy an egg to eat, it will cost us 6 cents.

So whether we eat the egg or do not eat the egg, it will cost 6 cents. (Can't you hear Alice from Wonderland saying, "When I go to college I'm going to concentrate in planned economy. That's the course where they learn to write with ink.")

To make room for the Thursday eggs, the 91,000,000 pounds of eggs in the warehouse can be sold to the bakers. To avoid the cost of renting the warehouses, I suggest that we bury the eggs and when they reach the stage of decay that the Chinese are said to prefer, we can send them to China as a gesture of our friendship.

P. S.—It would be an interesting research to determine what this Government of ours has bought, stored, sold, given away, and destroyed during the past 10 years. Planned scarcity must share in the blame for high prices.

INFORMATION FROM GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, neither the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] nor the Congress

is going to get anywhere with any investigation until this House passes a resolution requiring the departments to give us information when we ask for it. These speculators, these fellows who are making money because they happen to be on the inside and have some information which permits them to play the market successfully, are hiding behind a well-established principle of this and preceding administrations of telling us every time we want to know something that, if they give us the information we want, the Nation will be wrecked; we are going right out of existence as a nation if Congress gets the information it seeks.

I will give you an illustration. These four gangsters, who were paroled just a few days after they became eligible, were convicted of a conspiracy to extort a million dollars from a business concern. They were sentenced to prison for 10 years. A few days after the 3 years expired and they became eligible for parole, out they went. We asked the FBI to send us a report on those fellows, as to how those paroles came about who engineered them, and who, if anyone, was paid. Do you know what they did? The FBI made an investigation and they turned it over to the Justice Department, and Tom Clark tells us, in effect, it is none of our business, and sends up a summary, which is just gossip that the information belongs to the Justice Department. I can understand why Tom Clark and the Justice Department do not want Congress to know. They settled a bunch of income-tax cases, where hundreds of thousands of dollars were due to this Government, for a few thousand dollars. I asked the Treasury Department to let us take a look at the income-tax returns and they said, "None of your business." Now, this administration is protecting the worst bunch of crooks that ever existed, at least within your memory and mine.

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

PULSES

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCK]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, during debate on H. R. 4604 my esteemed and scholarly friend the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HALE] asked me to define "pulses" of which the State Department had recommended shipment of \$5,000,000 worth to Italy. My definition was not as definite as I wish it had been. The distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] did not make substantial contribution by opining that pulses are something which originate in Brooklyn.

I can now enlighten both gentlemen.

Webster defines pulses as "edible seeds of various leguminous crops such as peas, beans, lentils," and so forth. For the benefit of the gentleman from Mississippi, who often quotes the Bible with effectiveness, I refer him to chapter 1 of the Book of Daniel. Therein it is related of Daniel and his associates that after

a 10-day diet of pulse and water "their countenances appeared fairer and fatter in flesh than all the children which did eat the portion of the king's meat."

Thus the State Department had Biblical backing for its proposal that pulses be shipped to Italy.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. COX asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. JARMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a speech of President Collier, of the B. F. Goodrich Co., at the Goodrich plant in Mr. JARMAN'S district.

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

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. GARY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement of Mr. Charles E. Heinrichs before the Fertilizer Subcommittee of the House Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

DEPRESSION PRICES OF 1947

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am afraid my New Deal friends are getting themselves out on a long limb. You know we have heard here for years about the prices that prevailed in 1932 when the world-wide depression started. I have just kind of checked up in the last few days and I find that we are now back about where we were in 1932 as far as the chicken business is concerned. In my particular State they are selling at 11 cents a pound. In 1932 they were selling for 10.9 according to the official records of the BAE.

I do not want to bring up any controversial matter but I think the time has come when this administration ought to pay some attention to the laws of the land and at least follow the laws that they passed when they were in power. The Steagall amendment passed, when they had control of this Congress. I do not know how they expect us to pass any law they are going to follow if they will not even follow the ones they themselves passed.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I understand that roosters are selling for 7 cents a pound.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I know that the price of roosters all through

the Midwest is very low. They sure have not anything to crow about if they are bringing from 7 to 10 cents a pound.

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

SHORTAGE OF PETROLEUM PRODUCTS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, during the past several days, I have been receiving repeated calls, telegrams, letters, and other communications from my district regarding the acute shortage of petroleum products. The county road supervisors are unable to operate their road machinery by reason of the fact they cannot get necessary oil. Our roads need to be worked and otherwise looked after during the winter months more than at any other season.

During the past few years, residents of our section have been encouraged to convert their coal-burning furnaces and other heating facilities to oil. This change was advocated by reason of the shortage of coal due to strikes and otherwise and, also, by reason of the very high price now charged for coal. Many of our veterans who have been successful in getting houses, heat their homes with oil. Oftentimes a veteran has had great difficulty, even under normal conditions, getting fuel oil due to the fact that in most instances he is a new customer. The dealers seem to give first consideration to their regular customers.

Kerosene is used quite generally for cooking purposes. This is particularly true in industrial communities. Unless a greater supply of kerosene is soon provided, many will go hungry.

I have communicated with all the authorities, including the White House, urging that everything possible be done to make these necessary petroleum products available and express the hope that immediate action will be taken in this important matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BARTLETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. BATTLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article which appeared in the Birmingham Age-Herald entitled "A New Labor League."

Mr. KEFAUVER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Chattanooga Times.

Mr. RIZLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the Daily Oklahoman.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. BARRETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article by Mr. Curte Forstmann.

Mr. STEFAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article.

RESIGNATION OF MR. DRISCOLL SCANLON

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the "resignation" of Driscoll Scanlon as an inspector in the Illinois State Department of Mines revives a sad story, and should remind Congress that the coal miners of the Nation can hold it as being derelict in its duty if it does not soon act favorably on proposed legislation to put teeth into the Federal mine-inspection law.

Immediately following the Centralia, Ill., mine disaster of last March 25, when 111 men needlessly sacrificed their lives, Congress seemed interested in doing something to avert future mine catastrophes. But how short was Congress' interest. It seems more intent now on forgetting the whole matter.

The case of Mr. Scanlon should be the strongest evidence a congressional committee needs to establish the fact that a strong Federal inspection law is the one answer to the problem of mine safety. Scanlon dared to be an honest inspector, and for the concern he showed for the safety of Illinois miners he is rewarded by being unwanted by the State department of mines.

What need is there for further evidence to support the bill of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS] for a Federal inspection system with power to enforce its findings? This matter has been debated many times before, and if it had not, the record of mine disasters in recent years should be sufficient to show that it is time for the Federal Government to become more than just an adviser on mine-safety matters.

Illinois is not the only State guilty of acts that might well be termed criminal in the manner in which they fail to enforce their mine-safety codes. It is shameful the way the mine-inspection systems in many States have been used for political advantage.

The case of Illinois is pointed out because it was only a few weeks before the Centralia disaster that the State Republican political machine was exposed in the act of placing a lug on coal-mine operators to help finance the campaign for a Republican candidate for mayor of the city of Chicago.

On top of this exposure it was revealed that the Governor of the State of Illinois had failed to consider an appeal from State Mine Inspector Scanlon to act promptly to prevent a disaster at the Centralia mine. Scanlon's appeal went unheeded when Governor Green referred his report to the State Department of Mines. One hundred and eleven miners paid the price of this neglect.

A Federal system of inspection, backed by law with the power to enforce its

orders, is the best way to remove politics from enforcement of mine safety.

Will it take another national mine disaster to awaken this Congress to its responsibility?

Herewith is included an editorial from the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch of December 13, 1947:

JUST TOO HONEST

Every coal miner in Illinois and every Illinois citizen who cares how coal miners are treated by the State Department of Mines has a right to be fighting mad over Director Moses' insulting release of Driscoll Scanlon.

Ignored and then sold out by his superiors prior to the Centralia mine disaster, Inspector Scanlon has been disheartened since that avoidable loss of 111 lives by the failure of the Illinois Department of Mines to go all-out in enforcement of the Federal mine safety code. As he watched the mines in southern Illinois continue to jeopardize their employees, he at last made up his mind the struggle was useless. So he submitted his resignation and asked that it take effect December 16.

Instead of urging this heroic figure to continue as an inspector, Director Moses wrote him that the department would be glad to get rid of him at the very earliest possible moment. These were not the actual words but this is what they meant. Here is what Director Moses wrote:

"It will be especially pleasing and satisfactory to the department if you will take a vacation from the time you receive this letter to the 16th."

That is the thanks which Driscoll Scanlon gets from the Green administration at Springfield for having been an honest, faithful, and industrious inspector.

That is his thanks for posting notices at Centralia Mine No. 5 and other mines which told how the coal companies were violating safety regulations.

That is his thanks for protecting as best he could the lives of the miners in his territory.

That is his thanks for risking his own life in directing the efforts to bring out the men who were trapped by the Centralia explosion.

That is his thanks for staying on the job out of loyalty, when he knew that his superiors did not intend to back him up.

Dwight H. Green said he did not see the letter in which the Centralia miners pleaded with him a year before the tragedy to "please save our lives." Did he see the letter which Director Moses sent Driscoll Scanlon saying the sooner the inspector quit the better his administration would like it?

Governor Green may think that Illinois has forgotten the way in which he tried to dodge away from his share of the responsibility for the mine disaster. He may think that the coal miners have forgotten his use of mine inspectors as shake-down collectors for the mayoral campaign fund in Chicago. He may think that the people have forgotten his promises, before he was elected, for full enforcement of mine safety.

Governor Green is wrong. He is wrong on every count. The coal miners have not forgotten. The people of Illinois have not forgotten.

The Governor may think he is going to get away with this callous unconcern with human lives. He still has a lot to learn.

As things stand, the Department of Mines, under Director Moses, is against complying with the Federal code. It is against inspectors, who wish to enforce Federal safety provisions—if there are any left after the insult to Driscoll Scanlon.

This is as bad as the Department was under "Dear Bob" Medill. How many more mine disasters will it take to bring Dwight H. Green around to giving the miners his promised protection in the time that remains for him in the governorship?

Driscoll Scanlon's late superior told him that he was "just too damned honest." Illinois may well wish that those above him were cut from cloth half so good.

If any doubt remained as to the need for Federal mine inspection with teeth to punish safety violators it has now been removed. The Green administration alone has made Federal enforcement a necessity.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

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

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

There was no objection.

FINLAND

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, if I correctly understood the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] this morning he stated we ought to use the money which the Government of Finland is paying the United States on its debt to import Finnish nationals and educate them.

I would like to know what the United States has to offer Finland in the way of an education that would make them better citizens than they now are. A nation that has demonstrated the good sense, the integrity, and the ability that Finland has leads me to venture that it is pretty presumptuous for a Member to get up on this floor and suggest that the Finnish people ought to be brought to this country to learn how to live.

What would the gentleman from South Dakota teach the Finlanders? New Dealism?

But is not that the very ism the pitiable Finnish people are struggling against having imposed upon them by the country adjoining theirs, the police state of Russia?

Too many of our lawmakers and citizens are suffering from a superiority complex to be good for the Nation.

PULSES, PAULEY, AND EUGENE MEYER

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, if my facetious query the other day relative to pulse had no other effect, it seems to have put the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCK] to reading the Bible, either in person or by proxy.

We now know that pulses are not grown in Brooklyn. But the thing that interested me most was these attacks on Mr. Ed Pauley. Without defending Mr. Pauley, I want to say that the Pauley matter seems to have had one

effect: It seems to have awakened the Rip Van Winkles of the Republican Party from their 20 years of peaceful slumber. They seem to have forgotten that when Eugene Meyer was head of the Federal Reserve System he speculated through a stooge on the exchange and made himself rich, while squeezing the currency and wrecking the Hoover administration.

This Pauley issue seems to have inspired a revival of righteousness that is almost 20 years overdue.

Let me suggest to you—and I am willing to join you in it—that you go back and investigate Eugene Meyer. All you have to do is to investigate his income-tax returns for the last 30 years. I am told that he could not pay his grocery bills at the close of the First World War; but when he got through with the Federal Reserve System the Hoover administration was wrecked beyond recovery, and Mr. Meyer was able to buy the Washington Post to defend himself with.

That newspaper is now being used against the white people of the District of Columbia to stir up race trouble and to try to force Negroes into the white public schools of the city of Washington. It is now being used, and has been used all the time, to stir up race troubles throughout the Southern States.

The other day there appeared in it an article accusing the white people of Loganville, Ga., of burning Negro schools and Negro churches. That charge was published in the left-wing press throughout the country. This morning it comes out under a UP date line in the Times-Herald that a Negro has confessed to burning those schools and those churches because he had failed to collect \$180 of insurance that he claimed was due him. He told about pouring gasoline on the church while his own people were in there holding services, and then when the audience got out he burned it.

Anybody, Mr. Speaker, with any intelligence knows that the white people of the South do not destroy Negro schools or Negro churches; yet we find that kind of stuff echoed and reechoed in the Washington Post.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. COX. If the gentleman would be interested, I can furnish him with a record made by a congressional committee in which it is disclosed how and where Mr. Meyer got the money with which he bought the Washington Post.

Mr. RANKIN. I was just going to ask the gentleman if he would be interested in supplying that information to our friends on the other side of the aisle. I am not defending Mr. Pauley.

Twenty years ago I investigated the manipulations on the cotton exchange successfully and saved the cotton farmers millions of dollars.

I do not blame anyone for protesting against a man who holds a key Government position speculating on the exchange and using the information he gets as a Government official to aid him

in that respect; but I say it comes pretty late after you gentlemen have slept for 20 years on the hard pillow, supplied to you by Eugene Meyer of the Washington Post, to arouse from your 20 years of undisturbed slumbers and concentrate your fire on Ed Pauley—shooting right over the head of Eugene Meyer.

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

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HALLECK. 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 Indiana?

There was no objection.

RECESS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, as I announced yesterday, it was our plan to take up the appropriation bill today. The committee is delayed a few minutes in the final preparation of the bill. In view of that fact I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that the House stand in recess until 1 o'clock.

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

There was no objection.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 34 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess until 1 o'clock p. m.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 1 o'clock p. m.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MEADE of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I request unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein an address delivered last evening in Baltimore by the Honorable JOHN MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, at a testimonial dinner given in honor of our friend and former colleague, Mayor Thomas D'Alesandro by the Italian-American Club of Baltimore. More than a thousand people were in attendance including both Maryland Senators and the Governor of Maryland, and I think that the sentiments expressed by Congressman MCCORMACK so well express the feelings that we Baltimoreans have for our Mayor that I would like to have his remarks printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 1770) to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: MESSRS WOLCOTT, GAMBLE, SMITH of Ohio, KUNKEL, SPENCE, BROWN of Georgia, and PATMAN.

THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1948

Mr. TABER, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 4748) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1191), which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. TABER. 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. 4748) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate run throughout the day, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] and myself.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wonder if I could inquire of the gentleman from New York as to the parliamentary situation. It is my understanding that unanimous consent has been secured to report this bill at any time.

Mr. TABER. That is correct, and to take it up immediately when it is reported.

Mr. CANNON. It is also my understanding that consent has been secured to waive all points of order on the bill.

Mr. TABER. That is correct.

Mr. CANNON. There has been a general understanding for a day or two, although perhaps without any specific agreement, that we will endeavor to complete this bill today. It had been our hope to dispose of it in order to expedite adjournment prior to the holidays. We have few requests for time, and I wonder if it would be possible for us to conclude general debate this afternoon, say, about 4 o'clock.

Mr. TABER. Well, if we should, I see no objection to begin reading the bill at that time. I made no limitation in my request that there would be anything in the nature of a prohibition against reading the bill.

Mr. CANNON. Then in the event that the debate could be concluded by 4 o'clock we would proceed to read the bill for amendment?

Mr. TABER. I would hope that might result.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I desire to propound a parliamentary inquiry to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] whom I regard as one of the greatest living parliamentarians. I understood him to say that points of order against the bill had been waived by unanimous consent. Is that correct?

Mr. CANNON. That is the statement of the gentleman from New York who made the request.

Mr. RANKIN. In this bill on page 4 is a section relating to the Department of Agriculture. We have run short of funds

in the Rural Electrification Administration, which is under the Department of Agriculture. We need at least \$200,000,000 to carry on the work from now to the end of the present fiscal year. We need a deficiency appropriation of that amount. I should like to know if it is the opinion of the gentleman from Missouri that such an amendment would be in order on this bill?

Mr. CANNON. If it were germane.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman knows whether it would be germane or not. You have the Department of Agriculture in the bill, and the REA is under the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. CANNON. A bill of this character which deals with many subjects of one class is of course open to amendment on another item of the same class. It is not open to amendment on proposals of a different class. The gentleman's suggested amendment would involve two questions; first, whether there was sufficient similarity between the subject of the amendment and subjects carried in the bill to render it of the same class, and; second, then whether it was germane.

I might add that I am in heartiest sympathy with the gentleman's amendment. Money loaned for REA is the best investment the United States Government can make and ample funds should be provided to complete all pending projects as expeditiously as possible. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] has rendered notable and invaluable service to the people of the United States in this field.

Mr. RANKIN. Then the gentleman is unable to tell me whether or not in his opinion it would be germane?

Mr. CANNON. Not until he has had an opportunity to study the form in which the amendment would be presented.

Mr. RANKIN. I thank the gentleman. Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

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. 4748, with Mr. HARNES of Indiana in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this bill carries provisions for certain items with reference to the House of Representatives, an item for the so-called emergency foreign aid or European interim aid, an item for the Federal Security Administration, an item for government and relief in occupied territories under the Army, and items for the Department of the Interior under Indian Affairs and Reclamation.

The Committee on Appropriations has reduced the budget estimate of \$597,000,000 for foreign aid to Austria, France, and Italy by \$88,000,000. I will discuss that in a moment. I will say to you that the authorization bill which was

presented here called for interim aid to Austria, France, Italy, and China. In bringing in the report upon their bill, the Committee on Foreign Affairs said:

This bill makes it possible for the Committee on Appropriations and the Congress to provide funds for aid to China just as soon as specific recommendations are presented by the Department of State, which Secretary Marshall has indicated will be before Congress convenes in regular session in January 1948.

With the reduction that has been made in this estimate, there will be available for appropriation for China or for any other of the three countries the balance of the authorization of \$88,000,000 whenever a program may be presented that can be justified.

The question has been raised as to what will be the procedure with reference to that. If an appropriation needs to be made for China, thorough hearings will be held, and they will be held as soon as the committee can give the Department an opportunity to go into the situation and make a study of it and make a submission to us. If they do not make a submission I shall be glad to call the committee together for the purpose of hearing what information we may receive from the outside.

With reference to this bill—this reduction of \$88,000,000 is made up on the following basis. The statements that have been made to the committee and the justifications that have been presented provide that France out of her funds, gold that she presently has, her credits that she has, shall pay interest on foreign debts to the tune of \$26,000,000; that she shall pay Belgium on commercial accounts \$17,000,000; to Brazil on commercial accounts \$3,000,000; to make an additional contribution to the International Monetary Fund of \$10,000,000, paying out \$10,000,000 for operation of her foreign affairs and the entertainment that goes with it. That makes a total of \$66,000,000.

The thing is set up in such a way that if we make the appropriation of that amount, we are, in effect, paying the debt of France on those items, and putting up funds for her to operate them. In other words, if she would use that fund for buying food and fuel for the needy, she would not be in a position where we would have to put up \$66,000,000; and, therefore, in effect, by making an appropriation of that \$66,000,000, we would be providing the funds to pay those items.

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

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. In effect, they ask us to pay some current debts they have, in order to reestablish their credit. Is that a fair statement of it?

Mr. TABER. I believe so. If we start in doing that for one country we have got to do it for every country and we have got to go down the line. Frankly, I do not like that approach.

As to Italy, there is a set-up of \$22,000,000 of invisible items. That is what they call them in the State Department. Those invisible items are payment to the United States for settlement of war claims, \$5,000,000.

Partial repayment of Export-Import Bank cotton loan, \$7,000,000.

Interest on United States surplus-property credit, \$4,000,000.

Diplomatic expenditures, prewar bond settlement, interest payments, and miscellaneous financial items, including the diplomatic entertainment, \$6,000,000.

In substance, we are being asked to provide funds to buy food, fuel, fertilizer, and petroleum products for France and Italy to the tune of \$88,000,000 so that they can use their own funds to meet those debts. In other words, instead of obtaining a postponement of those obligations from their creditors, they are asking the people of the United States to pay their debts, and to pay the administrative expenses of France and Italy. To my mind, that is utterly inconsistent, and I cannot go along with it. I do not believe that the people of the United States realize what this part of the bill involves, nor do I believe that the House of Representatives realized what the bill involved.

Why should we, as a relief item designed to feed starving people, pay interest on our own debt, pay for the operation of the French and Italian foreign services and entertainment connected therewith, and try to hide it under the cloak of relief for needy people?

The United States and all of the other countries involved are everyone of them members of the United Nations. In a situation of this kind there must be world cooperation and sacrifice by nations other than the United States. We are willing to go a long way, but we ought not to be willing to bail out everybody else and then let them laugh at us. I believe that it is time we began to realize what we are doing and lay out a program which would have in it some element of fairness to the American people.

The committee has provided \$509,000,000, with no cut on the \$59,000,000 that was estimated for Austria, and a cut of only those items which are manifestly unfair, and which we should not assume, for France and Italy.

I am frankly disturbed about the United States food situation. The Secretary of Agriculture comes before us and states that out of an estimated crop and carry-over of 1,490,000,000 bushels of wheat we are going to be obliged to have a falling off in domestic consumption. Food, 510,000,000 bushels; feed, 250,000,000 bushels; seed, 85,000,000 bushels; industrial consumption, nothing. Total, 845,000,000 bushels.

As contrasted with that, the Department of Agriculture brings out a document known as the Agricultural Outlook Charts, 1948. On page 58 of that they submit the following table of consumption in the United States: Food, 510,000,000 bushels; feed, 325,000,000 bushels, as against the Secretary's estimate of 250,000,000; seed, 87,500,000 bushels, as against the Secretary's estimate of 85,000,000 bushels; industrial uses, 5,000,000 bushels, as against the Secretary's estimate of none. Total, 927,500,000, indicating that the Department itself is 82,500,000 bushels apart within its own borders.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. On the question of food estimated for human consumption, as far as wheat is concerned they have estimated 510,000,000 bushels which is based upon a population of around 141,000,000 people. We are going to have next January 145,000,000 people, and on a per capita consumption of 3.6 bushels they would need about 530,000,000 bushels of wheat instead of 510,000,000 bushels.

Mr. TABER. The consumption for the first 6 months of this year was given to me. I do not know whether it is correct or not. It was given to me by the International Emergency Food Council, Dr. Fitzgerald, yesterday morning, as 260,000,000 bushels. I do not know how far that would be reflected in the following 6 months. I would, however, anticipate that it would not be less than that but probably more on account of the longer period of colder weather that we will have in the second period.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Let me say to the gentleman that that figure would be closer to being accurate than the estimate made by the Department in their outlook.

Mr. TABER. I expect that is so.

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

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. ROBSION. What consideration is given to the weather and the crops for next year? Is that taken into consideration?

Mr. TABER. I will get to that in a minute. On top of that I have a letter before me from Dr. Fitzgerald of the International Emergency Food Council addressed to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER], indicating that 904,000 tons must go to Italy from the United States in the last half of the present fiscal year as against 706,000 tons set forth in the relative program that we have been holding hearings on, indicating the period is larger but it comes out of the same year's crop. That indicates that there probably will be presented an additional program for 200,000 tons of wheat for Italy, and at least that much more for France in the last half of the year, and that would mean eighteen to nineteen million bushels more.

Next year's wheat crop instead of being 1,400,000,000 bushels is going to do well to hit 1,000,000,000 bushels. If it runs 1,000,000,000 bushels the surplus is going to be small, if any, and it is not safe for us to allow our wheat supplies to become too greatly depleted. One hundred and fifty million bushels is the minimum carry-over that we can afford to have. The present program for shipments of wheat calls for 457,000,000 bushels to be shipped without counting the regular commercial shipments in the last half of the year. If there is 50,000,000 bushels in addition to that, it will make 507,000,000 bushels. At the present time 339,000,000 bushels of wheat and wheat flour equivalent have been purchased by the Production and Marketing Administration in the Department of Agriculture which means that there must be purchased, in addition thereto, be-

tween one hundred sixteen and one hundred sixty million bushels and there is grave doubt if it can be done without upsetting the whole governmental apple cart and raising the price of wheat to such an extent as to start large spirals of inflation.

Therefore, the committee has included a requirement that wheat shall not be purchased for export beyond the point where there will be less than 150,000,000 bushels carry-over into next year's crop.

There are, at the present time, enormous quantities of potatoes, dried fruits, canned and dried vegetables and dried and frozen eggs which should immediately be placed on the market so that they can stabilize the cost of living and keep it from going too high.

These surpluses are in the hands of the Commodity Credit Corporation and can very readily be used for that purpose. A provision has been adopted permitting those items to be sent abroad. The frozen eggs and potatoes should be utilized right in this country for the purpose of helping out the cost-of-living situation.

In order to prevent that situation from becoming absolutely dangerous and inflationary, the committee has adopted an amendment which would limit to \$50,000,000 the amount of funds available to make good a deficiency in the Commodity Credit Corporation's books.

Very generally this bill attempts to try and bring some order out of the chaos of this foreign relief program and to put it on a sounder basis.

There will be left, if this bill passes as it stands, \$88,000,000 of unused authorization which can be used for relief of China or to supplement any other program which is within the authorization, if it can be justified.

Making \$509,000,000 immediately available for this purpose is a lot of money and it, together with the funds that are in the hands of the beneficiary nations, will enable them to meet their problems, insofar as it is possible to meet them and insofar as the feeds, fertilizer, fuel, and phosphates are available.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to take a minute or two in reference to the other items in the bill.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. We were told on the floor in connection with the discussion of the interim aid bill that no authorizations were provided in the bill for funds to France to pay dollars to Belgium or to Brazil. Now, I understand that they were included in the estimate but, apparently, erroneous information was given to the House at that time, not intentionally, but at least we were led to believe there were no such dollar-payment balances.

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

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think that anybody attempted to deceive the House, but I do know that that situation is as I have presented it here.

In other words, we are being asked to make that \$88,000,000 of appropriations so that France can go ahead and pay her bills and make herself solid—and the same thing is true with Italy—and provide for their administrative expenses and the entertainment connected with their diplomatic services, which are on a larger scale than ours in a great many cases.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. If we do it for France and Italy, certainly there will be a precedent and an obligation for us to do it for all other countries of the world.

Mr. TABER. That is just what I am afraid of.

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

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Is it not a fact also that apparently France has proceeded to make some payments on her commercial agreements with Belgium and Brazil and expects to recoup them out of the dollars saved by the food that we will make available?

Mr. TABER. Well, she has made payments. The last part of the question I am not sure about. It might be so.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The point I wanted to make was that the one table which was submitted showing dollar requirements as of October 1 showed expenditures contemplated on per dollar resources, \$30,000,000 to Belgium under the commercial agreement and \$10,000,000 to Brazil under the commercial agreement, whereas the later table shows some of those having been paid.

Mr. TABER. That is correct, but I do not know about the recoupment proposition.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. France had \$125,000,000 set aside to purchase wheat for the month of December, and when this bill was dated back to December 1 for France, it gave them the opportunity to use that \$125,000,000 for other purposes.

Mr. TABER. That I did not know.

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

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

Mr. VORYS. Is it not true that the authorization bill which passed yesterday was exactly like the public aid for the \$350,000,000 relief authorization bill presented last spring in this respect, that both of them were presented arithmetically as balance of payments bills in that we were asked to furnish by way of relief supplies dollar needs in these countries, so that they could in turn be able to use their own dollar resources for other purposes?

Mr. TABER. Well, I did not understand the other bill that way. I did not get that meaning of it when it was up. Maybe that is true.

Mr. VORYS. Well, the gentleman does know that in the report from the Committee on Foreign Affairs it was shown

that France, for instance, had other dollar resources and other dollar obligations but had an estimated deficit of \$300,000,000 during this period, and it was that deficit which we were asked to make up subject, of course, to action by the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. TABER. Well, I assume that that is in the report. I have not seen that part of it.

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

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

Now, with reference to the relief in occupied territories, the picture was presented this way: First there was an item of \$237,000,000 for feeding the people in the British zone of occupation. The agreement with Great Britain has not yet been signed and not yet been mapped out completely. As to that the committee felt that we should presently provide \$100,000,000, so that the feeding could go along but that we should reserve the other until the agreement was signed, so \$137,000,000 was reserved out of that item for that reason.

The estimates presented call for a pipe line which would extend into the middle of September or the first of October, in that territory, and there was a considerable amount of money available for that purpose. On a monthly basis it figured out to \$81,000,000 a month. We deducted that pipe line beyond the 1st of July because we thought that was too far ahead for us to make appropriations. Therefore, we deducted \$137,000,000 plus \$162,000,000, or approximately \$260,000,000 from that figure, and carried \$230,000,000.

These people have a lot of money left available out of the \$600,000,000 that was appropriated to them for relief in occupied territory. The amount expended down to the 1st of December was only \$99,000,000, and the amount obligated was \$199,000,000, leaving a balance of \$400,000,000. So that with this \$230,000,000 we will have available in that picture \$630,000,000 to spend from the first of December on, which is enough until the committee can have another chance to look it over a little later in the year.

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

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GROSS. I have been wondering about this relief in the occupied countries. For instance, the other day in Harrisburg a German man who is an American citizen came to me and said, "Why doesn't the army of occupation let the German people work and do something for themselves?" I said, "I don't know whether they are doing that or not." He said, "I have a brother over there that wrote me and said, 'It is going to take us 43 years to rebuild ourselves.'" I wrote back and said, "Why do you say 43 years?" He said, "Well, the occupation army is going to be here for 40 years, and when they get out, in 3 years we will be back to normal life again." Maybe there is something in that.

Mr. TABER. There is an awful lot in it, and there is this picture: When I landed in Germany there were over 700,000 of their most active business people

who were refused an opportunity to work because they were alleged to be Nazis. We and members of the Herter committee which had preceded us thought it was rather funny that they had not disposed of those cases. Before we left an order was issued that would reduce that number by about 500,000 cases, which might put a good many of those people to work. We have been promised that that would be cleaned up, but the trouble is that they have too many of these people who are not American citizens mixed up in those trials, and they are very hostile to the Germans. We are not getting prompt and effective results. We have been after that picture with the Department hard, and I hope it will have an effect on giving those people an opportunity to go to work. We have a great many things that handicap them in connection with their going to work.

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

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. When you were in Germany, did you discover that Great Britain, France, and Russia had withdrawn from the prosecution of the war criminals and that the United States was proceeding against them alone?

Mr. TABER. I did not know that, but, if that is true, it ought not to be.

Mr. DONDERO. It seems to me that any good will that we have built up in Germany through the efforts of General Clay would be destroyed if that is the situation.

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

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is the situation. The prosecution of the so-called war criminals at Nuremberg is being conducted by the United States alone. The British and French are not taking any part in it now.

Mr. TABER. That ought to be ended, and we ought to be through with that operation, and these people ought to go to work.

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

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. Is it not just possible that these aliens who are employed by this Government to prosecute these cases do not want to let go of a good thing?

Mr. TABER. There is no question about that. On top of that, they do not have the right kind of disposition to create good will and to get rid of the attitude that some of these people have had.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I might say in that connection that it is the purpose of our Government not to prosecute any cases the indictments on which have not been presented by the 1st of January. They anticipate cleaning up the pending trials by April.

Mr. TABER. That would help, but it ought to be done more quickly than that.

I will not mention the reclamation feature of the bill because I am going to leave that to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

There is another item in the bill that I should call attention to. There is a small item for the Federal Security

Agency to implement the program for seamen's unemployment compensation, which was authorized by a bill passed here in the House.

There is also an item in the Interior Department part of the bill for the relief for the Navajo and Hopi Indians. We found a rather bad situation there, especially with the management of the thing by the Indian Bureau in the Department of the Interior. We were told there were 1,200 presently on relief, being paid for out of relief funds of the Department, and that there were 3,800 more who should have been on relief. They have a thousand employees on that reservation, and included in that group there was not one single doctor or a single nurse, with the exception of one school nurse. Evidently they have a very large surplus of civilian employees on that reservation. They have evidently done everything they could that would make trouble for these people. For instance, I am informed that in 1930 there were 1,200,000 goats on the reservation and these goats were able to live off of the pasture on the land. They got meat and milk and mohair from the goats and were able to take care of themselves in pretty good shape. The Indian Bureau came in, took the goats away from them, and gave them 50 percent as many sheep. The sheep are not able to get a living off of the land. That performance on the part of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, according to my information, is largely the cause of the distress among these Indians.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] has again expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself four additional minutes.

We went into that and we found that under the law already, surplus products in the hands of the Department of Agriculture can be made available to those people. There are 2,500,000 bushels of potatoes on hand in the Department of Agriculture, available for such purposes. There are enormous quantities of frozen eggs, dried fruits, canned vegetables, and other foods that may be made available. After listening to the Department we felt that \$10 a month would be a fair amount for each of those people who were on relief. One thousand two hundred plus three thousand eight hundred makes five thousand. We allowed \$10 for cash relief for 4 months, from January to April. We felt that the 1,000 employees that they already have got, amply took care of the situation. We believe we have amply provided for that situation.

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

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. WELCH. Under the title, "Department of the Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Welfare of Indians," is that intended to include Indians on all Government reservations?

Mr. TABER. It is only intended to include this particular item. Frankly, under that, it could be used for other places, but that is not what our intention is and is not what the Department said it would be used for.

Mr. WELCH. The gentleman will recall that only a few days ago this House

unanimously passed an authorization of \$2,000,000 to meet the terrible distress existing among the Navajo and Hopi Indians. The Senate immediately passed the bill, and it is now in the hands of the President of the United States. The Senate and the House were unanimously in accord that an authorization of \$2,000,000 should be made. I will ask the chairman of the committee if he feels that \$100,000, payable from funds held by the United States in trust for the Navajo Indians, is adequate to meet the distress existing at this time among the Navajo and Hopi Indians.

Mr. TABER. I have analyzed that situation carefully, indicating that we have provided \$10 a month for each of those whom the Department told us ought to be on relief or ought to receive relief. If the gentleman has any better information than that, I would be glad to have it, but we were unable to find anything that indicated any larger figure.

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

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. ROBSION. How long has this condition obtained among the Navajo Indians?

Mr. TABER. It has been developing ever since this man Collier went in and wrecked the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] has again expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, Congress convened in extra session with certain definite objectives in mind.

We can enumerate them categorically: First, to avoid, or at least to delay, the Third World War with the appalling wastage of billions of property and millions of lives which such a war would inevitably involve.

Second, to rehabilitate and revive and expand American commerce throughout the world, but especially in the Eastern Hemisphere.

Third, to stop the onward march of communism and thereby protect and preserve our form of government, our way of life, and life itself.

Fourth, to support the anticommunistic governments of western Europe and Asia whose survival and maintenance are essential to the solution of the world problem confronting us today.

Fifth, to save vast numbers of people in Europe from death through starvation this winter by providing the minimum amount of food required to sustain life.

Sixth, to maintain the world leadership of the United States which has been thrust upon us, the abdication of which would leave world dictatorship in the hands of a regime more ruthless and barbaric than any which has menaced mankind since the days of Genghis Khan.

And last and seventh, to establish and effectuate an equitable and enduring peace.

Congress assembled with these seven objectives in view. They are, of course, closely related and integrated; one involves the other. Together they constitute a chain in which no link can be broken. The realization of any one of them automatically involves to that ex-

tent the achievement of all, and, conversely, the failure to attain any one of them affects adversely, to that extent, all of them. If starvation spreads unchecked through Europe this winter, the anticommunistic governments, which are maintaining their position by such a precarious margin, will be swept from power. If they fall, communism comes in. With communism comes Russian control of Europe and Asia, and with Russian control of the Eastern Hemisphere our Government and our people are in dire peril and a defensive war of survival is inevitable.

The first step, the first link in the chain, is the appropriation of funds to provide a minimum diet for famine-stricken Europe. With that in view the Committee on Appropriations brings in this bill to implement, more or less completely or incompletely, the authorization which the Congress passed with practically unanimity last week. The question before us this afternoon is whether it adequately carries out the directions of the Congress as expressed in the legislative bill.

Let us not minimize the significance of the task before us. It is neither simple nor inconsequential. We are dealing with tremendous forces and immeasurable consequences. There are Members sitting on this floor this afternoon who can recall within the scope of their service here when the daily proceedings were largely provincial and sufficient for the day thereof. But we are today dealing with questions of further reaching importance than any ever previously determined in councils of State or legislative assemblies in the annals of mankind. And the decisions will affect history for all the centuries to come. This is the most powerful legislative body the world ever saw and it sits in the Capital of the nations. It has no time for petty trivialities.

And the situation is urgent. Lights blaze through the night in sequestered shipyards along remote Russian coast lines where the latest type of submarines are being constructed on a round-the-clock schedule. In the inaccessible hinterland of Russia modern jet planes are being fabricated on models perfected by Germany just as the war was closing. In teeming Russian laboratories covering hundreds of acres, secure from observation, every world scientist who can be recruited or impressed is engaged in research in every branch of chemistry, physics, and mechanics in an effort to devise the most destructive agencies that can be adapted to wholesale devastation.

And in every quarter of eastern Europe and northern Asia millions of men are being trained and indoctrinated for a war of extermination.

I do not have to ask you for whose benefit these continent-wide activities are being pushed with such sustained and relentless purpose. Fleets are being built, air power is being created, research is being prosecuted, and armies are being trained for what purpose? For the destruction of America.

"Oh" some say, "that is fantastic." Certainly it is fantastic. Pearl Harbor was fantastic.

No one can drive today through the wrecked and shattered streets of Berlin, once the seat of power and splendor, and a thousand other devastated European and Asiatic cities and fail to realize the fate that awaits every city in America the first day, the first hour, we are unable to defend them, the first day we lose control of the air. America is a rich and opulent country. Its cities are overflowing with treasures beyond the dreams of Midas. What a price it would be. Such spoils, such loot, such carnage, such rapine, and plunder as it would afford a modern Attila, such as sacked Vienna and Warsaw. Certainly it is fantastic. But we have lived to see in our day and time scenes beside which the sack of Rome and Carthage pale into insignificance. The Vandals left the marble magnificence of Rome still standing but in Warsaw not one stone is left upon another. It is high time we take these lessons to heart.

Let us reduce the problem to its lowest common denominator. Hitler threw 220 divisions against Russia. They were the best trained and most completely equipped armies ever marshaled in review. They were ready to the last buckle and they melted like snow—with Russia taken by surprise and half prepared. In the entire war the United States mustered only 89 divisions on both fronts. It would require futile months to again mobilize our 89 divisions. And if they marched into Russia not a man would ever get back. Hitler could tell you something about that. And Napoleon tried it a hundred years before when Russian military power was hardly more than a shadow.

"Oh," you say, "there is the Navy; we have the greatest Navy in the world." And you are right. It is more powerful than all other navies combined. But how can any navy blockade a hemisphere? You cannot go to Moscow in a battleship.

That leaves us only one other recourse—defense through the air. We used it effectively in the last war. We won through our superior production of aircraft. But we are not winning now. We are turning out today approximately 2,000 planes a year. While competent authorities estimate that Russia will produce 100,000 planes in 1948. The ratio is 2,000 American planes to 100,000 Russian planes.

And no one knows better than ourselves the potency of air power. At the close of the war we had based on the Marianas enough B-29's in service to have destroyed, with sufficient supplies of atomic bombs, every city in Japan with a population in excess of 30,000 people.

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

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I will take 10 additional minutes.

With a superiority of 98,000 planes production a year and the explosives under production in their all-out laboratories, how long would it take to destroy every city in America with a population in excess of 30,000? And if you could accomplish that as expeditiously today as we could have pulverized the cities of Japan at the close of the last war, what

opportunity would there be for recuperation if all our production centers were reduced to rubble in the first 24 hours?

You say it could not happen to us. But it has already happened to everybody else. And if it has happened once it can happen again. And we might be on the losing side next time if we are a little slow in taking off. Or if we are a little obsolete in equipment.

In other words, it is a condition which confronts us today. Not a hypothetical situation for purely academic consideration. It is a condition which we must meet and with which we must deal either now or eventually.

In our approach to this situation we have two alternatives. We can enter into a race of armaments such as preceded former wars. We can build more battle-ships, build more planes, drill more men, and manufacture more guns. And that will, as usual, require some considerable outlay. In a report just released last week a competent military authority estimated that if we adopted a program for construction of planes sufficient to protect our borders it would cost \$3,000,000,000 a year for air power alone.

That is one alternative. The other is to so strengthen the free governments of western Europe as to create a balance of power which, in cooperation with us, will preserve the peace of the world. That is the plan which this bill proposes to implement. We propose to feed starving cities in order to prevent the overthrow of non-Communist governments and maintain the integrity of the friendly powers of western Europe in order to make them self-sustaining and thereby check the further spread of communism and preserve the peace of the world. That is the purpose of this bill. It is in effect a bill for national defense.

But how far does the bill go toward the accomplishment of that purpose? Presumably it implements the authorization which was given by the Congress last week. Under that authorization, enacted after days of exhaustive debate, and the rejection of numerous amendments to increase and decrease the amount, we finally determined by a practically unanimous vote that the minimum amount necessary to implement this program was \$597,000,000. But the Committee on Appropriations does not accept that figure. In a report which is noteworthy for its verbiage rather than its consequential conclusions, it proposes to reduce materially the amount provided essential for food. The legislative authorization provided barely enough to supply the minimum food requirement. If it varied in either direction it was too little rather than too much. It was conceded to be the irreducible minimum. So when we reduce the money carried in this bill for food, we to that extent hamstring the program for European recovery. To that extent we impair the program for national defense.

They say, "Here are certain hidden items." There is nothing hidden here at all. All items have been enumerated time and again. They were fully discussed in the hearings. They are listed in the report. Let us turn to page 4 of the report and consider them one at a time in the light of actual facts and com-

mon sense, having in mind all the time the tremendous responsibility resting upon us to maintain the status quo in western Europe. It is not merely a matter of people starving. In the last analysis it is a matter of preservation of the American form of government.

Let us take the first item in the allocation to France. It is service of foreign debt. And let me correct here and now a misapprehension under which some seem to be laboring with reference to these items on page 4 of the report.

There is not one dollar in this bill for the payment of this foreign debt or any other of these items. Not a penny provided in the bill or in the legislative authorization can be used for any such purpose. None of the funds in this entire list can be used for any purpose except to buy food.

The contention of the committee is that France and Italy have funds of their own with which they could buy food, but which they propose to expend for these purposes. Therefore, they argue they should use such moneys to buy food instead of spending it for these purposes, and the committee proposes to cut down the money provided in the bill for food to that extent. But to do that would defeat the whole purpose of the bill.

This payment on the foreign debt of France is interest on her loan just secured last year from the Export-Import Bank. All loans from this bank must be repaid in full with interest. It was established for that purpose, and with that in view and its operations are a fundamental part of the plan for the rehabilitation of war-wrecked nations. If France should fail to pay her interest, it would be the first default and would be a disastrous precedent. The Committee on Appropriations in this bill invites France to repudiate her obligations to the Export-Import Bank. The committee insists on it. The action of the committee in that respect is an effort to disorganize and destroy one of the key provisions for postwar recovery agreed upon by all nations. And it proposes this astounding sabotage without any compensating advantage. For even if the proposal of the committee is adopted not a penny will be saved. Practically all of the interest to be paid by France is due the United States. So we have an anomalous situation here. If we pay for the food, we get the interest. If we do not pay for the food, we do not get the interest. It is six of one and half a dozen of the other. If we pay for the food, it comes out of the United States; but the United States gets the interest in the exact amount it pays for the food. And if we do not pay for the food, it does not come out of the United States; but the United States does not get its interest—in the exact amount it does not pay for the food. It would be amusing if the consequences were not so serious.

In the case of the International Bank loan, it is necessary that France pay its interest and maintain its credit with the bank at all times and especially now when it is making application for additional loans to help meet its urgent import needs in the near future.

Take the second item, due Belgium to cover imports into France in excess of

France's exports to Belgium. Belgium herself is extremely hard pressed. She is barely able to keep her head above the water. To take food away from France for this purpose means to sink both France and Belgium. And the payment to Brazil is merely the excess of imports over exports but it involves all future imports from Brazil the discontinuation of which would be disastrous beyond the comparatively small amount listed. It is the understanding that in the future such imports from Brazil to France will be financed on credit that France would arrange to avoid the accrual of a deficit.

The \$10,000,000 payment to the International Monetary Fund is France's payment which renders her eligible for applications to the fund. France must make this payment or lose her standing which would amount to a disadvantage many times the amount of her contribution.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] has again expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

Let us take the second \$10,000,000 on page 4, listed as administrative and other expenditures. They try to tell us this is for entertainment and cocktail parties. That is thrown in merely to create prejudice. The actual purpose for which this comparatively small amount is to be used is to maintain France's diplomatic representation throughout the world. France has made tremendous and notable, and heroic progress in balancing her budget. While we were over there they told us that they were going to balance the budget, and they did do it in the face of seemingly insurmountable obstacles. They have reduced expenditures generally and they have reduced expenditures for this item to one-fifth of what it was in the last quarter. We cannot leave France without representation in the chancelleries of the world. How can the present government of France be maintained, the government which the Communists have made every effort in the last 3 months to destroy? How can we support this upstanding anti-communistic government, on which the survival of western Europe depends if we deny her this small amount for representation in the other countries of the world? Why, it is absurd to even consider such a proposition.

Now, let us take up the \$22,000,000 for Italy. In the first place, \$5,000,000 is provided for the settlement of claims of United States nationals against Italy under an agreement which was concluded in December 1946, last December; and it is a material scaling down of the debts which they owe our nationals. Shall we encourage the Italian Government to default in its obligations to our own citizens? Italy must do that if we take this money out of this bill as the committee proposes; there is no alternative. In view of the millions of dollars of surplus-property credits extended throughout the world we certainly should not encourage a default on this debt which is owed to our own Government, owed to us. If we put the money in food we get the money back. If we do not put the money in food we do not

get it back. Nothing is saved. The only thing that we do is to wreck the basic foundation of the plan upon which world recovery must be achieved.

Now, mind you, the Committee on Appropriations does not deny that the whole \$597,000,000 is essential to provide this food. They agree that the whole \$597,000,000 is essential, but they seek by subterfuge to pull this \$88,000,000 out of it, and though they do not save a penny but they destroy the whole theory upon which the plan for postwar recovery is based.

Mr. Chairman, we have here a grave responsibility.

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

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself two additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, let us take heed lest some day we again look back as we looked back after Pearl Harbor. On the afternoon of December 7, 1941 how many Members recalled votes cast against provisions for the Army, for the Navy, for the fortifications of Pacific bases? How many remembered bitter opposition to the League of Nations which would have avoided a war the cost of which will never be fully tabulated?

Stanley Baldwin and those who followed him looked back to those crucial days when Germany was arming, and England slept.

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

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, America today is confronted by two outstanding dangers.

On the one hand, as the result of waste and extravagance and the spend-and-spend policy to which this Nation has adhered over a period of 15 years, we are confronted by the danger of serious inflation. On the other hand, as a result of decisions which have been made in the field of foreign affairs, we are confronted by the possibility of losing all that we thought we had won after 4 years of fighting, and of seeing the wave of communism sweep throughout western Europe.

Either of these results can have consequences of the greatest gravity to this Nation of ours. The role of statesmanship seems to be to try to steer a course between them.

During the past summer, like many Members of the Congress, I made a trip to the other side. In the past I have been many times to Europe, at one time putting in 4 years there working as assistant to the Agent General for Reparation Payments, representing the interests of 12 nations, including our own, creditors of Germany as a result of World War I.

The trip which I made last summer together with the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], and in part with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], took me to nine separate countries all the way from Turkey to England.

It resulted in interviews in the countries visited with practically every prime

minister, foreign minister and finance minister, with other ministers, with the heads of banks of issue, with industrial leaders, labor leaders, and leaders of finance; and in the Ruhr, with workers in the mines and at the blast furnaces, and with their wives and children in the housing about the mines. We also had the benefit of the views of our diplomatic and military staffs.

Without going into detail I heard statistics indicating the alarming rate at which Russia is arming. I heard the testimony of officials from the satellite countries as to the extent to which those countries are being purged under the iron hand of Russia. I saw in country after country what to me was a vicious circle, on the one hand, economic and financial problems growing out of the war of the most severe character, and, on the other hand, political problems of the greatest severity resulting from the threat of communism either within the borders of the country or immediately outside of its borders.

Two hundred and sixty million people or more in western Europe, with a pre-war production greater than this country, threatened with being overrun by the forces of communism and losing their freedom against their will.

I returned, Mr. Chairman, with the conviction that affirmative action by the Congress was imperative and imperative promptly. I believe that affirmative action is essential in the national interest. In the absence of stronger measures I see no other alternative at this time. I believe that a denial of affirmative action at this time would serve to kill the spark of hope that has been kindled in western Europe, would serve to destroy the principal psychological barrier to the advance of aggressive communism and would invite the moving of the iron curtain to the Atlantic and the Mediterranean in short order, with serious consequences to our national economy if not to our national security.

Having made that statement, Mr. Chairman, I want to qualify it as I have qualified it in other public statements that I have made.

First. I believe that what we do should be done on a short-term basis, as in this instance. A long-term basis destroys our influence. A short-term basis is not only fairer to America but, in my opinion, strengthens the hands of the leaders of those countries that we seek to aid.

Second. I believe that what we do should be so supervised as to insure that every dollar spent will be productive in terms of recuperation and not wasted for some political purpose as has happened so often in the past. I regret that the time element has prevented the setting up of adequate supervision in connection with this appropriation.

Third. Mr. Chairman, it is obvious that we must not do more than we can do in fairness to ourselves and to the rest of the world. To destroy our own economy in trying to help others would not only be suicidal but a catastrophe from the standpoint of the entire world.

AVAILABILITY EVIDENCE INADEQUATE

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have sought throughout these hearings to get some specific evidence of availability in terms

of the commodities which we are to provide under this bill. I have tried to get simple tabular break-downs showing for each commodity the amount available, the amount of obligations against the amount available, the amount called for under the two programs before us in this bill, so that the Congress and the people of the country as a whole could see exactly what it is we are called upon to do.

I regret that I have been unable to obtain that information. There appears to be no single agency and no single individual in this Government that can present a simple, coordinated picture in these terms of the plan now before us.

The so-called Harriman committee, as you will recall, was asked to determine the limits within which this country could safely and wisely extend aid to western Europe. If I understand it correctly, Mr. Chairman, the report of that committee declines to take any position as to the period after December 31, 1948, and as to the period before that date approves what is requested only by implication.

The Acting Secretary of State, Mr. Lovett, was more than cooperative with this committee. He did his utmost to provide us with all information at his command. He stated specifically, however, that he was in no position to give the assurance that I desired in respect to any of the commodities. He stated that he was dependent in that respect on the Department of Agriculture and on the Department of Commerce.

The Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Commerce both appeared before your committee. Neither of them, in my judgment, Mr. Chairman, gave the type of information to which the Congress is entitled in the consideration of this bill. In fact, the testimony of the Secretary of Commerce was so vague and required so much research that it did not arrive in time to be included in the hearings and, as far as I know, has not yet been received by the Committee on Appropriations.

Representatives of the Department of the Army, the Department of the Interior, the Army and Navy Petroleum Commission, and the Tariff Commission all appeared before the committee. One supplied one piece of the picture puzzle, another another, but nowhere did we get a comprehensive detailed statement such as I hoped and sought to obtain.

As a result, we are forced to rely largely, first, on what we are told is a table agreed to by the Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, and State, which you will find on page 229 of the hearings; second, on a statement by Secretary Anderson to the effect that "520,000,000 bushels of grain is a perfectly safe figure to use as a minimum that we can ship"; and, third, on a statement by Secretary Harriman, which is not in the record for the reasons I have given, to the effect that he assumes as Secretary of Commerce full responsibility for all nonagricultural items.

Mr. Chairman, before any long-term program is considered by this House I hope that someone somehow will give us a coordinated detailed picture so that we can understand and the country can understand exactly what is involved.

INTERIM AID

As has been pointed out, the bill before us carries an appropriation of \$509,000,000 for implementing the interim-aid bill. It carries an appropriation of \$230,000,000 for implementing a deficiency request for the occupied areas. It carries certain other items, bringing up the total to about \$772,700,000, about \$345,000,000 below the Budget estimates.

The purposes of the interim-aid bill by this time are well known to us all. If you want a break-down of what is contemplated in the program, you will find at pages 229 to 233 of the hearings, first, an over-all break-down for all countries involved; second, break-downs individually for Austria, France, and Italy. I may add that no program is presented for China at this time, the State Department stating specifically that it is not yet ready to come forward with any such program.

The justification of the State Department was on the basis of \$328,000,000 for France, \$211,000,000 for Italy, and \$58,000,000 for Austria, with nothing for China. You will find at pages 267, 237, and 269 of the hearings itemized tables for Austria, France, and Italy, respectively, showing exactly how the over-all figures were arrived at, estimated dollar balances being deducted in each instance from estimated dollar needs.

The authorization bill which was passed by the Congress yesterday included not only Austria, France, and Italy, but China, and it is clear from the record that your committee was supposed to reserve part of the authorization perhaps \$60,000,000, for appropriation to China when a program for China is received from the State Department.

The appropriation suggested, by your committee is in the amount of \$509,000,000, or \$88,000,000 less than the authorization.

I submit that the reservation or withholding of funds is not only justified but required, in large measure at least, by the situation with respect to China, to which I have referred. If I understand the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], correctly, he would wipe out all possible help under this authorization for China, contrary to the expressed will of the Congress in the authorization bill. If \$597,000,000 is appropriated for Austria, France, and Italy, obviously nothing whatsoever will be left for China.

The reservation or withholding of funds to the extent of \$88,000,000 is based also on the fact that certain items are included in the program, most of which appear to represent the service of inter-governmental debt which might be deferred, and which perhaps might be more properly considered in connection with a long-range program. The items are listed in the committee report.

The reservation or withholding of \$88,000,000 makes it possible in January or in February or whenever the need is demonstrated, to make any part or all of that sum available to China or to any one of the other three nations now under consideration.

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

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

Mr. HINSHAW. Would the gentleman care to discuss for a moment the occupation costs, or does he want to confine himself to the subject he is presently speaking on?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I would prefer to complete my statement on interim aid first.

Mr. HINSHAW. Would the gentleman, then, when he completes his statement discuss the occupation costs in the countries occupied?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I shall be glad to.

If you will turn to page 229 of the hearings, you will find from the break-down to which I have already referred that this program calls for the furnishing of grains and other food products, cotton, coal, petroleum supplies, aviation gas, fertilizers, miscellaneous agricultural supplies, medical, hospital, dental, and veterinarian supplies.

Some of these items are in short supply.

I wish it were possible to give the House the exact situation in respect to each item—that information is not available.

Grain is, of course, the major item. The testimony of the Secretary of Agriculture is important in this connection.

Starting with an over-all availability of 1,491,000,000 bushels of wheat, and deducting from that 845,000,000 bushels for food, seed, and feed, he arrives at a balance of 646,000,000 bushels. Allowing 150,000,000 bushels for carry-over, into next year, there remains 500,000,000 bushels of wheat available for export. Using four hundred and fifty million of this total and adding 70,000,000 bushels of grain, he arrives at 520,000,000 bushels of grain available for export, a total which he states is "a perfectly safe figure to use as a minimum that we can ship."

He also states that the program may go to 560,000,000 bushels. There remains to be bought about 120,000,000 bushels of wheat and 3,000,000 bushels of grain.

There appears to be nothing included in his figures for wastage or for industrial purposes. Doubt as to the accuracy of the figures is thrown by the conflict of figures appearing in the committee report and already referred to by the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]. It is clear that more wheat is to be required for France and Italy than can be provided. The excess provided for must be taken care of in substitutes.

It is for this reason that this committee has inserted in substance the amendment of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] in order to insure that there shall be a minimum carry-over at the end of the year of 150,000,000 bushels of wheat for use in this country.

I invite your attention also to the testimony in respect to petroleum products, which shows that the production, consumption, exports, and imports are almost in balance today, and that any of these products taken from this country for abroad must either come out of domestic consumption or commercial exports.

The daily production in America is 5,500,000 barrels a day. The amount

said to be required for this program, if estimates are correct, is infinitesimal—1,800,000 barrels for the 4-month period.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Other commodities are discussed to some extent in the hearings, but for the most part, as already pointed out, we are forced to rely on the table I have referred to and the assurances of the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Commerce. We just have not got the detailed information which should be available.

The effect on our economy is consequently difficult if not impossible to predict. It probably depends largely on how the program is administered.

The Secretary of Agriculture goes so far as to indicate, at page 24 of the hearings, that in his opinion this program can be accomplished without any rise in commodity prices. I confess it is very difficult for me to escape the conclusion that an increase in the price level is inevitable. We must entrust the program to those who will have charge of it.

GOVERNMENT AND RELIEF IN THE OCCUPIED AREAS

The other most important item in this bill is for government and relief in the occupied areas, \$230,000,000.

Six hundred million dollars has already been made available for this purpose. The deficiency request was for \$480,000,000. Your committee recommends an appropriation of \$230,000,000.

The basis for the increase requested is, first, an item of \$237,000,000 representing the estimated increase in the cost of feeding in the British zone in Germany, with respect to which negotiations are now pending between America and Britain.

Second, the increase is due to higher prices, to decreased crops and similar causes. One million four hundred and thirty-six thousand tons of crops less than estimates have been produced in Germany; 453,000 tons less than estimates in Japan.

You will find the details of this program on page 144 of the hearings. It includes food products, agricultural supplies and fertilizer, petroleum products, medical supplies and equipment, other supplies, services and equipment, pay of civilian employees, travel of civilian employees and certain military personnel, transportation of civilian supplies, and incidental operating expenses.

The reduction which the committee recommends is reflected first in a reduction of \$137,000,000 in respect to the estimated amount necessary for feeding in the British zone in Germany, the committee feeling that the \$100,000,000 provided is ample for the time being, that we should take another look at the situation after negotiations are concluded.

It is reflected in a reduction of \$122,000,000, or two-fourteenths of the amount otherwise available for a period of over 14 months, the committee feeling that it is sufficient to make funds available up to the end of the fiscal year and

to reconsider the matter of any pipe line thereafter at a later date.

I believe the funds provided for this item are ample and that any discrepancy can be taken care of upon further consideration.

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

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I believe the gentleman will agree that the two occupied zones, British and American, are among the most highly developed industrial areas in the world. Those people manufacture products, as I understand it, and they turn those products over at practically no cost to the Office of Military Government. The Office of Military Government sets its own price at which the products will be sold, from which 10 percent is withdrawn, 5 percent being given to the manufacturer in dollars, 5 percent being assigned to the employees at the official rate; 90 percent of the price, as I understand it, going to make up part of the cost of occupation.

Does the gentleman know how much we are receiving from that 90 percent of the goods we are receiving from the German local governments to offset the occupation cost?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I am sorry, I cannot give the gentleman any information on that.

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

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

Mr. HINSHAW. Does not the gentleman agree with me that if the industrial area, the industrial heart of Germany, can be started going again that with their exports they can pay their own costs? And that unless they are permitted to get started on manufactures that they can export they will be a drain on the Treasury of the United States for a long time to come.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I may say to the gentleman from California that it is my opinion that a revival of Germany subject to proper control from the military standpoint is the heart of the entire problem of the recuperation of western Europe.

Mr. HINSHAW. I am glad to hear the gentleman say that because I was convinced in my brief visit that, given half an opportunity to produce peacetime goods, they could support themselves and then some.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WORLEY].

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Chairman, it is my desire today to pay honor and just

tribute to a fellow American and fellow Texan whom we all have come to hold in highest esteem, a man who as a naval officer has served his country well and wisely for 42 years and who now embarks upon a well-earned and richly deserved rest—Fleet Adm. Chester W. Nimitz.

As a youth in a small Texas town, son of a country innkeeper, Chester Nimitz had no more than the average American youth's advantages. Yet through hard work and perseverance he has reached the pinnacle of success and fame in his chosen profession and has become one of history's greatest naval leaders in the long up-hill struggle in the recent Pacific war.

His brilliant and gratifying success, however, has left him fundamentally unchanged in character and purpose. And the consummate respect he holds for the enlisted man in the service is still second only to that which he holds for the Chief Executive in the White House.

His work has always been characterized by his sound dependable judgment and by unflinching devotion to the task at hand. His calm, patient, and deliberate manner is contagious; his innate modesty and high sense of loyalty have endeared him to the hearts of all hands in the naval service; and have won for him the complete confidence and highest esteem of the American people at large.

It has been said that two of the most valuable qualities Admiral Nimitz took to the task of winning the naval war in the Pacific were "calculating common sense" and a "stoutly reasoned good opinion of his fellow men." He has been affectionately called every man's admiral. Knowing him it is not difficult to understand why.

This country was singularly blessed in having men of the caliber of Chester W. Nimitz to whom it could turn for leadership and inspiration in time of great national peril as well as in peacetime. His very stature and demeanor was instrumental in rallying the spirit and will and determination of his countrymen at the most critical hour of our history. We in this land will ever be in his debt.

Mr. Chairman, the Navy and the entire Nation will never forget but will deeply miss for a long time to come his active leadership in our defense establishment. On the occasion of his departure from active duty, we desire to wish him smooth sailing, fair winds, and snug harbors with many long years of good health and abundant happiness ahead.

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

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

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, I am delighted that the gentleman has taken this time to pay tribute to Fleet Admiral Nimitz upon the occasion of his retirement. It happens that the Admiral was born in the district which I have the honor to represent, he having been born at Fredericksburg, Tex., in the central part of the State, on February 24, 1885. He attended school at Kerrville, a few miles away in the rugged hill country of southwest Texas. There he gained those lasting impressions that followed him throughout his great and eventful life.

The admiral's grandfather was Capt. Charles Nimitz, who was a German-born sailing ship master who built a hotel at Fredericksburg which had a boat deck and bridge looking out over the Texas prairie. With that background, it was only natural that he should fall into a naval career, though he first aspired to attend West Point. Chester Nimitz graduated in 1905 from Annapolis, seventh in his class.

The new ensign climbed steadily as his fine qualities of leadership were brought into play. The story is told that on one occasion when Nimitz was an ensign and was on board a ship, the engineer called excitedly over the tube that the ship was about to sink. "Look on page 84 of Barton's Engineering Manual," Nimitz replied. "It tells you what to do in a case like that."

Those associated with him have often asserted that two outstanding qualities were always present in the admiral's service. One, his "calculating common sense," and, secondly, "a stoutly reasoned good opinion of his fellow man." It has often been said that he was never known to become excited.

Admiral Nimitz, as we all know, immediately after Pearl Harbor was given the formidable assignment as Chief of the Pacific Fleet. He directed the painful task of building up and directing the naval strength that smashed the Japanese dream of conquest. When given that assignment, he was quoted as saying: "I have just assumed a great responsibility and obligation which I shall do my utmost to discharge."

This great naval leader received many great honors during his career. One was the Distinguished Service Medal, by special act of Congress. But among his proudest possessions is the Treasury Department's silver life-saving medal. He won it as a lieutenant March 20, 1912, when he saved Fireman 1c W. J. Walsh from drowning.

Finally, the great pinnacle of his career came on September 1, 1945, when Admiral Nimitz signed for the United States the formal Japanese surrender terms on the battleship *Missouri* in Tokyo harbor.

Fleet Admiral Nimitz has retired. He is a great American, a great Texan, and one of the great naval leaders of all time. To him and his family I extend best wishes and Godspeed during the period of his retirement.

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

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

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I do not think that in the Army or Navy of the United States a finer type of man has ever come on the scene than Admiral Chester Nimitz. He is a great American, he is a great Texan, and we are proud of the fact that he is a Texan.

Mr. WORLEY. I thank the gentleman. Admiral Nimitz has received a great many honors in his lifetime, but not the least honor was the one he received the other day when the Governor of the State of Texas made him admiral of the Texas navy.

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

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, let me say this word of tribute in behalf of Admiral Nimitz, whose record will always reflect glory upon his native State of Texas, and the people of the entire Nation. I ask unanimous consent that any Member at this point in the Record may have permission, if he wishes to do so, to make some reference to the distinguished career of Admiral Nimitz.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, this bill involves something short of a billion dollars in appropriations. It is tremendously important. It has to do with implementing the foreign policy of our Nation, and at this critical hour in the history of the world, all of us are thinking about the question of foreign affairs and the course that our country should properly follow to promote our own welfare in the days that lie ahead.

During my service as a Member of the House one thing has always been paramount with me, and that is the question of national defense. I have felt throughout my service in Congress that our national defense program has been inadequate, and I have seized upon every possible opportunity to try to promote our national security by way of appropriations and otherwise.

Before the war, when there were those in this House and outside of this House who were crying, "Who is afraid of the big bad wolf?" I was among those who took advantage of every opportunity to vote for increased appropriations, including the implementation of our defenses in the islands of the Pacific in order that our country might be secure.

During the war, as a member of the Subcommittee on War Department Appropriations, with many of my colleagues, I went even to the extent, perhaps, of extravagance in an effort to make American dollars play a major part, if possible, in saving the lives of American fighting men, and as a member of that subcommittee, and following that philosophy of service, I agreed to take the gamble with a few of my colleagues on the \$2,000,000,000 appropriated over the years for the atomic bomb. If there is anything fundamental in my political philosophy it is this question of a strong national defense.

Since the war I have not had occasion to change my position on that matter. On June 3, 4, and 5, 1947, in this House of Representatives, following an unsuccessful fight which I had made in the Committee on Appropriations to get an additional \$40,000,000 for military aircraft, I offered an amendment in the House which would provide the additional \$40,000,000 for military aircraft for the Air Forces. After 3 days of debate we were finally able to get that amendment accepted. I recite these facts in order that I may say this, that in my opinion the foreign-aid program, stripped of all the trimmings, is nothing more or less than a national defense program. If I should vote against the

foreign-aid program I would feel that such a vote was a vote against national defense. It would be contrary to my record of service.

I do not think of this legislation as a foreign-aid bill, though of course, the bill is of vast importance and assistance to peoples overseas. To my way of thinking this is an American aid bill, and if I may be perfectly frank about it, I should like to say without apology that my first interest is the interest of the United States of America. I believe that if we do not look after the best interest of the United States, nobody else is going to do the job. So, I say without hesitation that the enlightened self-interest of the United States is the thing that prompts me to support this foreign-aid measure, yet in supporting it, I am fully aware that it will not work out perfectly. I know that in the future there will be those who will rise up and say, "Yes, I told you so. I told you that this or that would happen."

There is not going to be a perfect road for us to follow, but we are standing at the crossroads, and we inevitably must take one road or the other, and both roads are bad in many respects. In the old days of bad roads, when we went from one part of the country to the other, we found the traveling pretty rough regardless of the route that we finally selected for our journey, and I know full well whichever road we now take is going to be difficult, but we must do the best we can to meet a bad situation. It is one thing to sit on the sidelines and observe errors which will no doubt be made. It is another thing to find and follow the right road and fulfill the destiny of our Nation in the critical days ahead.

Yes, my objective is the welfare of our own people, and of course we have many Americans who are in want and distress today. I would not consider supporting this bill if I did not think that this bill was in their true interest. I admit that I may be wrong, but all we can do in this sort of situation is to follow our best judgment and do the best we can under all the facts and circumstances.

Is there anyone in America, or anywhere else for that matter, who would think that Gen. George Marshall, our Secretary of State, would be concerning himself so much about a foreign-aid program unless he had in mind the military security and national defense of this country? He has spent his life studying and working and fighting for the security of the United States. Like any normal person, he undoubtedly has humanitarian impulses, but I have not the slightest doubt but that his major objective is the welfare and military security of the United States.

I have all sympathy for the suffering and hungry peoples of the world, including those in our own country. I am not impatient with the impulses of humanitarianism. It is all a very wonderful thing, and that is and should be a consideration in this matter, but I am frank to say that there are motives more compelling than humanitarian motives which impel me to support this American aid bill today.

Not only am I interested in the security of our country in a military sense, I am

interested in the welfare of the American taxpayers. In trying to make up my mind, and I have been much disturbed about this question, as have all of you, I have tried to detach myself from sentimentalism and think, shall I say, in a cold-blooded way about the welfare of this country and the interest of the American taxpayer. If we fail in our efforts to help bolster up the free countries of western Europe, then what happens? In other words, if Moscow moves in and takes over western Europe and the iron curtain moves to the Atlantic, what happens to us in a financial way? Overnight, we would have to come before the Congress and say, "Let us have an additional appropriation of five, ten, or fifteen billion dollars for national defense in addition to what we now have." I am fully convinced that it is to the best interest of the American taxpayer that we undertake to help preserve the integrity of the free countries of western Europe and prevent the iron curtain from moving to the Atlantic ocean. So when I speak about this matter today I speak as one who proposes to carry on his long-established record of national defense and as one who is concerned about the American taxpayer, in short the financial and military interests of the United States.

I well know that if this foreign-aid program, which I hope will prove to be an American-aid program, fails, you are going to have to double, treble, or quadruple immediately the vast appropriations which we are presently making for our Army, our Air Forces, and our Navy. So it is of the greatest importance to the taxpayer that the money we spend, considerable as it may be, achieves the results we seek, because if this money fails then it may be a mere pittance compared to the multiplied billions which will be necessary overnight in the event that Moscow moves into Paris and Rome, and the other capitals of western Europe and begins to marshal the industrial resources of that great section of the world against the Western Hemisphere. Secretary Marshall has not said that, but how can we look at the ominous world situation and come to any other conclusion?

In my capacity as a member of the Herter committee, appointed by the Speaker, I was among those who made some study of the situation in Europe. While in Italy I heard much of a man by the name of Palmero Togliatti, a citizen of Italy and a powerful Communist leader. He had received years of training in Moscow. He is the leading Communist in Italy. He was trying and threatening to take charge of the government of Italy by threats of force and violence. I am one of those who believes that if we can do so, it will save us money and, perhaps American lives in the long run if we can prevent the Communists from taking over the countries of western Europe.

What is communism? Books have been written about it, and I certainly would not undertake to define it, but communism in the sense I am talking about it is this sort of thing: It moves into other countries from Moscow and

wherever it may be found in the world it is joined up with Russia. It is never detached from Moscow. It takes over a government. It first gets control of the police force and the army. Then it makes little difference what the majority of the people think because when communism comes in freedom of speech goes out the window and freedom of the press is no more and freedom of religion is suspended as well as free elections.

In America, if the people do not like the Democrats they vote them out and vote in the Republicans, and if they do not like the Republicans they make another change at the next election. That is the American way. That is democracy. Not so with communism. If communism takes over western Europe the people cannot vote it out at the next election. It is dependent upon military forces and dictatorship and the opposition leaders are liquidated. Can we afford to take the risk of letting freedom of speech, free elections, freedom of religion, and freedom of the press be snuffed out in the countries of western Europe? I am one of those who believes that if we have trouble in the future, it will be most desirable, if not essential, to have someone on our side. I do not think America, as great as she is, can afford the luxury of undertaking to stand alone in the world. We cannot afford it from a military standpoint, from a financial standpoint, from a political standpoint, or any other standpoint. So that is the reason I say I am interested in the success of this program which I call by what I hope may be its true name, an American-aid program.

Now, I would not want our country to take over the governments of western Europe. I do not want them to be puppets of the United States in any sense of the word. I only want them to be free and independent in order that they may cooperate with us and not work against us in the perilous days that lie ahead.

Yes, America must make a choice. We can either pull out of Europe, or we can stay in Europe. Are we willing so soon after the victory has been won at so great a price in life and treasures to walk away from the victory which has been won? I say no, we are not willing to do that. Oh, yes, we can knock out the funds in this bill for aid to civilians in occupied areas of Germany. We do not have control of the so-called bread basket of Germany, but we do have control of the industrial heart of Germany. We can save several hundred million dollars by pulling out of Germany—but if we pull out of Germany and turn over the industrial heart of Germany and the industrial heart of Europe to Moscow, we will, perhaps, be making one of the most fatal and tragic mistakes that was ever made by any country, because whoever writes the ticket in the industrial heart of Germany and in the industrial heart of Europe will have a significant part in writing the ticket in Paris, in Rome, in Belgium, in Holland, eventually in London and all Western Europe.

There is, therefore, every reason why all thoughtful Americans are concerned these days about the international situation. If our present program succeeds it will be cheaper in the long run, expen-

sive as it is, to stay in Europe and take the leading part among the nations of the world in helping to save our country from the threat of a third world war.

There are those who say, "Why don't we ignore Europe and look after the best interest of the United States?" Unfortunately, that is not possible. We have learned from two world wars that you cannot ignore Europe and the rest of the world and at the same time look after the best interest of the United States. To ignore the rest of the world, to ignore Europe, and look after the best interest of the United States at the same time is as contradictory as trying to ride in opposite directions at one time.

The thing that is desperately important is the prevention of World War III. If we fail to prevent a third world war, then all our hopes and dreams of happiness and security will be shattered. It is in the hope that this legislation will contribute toward peace and security that a vast majority of the Members of the House will vote for this legislation when the vote is taken tomorrow. I would be the last man who would want to weaken the United States. The object is to strengthen the United States. That is what this bill is about—to strengthen and not to weaken the United States. It would serve no useful purpose for a man to leap into the stream to save a drowning man if he, too, will also drown.

Now, what have we shipped abroad?

We shipped abroad 40 percent of our wheat last year. We could have kept the 611,000,000 bushels of grain which we exported, in the United States. We could have said to those starving people—and that is a consideration—"We are not responsible for your plight. Starve if you care to." We could have taken that attitude and drawn our cloak about us and kept our 611,000,000 bushels of grain at home, and threatened with bankruptcy the economy of many of the States of the Union. We did not need it for American consumption. We provide in this bill for a carry-over of 150,000,000 bushels of wheat. Did this course of action unduly deplete our country? I do not think so.

Well, we exported a lot of other things. Our manufacturers, who make trucks and automobiles and one thing and another, have been sending a limited number of such things abroad. I have seen them in Europe. Our businessmen want to keep contact with their customers overseas, because they are looking to the future. They want to stay in world markets. This should be in the best interest of American industry, American labor, and the American farmers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] has expired.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 10 additional minutes.

Mr. MAHON. I was not shocked to see some of the products of American labor and industry in Europe. I was glad to see them there. I hope we may have in the future a good market for our farm and industrial products in other parts of the world. I am sorry we do not, at present, have enough to meet our own needs and the needs of others. I am sorry that we have to wait for some of these things,

but I am not opposed to a continued exportation of some of our production. Not everything that goes abroad is given away or sold on credit. We are selling billions of dollars' worth of products abroad for cash.

I am told that our exports to the 16 western European nations during 1946, which they could not pay for with their exports, amounted to only about 2 percent of our total national production. We must all agree that there have been some dislocations at home by reason of our foreign policy but certainly we have not wrecked our economy by the course which we have thus far pursued. We must exercise great care in safeguarding our own resources.

In this interim-aid bill we provide some money for petroleum products. Down in Texas we produce 40 percent of the petroleum products produced in the United States. Some of you in the East are concerned about fuel oil, and there is a shortage of fuel oil. How much fuel oil is provided for in the interim-aid bill now before us? One one-thousandth of 1 percent of our fuel oil production is included in the bill, and about one-third of 1 day of our production of petroleum products as a whole is included in the bill.

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

Mr. MAHON. I yield to my able colleague.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If the gentleman represented a district where the temperatures occasionally flirted with zero and he got a letter from a constituent who said:

Some years ago, and years before the war, I put an oil burner in my house and that is the only way I have of heating my house, but now I cannot buy any.

And you wrote him and told him that he should not worry because this program provided for exporting only one one-thousandth of 1 percent of our oil production, do you suppose that would help him keep warm?

Mr. MAHON. I would have the greatest sympathy for the man because he is undoubtedly confronted with a difficult situation and I would do everything in my power to be of assistance to him. Perhaps I would write him about like this:

DEAR BILL: I am glad to have your letter. It is true that there is some money in the interim-aid bill for petroleum products. We are exporting oil but we are importing as much or more oil than we export. In the interim-aid bill we provide for an exportation of one one-thousandths of 1 percent of our fuel-oil production. It is apparent that whether we do or do not export this relatively small quantity of oil there is still going to be a shortage. One one-thousandths of 1 percent of our production is not enough to take care of you and numerous others who are in need of more adequate supplies.

Speaking of oil, American interests in Arabia have control of one of the largest oil reserves in the world—if not the largest. Petroleum is an essential product in industry and in war and it is important that we try to prevent our lifeline to that oil from being cut by an unfriendly nation. It would be very injurious to our national defense plan. As you know, many warnings have been published to the effect that there is a temporary shortage of fuel oil and that people should delay installing fuel oil furnaces. However, I note that yours was installed several years ago.

Let me say while we are talking about oil that we are trying in our work here to look after the best interest of America. We desperately need to prevent a third world war and to do that some sacrifices will be necessary on our part, but I hope a way can be found to remedy the situation which you describe and I would like to assist in any way possible. I do not want your boy and your neighbor's boy to have to go forth to fight again. If we could spend billions of dollars to win the war I feel that we can afford to spend a few hundred millions now to try to keep our boys at home and prevent future difficulties.

At any rate, if I were in the position of the gentleman from South Dakota, I would do, as I am sure the able gentleman has done—I would do the best I could to provide information and assistance. The average American is tolerant and understanding and he doesn't expect more than can reasonably be done for him under the circumstances.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I am sure the gentleman has suggested a very helpful answer—at least it might generate a little heat while the letter is being read. But seriously, how will this man heat his home? He lives in the country and milks a large number of cows. He wrote me that when he cannot warm the water they drink in freezing weather, the milk yield goes down sharply. What is he to do?

I asked the same question of the Under Secretary of State in our hearings the other day. I am not sure whether his answer was on the record or not. He said that he could appreciate the situation because he too has an oil furnace in his own home but he has a couple open hearth fireplaces so his family can keep warm.

However, the gentleman referred to the reserves of oil. In the hearings I asked the Assistant to the Secretary of the Interior to supply figures on our reserves of liquid fuels in oil shale and lignite. The figures came too late to put in the hearings, but I have the letter and hope to make it a part of the record. He said the amount of liquid fuel we could obtain from shales is five times that of existing petroleum deposits and the liquid fuel we could obtain from lignite coal was 25 times. So the 69 years estimated for the petroleum reserves can be augmented by these other sources of liquid fuel, and it seems to me in preserving the independence and freedom of the United States it would be better to develop those resources of shale and lignite than to depend upon that tenuous line to Saudi Arabia.

Mr. MAHON. I think we should depend on all available resources. I believe in trying to look after every eventuality as best we can. I believe we are going to be able to come through.

Now there are those who, perhaps like the gentleman, cannot get all the fuel oil they want, and some who are saying, "Who won the war, after all?" In going with members of the Herter committee from England over the North Sea to Berlin by plane we were served a little basket lunch. By that time we had all become very conscious of the fact that there was a shortage of food in Europe. We did not want to waste anything. I said to the sergeant, "I do not need all

this food. Is there not some way you could save part of it?" He said, "Do not bother about that, Congressman; when we land in Berlin and throw this stuff out of the plane the Germans will lick the platter clean." I thought then, and I say now, I would hate to contemplate the situation being reversed and an occupying foe being in control of my own country and American boys and girls having to lick the platter clean of an invading and occupying force in an effort to sustain life. So, despite our disappointments, I say that the victory, after all, was not a hollow victory. But we must make the victory sure.

I am just as impatient with Europeans as are many others. I do not like many things that are transpiring in Europe. I think we would all like to be isolationists if we could safely afford to be, but we cannot afford the luxury. It is easy to be critical and say, "Why do you not go to work?" But from my observation, the farmers of Europe are doing the best possible job in cultivating their land, certainly as good a job as I have seen anywhere. I think they are doing the best they can to feed themselves. I know there are a lot of mistakes and maladjustments. But it does not behoove us to say, "You would have everything you need if you would just go to work." We have been working pretty well in this country and we cannot get all the new automobiles we want. We have been working pretty well but we cannot get boxcars to move our grain. We have quite a lot of factories and they are in operation, but they cannot produce all the gadgets we want even in this country. Why, one raid over England destroyed 2,000 factories. Not a bomb dropped in this country on an American boxcar or upon an American factory; yet with all our power and ingenuity we have not been able to meet all of our local demands.

It is impossible to expect people who have been devastated by war, countries wherein 90 percent of the transportation facilities have been destroyed, where cities have been burned and hundreds of factories wrecked, to produce within a few months everything they require. The devastated countries have not fully recovered. They will not recover for many, many years, though remarkable progress toward recovery has been made in many of the areas overseas.

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

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, we have all learned by sad and bitter experience that weakness and appeasement are not signposts on the road to peace. Weakness and appeasement, on the contrary, are signposts on the road to war. So we must stand firm, we must do the best we can with a bad situation and we must expect disappointments in the future because we are going to have them.

The morning paper announcing as it did the break-up of the Conference of Foreign Ministers in London only adds emphasis to the fact that we must assume our position as the dominant power on earth in promoting peace, security, and stability. It is not so much a ques-

tion of helping people in far away lands, rather it is a question of helping Tom, Dick, and Harry, and their families, and all our people in our own country.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Obviously a quorum is not present. The Clerk will call the roll.

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

[Roll No. 148]

Allen, Ill.	Cravens	Lynch
Allen, La.	Crosser	McConnell
Andrews, N. Y.	Davis, Tenn.	McDonough
Auchincloss	Dawson, Ill.	McDowell
Bates, Ky.	Dorn	Morrison
Bell	Eberharter	Norton
Bland	Fellows	Potter
Bloom	Fletcher	Powell
Brooks	Fulton	Rabin
Buck	Gathings	Reed, N. Y.
Buckley	Harrison	Rivers
Busbey	Hartley	Rooney
Case, N. J.	Hébert	Sabath
Celler	Hendricks	Scoblick
Chapman	Hinschaw	Shafer
Chiperfield	Jackson, Calif.	Short
Clements	Jenison	Strundstrom
Clippinger	Kearns	Taylor
Coffin	Kcogh	Thomas, N. J.
Colmer	Lanham	Trimble
Coley	Lesinski	West
Courtney	Ludlow	Wilson, Ind.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HARNES of Indiana, 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. 4748, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 367 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The Committee will resume its sitting.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, today I listened with great interest to the very splendid talk made by my colleague and good friend the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON]. I may say that in what he said I find myself in almost complete agreement. In this period when our thoughts turn to the Christ Child, and the spirit of Christmas invades our thinking, I wish that it were possible for me to picture Uncle Sam engaging in this great international enterprise for pure idealistic principles. There are those who contend that the spirit which prompts the giving of relief as proposed in one part of the pending appropriation bill is in order that the great heart of America, swelling with charitable impulses, may bring relief and succor to the hungry people of France, Italy, and Austria.

I have always had a lot of idealism in my faith, but in dealing with Joe Stalin we are dealing with a man who is practical, and to whom idealism, as such, is entirely foreign. So far as I am concerned, while I want relief to go to the suffering people of France, Italy, and Austria, I would never be able to justify in my own heart, or to the people whom I am honored to represent, my vote for

a continuation of this international program, unless it was coupled directly to the interest and welfare of the people of the United States. I am glad to say that I have been privileged to make a great many speeches in this country and in sections where they were bitterly opposed to a continuation of our intervention in foreign affairs, but when the real purpose of this bill was explained and the real interest of America disclosed, I found, inevitably and invariably, an aroused and awakened interest in the efforts that your country and mine is making to try to stop the forward march of Communist penetration. When the Greek-Turkish matter was before this House, I asked in a conference with General Marshall and Mr. Lovett a simple question: "I want to know whether or not this program which you propose is an implementation of the military strategy of the United States Government." The answer which I received categorically from Mr. Lovett was: "Yes."

On that basis, Mr. Chairman, stripping this bill of all the puerile and idle talk we have heard, idealistic as it may be, and beautiful as the concept may be, we can approach the consideration of this bill by asking ourselves a simple question, does this bill do anything to protect the interests of the people of the United States of America. If it does, then it is the policy of my country. I may harangue and argue about that policy all I please, but when I am put in the position of making a choice between the policy of my country and the policy of Stalin there is going to be but one answer as far as I am concerned. So I voted for the authorization legislation and I am here urging the adoption of this appropriation.

Does that mean that I must be foolish? Does it mean that I must be utterly oblivious to the facts of the situation in protecting the welfare and the interests of my people? You would think from the speech that was made by the gentleman from Missouri, the ranking man on this committee, that we have completely destroyed the efforts of the State Department to bring proper and orderly relief to Austria, to France, and to Italy. We are asking in this bill for an appropriation of \$509,000,000 for foreign relief. The authorization bill is \$597,000,000. We are therefore eliminating \$88,000,000. The gentleman said that is going to destroy this bill.

Let us think back for just a moment. The Committee on Foreign Affairs brought in a bill with a maximum limitation of \$590,000,000. They struck from the consideration items totaling \$67,000,000 and then substituted \$60,000,000 for China, bringing the total back to \$590,000,000. What were the items the Committee on Foreign Affairs struck out? They are the items that were referred to by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]. They are listed here in the justifications under this bill.

The situation is just simply this: France has about \$226,000,000 of her own dollar exchange available to purchase supplies and goods. She says to us, in effect, "We need so much food and we cannot buy it. In addition to that, we

owe our subscription to the international monetary set-up, we owe our subscription of \$2,000,000 to the International Labor Organization and some other international groups. We cannot support our embassies and our consulates, and we need \$10,000,000 for that. We owe Belgium \$17,000,000 under a contract that was made in 1945. We owed them \$40,000,000 but we paid them a part of it and it is down to \$17,000,000 now. We owe a balance of \$3,000,000 under a trade agreement with Brazil. So we are asking you, Uncle Sam, to make this contribution of ours good to the international monetary bank; we are asking you to pay our interest to the Export-Import Bank; we are asking you to pay up the principal we owe the Export-Import Bank; we are asking you to pay the expense, or make it possible for us to pay the expense, of maintaining our consulates; and we are asking you to make good, or make it possible for us to make good, what we owe to Belgium and what we owe to Brazil. The whole thing totals up to \$66,000,000. We have the money to buy \$66,000,000 worth of food, but if we buy this food, we cannot meet these obligations out of our dollar exchange. So we want you to furnish us the food, so that we can take our money and meet these obligations.

"In other words, you make it possible for us to pay these \$10,000,000 to the International Bank, and then we can go to the International Bank and get credit and we can borrow \$30,000,000 more, about 75 percent of which Uncle Sam will pay. We want you to make our credit good with the Export-Import Bank so that if we go to make another loan, we will have good credit and good standing."

Now what did the committee do? Your Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House decided that they would not include most of those items and they struck out the whole \$66,000,000. That is the amount they had when they brought the bill here. Now your committee on Appropriations has simply said, "We do not believe that we ought to saddle the American taxpayers with the responsibility of paying these obligations, indirectly, of course, and if we are living in a group of nations of which Belgium and Brazil are a part, let them defer their obligations and at the same time maintain the good credit of France instead of asking the United States and its people to bear the whole burden. Insofar as what they owe us, let us defer. Insofar as what they owe the International Bank, let us defer payments and let them spend their money for food because this thing was designed as a pure interim proposition for relief and never was presented to the Congress as part of the Marshall plan for the reconstruction of France or any other country in Europe."

So your committee has seen fit to eliminate those items from the bill. There was another reason why—you voted that you wanted to do something for China. If you vote the entire authorization of \$597,000,000 for France, for Italy, and for Austria, how are you going to do anything for China, pray tell? So we have a reserve here—when the State De-

partment brings to the committee a justification and a program for expending money for China, and so far as I am concerned as one member of that committee, I want the opportunity to provide funds for China—then this will make it possible.

The other \$22,000,000 in this item was for Italy. We struck those items out. What were they? Five million dollars payment to the United States for the settlement of certain war claims of United States nationals against Italy. I do not know what it is—Lombardo agreement, December 1947. Partial repayment of Export-Import Bank, \$7,000,000. Interest on the United States surplus property credit, \$4,000,000. Then again \$6,000,000 to maintain her diplomatic agencies in the dollar exchange countries. The total is \$22,000,000.

What I have said with respect to France applies with equal force to Italy because they have about \$126,000,000 available in dollar exchange which they can use themselves, or if they do not have the money, let them defer to their creditors—whether we are their creditors or not. How do we treat our own people, pray tell? In the name of God, have we not been pretty good? Since VJ-day we have made available to Austria \$341,300,000. We have made available to France \$1,976,000,000. We have made available to Italy \$1,692,000,000, or a total since VJ-day of \$4,900,300,000 to which we now propose to add \$509,000,000 more.

How do we treat our own folks? I do not know how they do it in New York or in Kentucky, but I know how they do it at home. An old couple walk into the headquarters for relief and say, "Here, I am 67 or 70 years of age. We cannot work any more, and we need old-age assistance pensions." The first thing that they are asked is, "What have you got?" They say, "Well, we have saved up \$300 for our burial expenses, and we have a little home with a mortgage on it that we live in."

We tell them, "If you turn that home over, that \$300 over, we will give you a little pension." That is the law. That is what they do. That is how we treat our own people, but when we are dealing with this international situation, there are some people in the Congress who think that the Congress of the United States ought not to ask a single question; that we ought to give everything that is asked, without any strings tied to it whatsoever. We have tried to give you some facts explanatory of the action of your Appropriations Committee. I do not think I am disclosing any secrets when I say that the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] did raise some questions with respect to how this would operate if we held out this \$88,000,000, but that was the only question raised in the committee; and in the full committee there was not a single word said by anyone. Yet on the floor of this House it would be made to appear by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] that we are just stripping and killing this foreign-aid bill.

Mr. Chairman, we are doing pretty well by France, Italy, and Austria, and as far as I am concerned I want to do

the thing that will preserve those countries. As one who is so interested, I believe that we have fulfilled our obligation, and there are many people in this country who are suffering and will suffer this winter who will inquire why it is that we must continue to go on and on and on, with no end in sight, nothing in the foreseeable future changing the foreign ministry situation in a complete breakdown, no end to these demands in the foreseeable future.

So, when we wrote the bill in the full committee this morning, thinking in terms of America, we wrote into the bill a little language, a part of which was offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] and the other part offered by the gentleman who is now addressing you, by which we asked, as in the case of wheat, that the President survey the situation in this country as to fertilizer and as to petroleum products and let the American people know the facts as to what we are facing as a result of the shipments of these things abroad. In order to do what? In order that the people of America may know the real facts and know and understand that every gallon of petroleum that leaves this country must be taken away from the possible consumption of the people of America. These facts appear without controversy, in the hearings before our committee. I think the American people will be willing to make such sacrifice as may be necessary, but they ought to be acquainted with the facts, and the amendment which we have offered merely requires the President to make those facts available and known to the American people.

The amendment, with respect to petroleum products, has for its purpose the thought behind the amendment offered in the House by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN], who at all times has vigorously pressed for some action to protect the users of gasoline and fuel oil in America.

There is another phase of this thing that I just do not understand. The Army asked for \$490,000,000, supplemental estimate, for feeding in the occupied areas of Germany. France likewise comes in and says, "We want some help to feed the civilian population in our occupied part of Germany." They did not come in as Britain did, through the Army, but they come in through the State Department; and included in these estimates is over \$28,000,000 to enable France to continue to feed the civilian population in Germany in her zone of occupation.

We did not strike that out, but it raises a lot of serious questions as far as I am concerned. How long, pray God, are the American people going to be called upon without any voice in the conduct of the affairs of French occupied Germany, to pay the cost of feeding the civilian population?

Now let us look at the situation as to the other part of Germany. We have a bipartite pact with England that she should share expenses. I asked the ques-

tion where England got her money to pay her share of that expense. Where? Why, the only place she could get it was to get it here. We lent her \$3,750,000,000. That has all been used up. So she comes in and says, "We cannot any longer pay our cost of maintaining the civilian population in our occupied areas; so, Uncle Sam, you have got to take that burden over." We did the feeding before, but we did it under the surreptitious device of lending the money to England and then through a bookkeeping transaction it was charged out of what we lent her. We all know, of course, that that loan will never be repaid. It is a gift. So now the thing is out in the open and we have got to pay the cost of maintaining the civilian population in British-occupied Germany. That is an obligation of Great Britain as an occupying power under the Hague Convention. What did we do about it? They wanted \$490,000,000 additional. About \$237,000,000 of it was on account of our assumption of the British obligation to support and maintain the population in her area.

They told us, Mr. Chairman, "We are negotiating an agreement with Britain."

"Well, what is the agreement?"

"Well, we do not know yet. A lot depends on what happens in the council of foreign ministers, and so on."

Mr. Chairman, we would like to see that agreement before we go any further. We want these people fed, we want to see that provision is made for them to be fed, but we ask them: What about the horde of civilian employees you are maintaining in Germany? What about the policy with respect to the operation of the coal mines and the sale of coal in your area? What about a thousand and one other things? We do not know a thing about it at present, but we are being asked to maintain out of American funds the cost of feeding the civilian population.

We have simply said this, "We want that program to continue. Here is \$100,000,000 to continue it. You have got enough money to run on; it will run you up to about the end of the fiscal year. After you have negotiated this agreement you come back to the committee. We will then know what the crop prospect is in Germany, we will have some idea as to what they can produce indigenously, and we will then get another look at this situation. And we are doing it in the interest of conserving and protecting the interests of the people of America to see if we cannot save a few dollars. If we are to be compelled to take over the entire feeding, especially in British-occupied Germany, then I for one want to insist that in the contract between the United States and Germany there shall be some provision made by which we will have some voice in the conduct of the civil affairs of that part of Germany. So we have reduced the amount of that request temporarily until we can get another look at the situation. Those are the big items in this bill and the items in reference to which

there might possibly be some ground for argument or dispute.

Mr. Chairman, I want you to know that I have never had anything in the 9 years I have been a Member of Congress that has weighed so heavily upon me as has this very situation. You and each of you want to do the right thing for your country. So do I. I want to know, please God, that we are doing the right thing. It is a tremendous responsibility. The very fate of the world may be determined by what we do. To me it is just that serious.

Your committee has approached this thing from that point of view. We have given for foreign relief and for relief in occupied areas every dollar that the taxpayers of the United States ought to be called upon to give. I hope that this committee, when it gets to the reading of the bill, will not be swayed by some emotional appeal and will support the committee.

I ask that you look on page 5 of the bill and you will see that the committee struck out the provision beginning in line 1 and ending before the word "Provided" in line 3. Personally, I do not think it makes very much difference whether it is in there or out, but there were those people who were interested in the livestock industry and in the poultry business who were adverse to putting the seal of approval in advance of any legislation on the subject to any proposal that would give the right and power to the Department of Agriculture to establish weights and grades that represent the most efficient utilization of grain. The matter is clearly a voluntary proposition.

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

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SCRIVNER. The reason for that amendment, as the gentleman will remember, is that this program of establishing weights and measures reads, as will be seen on the bottom of page 4, "under existing law."

Mr. KEEFE. Yes.

Mr. SCRIVNER. We felt that as far as we could see there are no existing laws which would empower the President to take action like that, and knowing some of the gentlemen who might carry on part of this program we thought the better part of judgment was not to give any stamp of approval or any congressional idea that there might be some existing law of that nature.

Mr. KEEFE. I think that was explained to the committee. It is contended that there is no law that would give authority to impose any such regulations. Anything that might be done in that regard would have to be through purely voluntary action and in the absence of any legislation on the subject the committee felt that it could very well be stricken from the bill.

I may say to the gentleman that his very persuasive argument in the committee convinced me, and should convince the Congress, that we ought not to

take any step that would by implication or otherwise place the seal of approval of the Congress upon any such regulations to be imposed on the poultry and livestock industry by the Department of Agriculture. I congratulate the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER] in the very firm and adequate presentation which he made in behalf of these two great agricultural interests.

The other little item in the bill with respect to the Federal Security Agency of \$1,300,000 and \$40,000 for miscellaneous expenditures is an item to which there is no objection because it simply requires an appropriation to meet a definite obligation of the Government to pay employment compensation to seamen who are paid their compensation by the respective States of the Nation. This is to reimburse the States for the amount of money which they have paid.

We may get into an argument and amendments may be offered to the bill when it is read for amendment.

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

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I hope when we get to a consideration of the bill, and the main part is involved in this foreign-relief program, in the direct appropriations for relief and in the request of the Army for supplemental money for relief in the occupied areas, the committee will not be diverted from supporting the action of your Appropriations Committee which has labored for weeks, as a matter of fact, ever since the Congress came back into special session, to try to get the real truth and the facts.

Now, all we are asking is this: "Mr. President, when you spend this money for wheat, we want you to be sure before you complete all your shipments under this program that you are going to have a 150,000,000-bushel carry-over for the protection of the people of the United States." Is that not fair? That is 50,000,000 bushels less than they ought to have as a normal carry-over, and all we say is, "Mr. President, when you are shipping those amounts of fertilizer and nitrogenous fertilizer abroad, we ask that you investigate the situation of the needs of America just a little bit and let the American people understand and know the relationship between these shipments abroad and the needs here at home, and when you are shipping these millions of gallons of fuel oil abroad, that are so desperately needed to heat the homes here in America, we ask you, Mr. President, in administering this law, that you look into the needs of the people of America just a little bit and tell us whether we can safely go on and make these shipments and still at the same time do what we ought to do for the protection of our own people."

I think when you view it that way you will find that the committee has done a pretty good job in bringing this bill to you.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin has pretty well covered some of the features in the bill which I had intended to cover, and I may not use the 10 minutes. I would, however, call the attention of the Committee to some of the things which the Congress should keep in mind as we deal with this whole problem of foreign aid:

Attention has already been directed to this question of the assets in dollars which these countries have that they would apply to the purchase of food or would apply to some of these other purposes if we provide food. There are a couple of other things which should be kept in mind, and I mention them at this time because as this matter of foreign aid develops, we should watch them.

The first is that the dollar crisis in Italy and France was precipitated by the decision of the British to suspend sterling convertibility, and the last \$400,000,000 of our loan to England was held up when the British suspended convertibility on account of conditions when the loan was made. Very recently the balance of the loan has been made available to England. The understanding is, as we have been notified in the press, that Britain expects to resume convertibility under certain conditions. When the convertibility was suspended, the dollars which Italy and France expected to get out of converting their sterling balances, of course, were not available to them. If the resumption of the loan and the resumption of the convertibility makes additional dollars available to France or Italy, then I believe that the United States Congress should know about it in order that we may take that into consideration in dealing with further requests under the foreign-aid program.

The second thing that we should keep in mind is the assets that these countries have in the United States, in securities. Before we get any deeper in this foreign-aid program we should have a definite report upon that.

The gentleman from Missouri, in objecting to the cuts made in this bill, said it would be a bad precedent to say to these other countries that they should not pay their debts. The United States is not saying that, but even if that were true, it would also be a bad precedent for the United States to say, "No; do not pay your debts; we will pay them for you, and you can owe us." Of course, actually they are not going even to owe us, because they are to put up some inflated currency which will be available only for expenditure in those countries for relief purposes there, for such purposes as they agree to. May I say to the House that if we adopt the philosophy suggested and say to these countries, "If you get a little alarmed about your political status, come to us and we will put up the money so you can meet all your obligations," we will have established a bad precedent for blackmailing the pocketbook of Uncle Sam.

There are some tables which were in the justifications submitted to the com-

mittee which I shall place in the RECORD, with permission which I expect to obtain in the House, which put this picture before you clearly and factually. Actually, we did not cut the bill as much as we should on this point, and the evidence of that will be in the tables which I shall submit.

(The matter referred to follows:)

APPENDIX E

(P. 43, justification)

France—Dollar requirements and available resources—Oct. 1, 1947—Mar. 31, 1948

[In millions of dollars c. i. f.]

Expenditures for supplies:	
Cereals from United States.....	139
Cereals from other sources.....	41
Milk and other foods from United States.....	8
Fats and oils.....	43
Coal from United States.....	176
Coal from Germany.....	14
Petroleum products.....	70
Cotton.....	55
Fertilizers.....	9
Other raw materials.....	95
Imports of food supplies for French zone, Germany.....	28
Imports for French overseas areas (excluding cereals, coal, petroleum supplies).....	52

Subtotal..... 730

Other expenditures:

Payments to Belgium for Belgians under commercial agreement.....	30
Payment to Brazil under commercial agreement.....	10
Interest on foreign debt.....	26
Administration and other expenses.....	10
Additional contribution to International Monetary Fund.....	10

Subtotal..... 86

Total expenditures..... 816

France—Dollar resources available—Oct. 1, 1947, to Mar. 31, 1948

[In millions of dollars]

Resources available:

Earnings from exports of goods and services.....	60
Stabilization fund balance as of Oct. 1, 1947.....	50
Possible drawings on International Monetary Fund.....	30
Balance of International Bank loan available for purchases of supplies.....	21
Estimated liquidation of French dollar securities.....	80
U. S. Army payment.....	50
Export-Import Bank credit available for purchases of supplies.....	93
Restitution of gold from Germany.....	104

Total resources..... 488

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Subtracting the four hundred and eighty-eight from eight hundred and sixteen, you get three hundred and twenty-eight millions. That is the amount of the request for France.

(P. 23 from the justifications)

It is proposed here that the difference of \$328,000,000 be supplied by the United States as interim aid.

It is now anticipated that this amount of interim aid, if forthcoming by December 1, 1947, will be used to purchase the following commodities:

TABLE V.—Commodities to be financed for France under interim-aid program, Dec. 1, 1947, to Mar. 31, 1948

[Millions of dollars]	
1. Bread grains.....	115
2. Milk products.....	3
3. Other special foods from United States.....	3
4. Fats and oils.....	16
5. Coal from United States.....	116
6. Coal from Ruhr.....	9
7. Petroleum products.....	22
8. Cotton.....	35
9. Fertilizers.....	9
Total.....	328

If the foregoing products are supplied to France under the interim-aid program, France's own resources should suffice to cover its other essential outlays, as is indicated in Table VI.

TABLE VI.—Outlays to be covered by France and resources available for that purpose during period Dec. 1, 1947, to Mar. 31, 1948

[Millions of dollars]	
(P. 24)	
Requirements: ¹	
1. Cereals.....	30
2. Fats and oils.....	12
3. Petroleum products.....	23
4. Food imports for French zone in Germany.....	13
5. Essential supplies for French overseas areas.....	32
6. Imports of industrial materials.....	52
7. Service of foreign debt.....	26
8. Payment to Belgium on commercial account.....	17
9. Payment to Brazil on commercial account.....	3
10. Additional contribution to International Monetary Fund.....	10
11. Administrative and other expenditures.....	10
Total.....	228
Available resources:	
12. Balance available on Dec. 1, 1947.....	153
13. Liquidation of French dollar securities.....	35
14. Earnings from exports and services.....	40
Total.....	228

¹ Equipment items are not listed since it is contemplated that the French will, during the interim period, restrict their equipment imports to the funds becoming available exclusively for this purpose. These will consist of approximately \$100,000,000 of funds from outstanding loans from the Export-Import Bank and the International Bank for equipment purchases, available for this purpose as of Oct. 1, 1947.

When you look at the tables, note the items under the heading "Other expenditures" which total \$86,000,000 in the October 1 table labeled "Appendix E." Then compare them with items 7 to 11, inclusive, in the December 1 table VI. You will note they then total only \$66,000,000, meaning that France has paid \$20,000,000 in those items. But \$328,000,000 was requested for France. To get that \$328,000,000 figure you have to use the table for the 1st of October, shown as appendix E. In that table, showing requirements between October 1 and March 31 France had demands of \$816,000,000, against possible dollar assets of \$488,000,000. You subtract one from the other and you get \$328,000,000, which was the item that was requested.

Since the 1st of October, France has paid \$20,000,000 on these obligations, but the requests for France are based on her dollar deficits as of that date. The cut, however, which amounts to \$66,000,000, is found by totaling the other expenditures of the character discussed in the table for December 1—table VI.

Since the \$328,000,000 which she requested was based upon the October table, it is evident that France expects to recoup some of these payments out of the dollars saved by the food we provide. So in my judgment, the appropriation is not cut as much as it should be. It should have been a cut of eighty-six million at this point instead of sixty-six.

The situation in Italy is much the same, and I shall ask permission to put in the tables on Italy, too. They speak for themselves and readily show where the twenty-two-million figure was suggested.

(From p. 49 of the justifications)

TABLE X.—Dollar outlays to be covered by Italy and dollar resources available for that purpose during the period Dec. 1, 1947—Mar. 31, 1948

[Millions of dollars]	
Requirements:	
1. Cereals.....	25.0
2. Coal.....	13.0
3. Petroleum supplies.....	15.0
4. Cotton and other textile fibers.....	15.0
5. Raw materials for chemical industry.....	10.2
6. Rubber and carbon black.....	5.1
7. Industrial fats and oils.....	1.3
8. Hides and leather.....	4.0
9. Ferrous metals.....	11.0
10. Nonferrous metals.....	9.4
11. Minerals.....	1.0
12. Lumber.....	4.4
13. Other industrial materials.....	18.6
14. Other foodstuffs.....	4.0
Total commodity requirements.....	137.0
Invisible items on current account.....	22.0
Total payments.....	159.0
Available resources:	
1. Exports of goods and services.....	77.0
2. Export-Import bank loans.....	55.0
3. Liquidation of blocked assets in United States.....	10.0
4. Treasury suspense account.....	2.0
5. P.O.'s trust fund account.....	15.0
Total receipts.....	159.0

Explanatory data on invisible items on current account (table X, item 15).

The \$22,000,000 invisible items on current account include:

Payment to United States for settlement of certain war claims of United States nationals against Italy (Lombardo agreement, Dec. 1947).....	\$5,000,000
Partial repayment of Export-Import bank 1946 cotton loan (Dec. 1947—Mar. 1948).....	7,000,000
Interest on United States surplus property credit (Jan. 1, 1948).....	4,000,000
Diplomatic expenditures, prewar bond settlement, interest payments, and miscellaneous financial items.....	6,000,000
Total.....	22,000,000

With respect to the sections in the bill that deal with the occupied countries, I wish to point out that we have a responsibility in the occupied countries

where our troops are that is greater than we have in France and Italy. France, Italy, and Austria have governments of their own. We are in Germany, Japan, and Korea, and to an extent in Austria, as an occupying power where we have a responsibility under international law to provide a minimum of subsistence for the civilian populations. The countries which have their own governments determine their own policies. But where we are the occupying power we determine the policies. We determine the capacity of these countries to get on their feet and their capacity to balance their exports against their imports. In determining those policies, under international law, we accept the responsibility for feeding them.

With respect to the British zone in Germany, where it is proposed that we take on \$237,000,000 additional, as the gentleman from Wisconsin has pointed out, we are advancing \$100,000,000, and are saying to the British, "Before we take on the full load and before we take on an irrevocable commitment, we want to know what voice we are to have on the policies to be pursued in the zone."

The fair-minded people of England recognize that the United States in taking on a larger share of the dollar responsibility should have a larger voice in the policies to be followed.

There is the matter of personnel.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLEVENGER] a moment ago reminded me that in the British zone there were reported to be 1,040 agricultural agents, whereas in the United States zone we have 52. When the subcommittee for Germany and Austria of the Select Committee on Foreign Aid asked questions about the personnel in the British zone, repeatedly we found that the British personnel was greater than ours—often about double—for it is also true in the bizonal set-up.

THE ECONOMIC POLICIES PURSUED DETERMINE THE RATE OF ECONOMIC RECOVERY

In the operation of the North German Coal Commission, the policies which the British were following were policies which many of our people seem to feel were expensive. It was with reluctance, apparently, that the British offered incentives for increasing the production of coal. They were opposed to the use of incentives in operating the coal mines in England, and they wanted to carry that same policy over in the operation of the coal mines in Germany. For many months German coal production went along on a level of about 200,000 tons per day.

Finally the commission did agree to offer incentives in the form of CARE packages. Almost immediately that brought coal production up to about 243,000 tons per day. There it leveled off again.

Then the United States representative on the North German Coal Commission in a liaison capacity proposed other policies which the British were reluctant to adopt. Among them was the placing of the management of the mines in the hands of a German who had considerable experience and the knowledge to deal with his own people. Finally, about the week that we were leaving Germany, a decision was made by the British ac-

ceding to the suggestion of the Americans. Within the space of 6 weeks, coal production went up to approximately 280,000 tons per day.

The Germans told us at the time that if they could operate these coal mines the way they believed they ought to be operated, that they would have the production up to 300,000 tons a day by the first of February, if not by the first of January. Everyone knows that increased coal production is the key to recovery over there.

Why is it important that we have some understanding as to the policies that will be followed in the British zone if we take over the bill? It is because these policies of management and these policies of operation and these practices with regard to the number of personnel determine the size of the bill that the American taxpayer will be called upon to pay. That is why the committee felt that before we committed ourselves irrevocably to the entire bill, that may be presented by the British, we should know what the terms of the agreement are, and we should have an increased voice in determining the policies that are to be followed.

There is another angle to the proposition, and that is the dismantling of industrial plants in Germany. I have pending before the Committee on Foreign Affairs two resolutions which deal with that subject, one a resolution of inquiry, and the other proposing a temporary suspension of the dismantling of plants until Congress can review the situation.

Under the Potsdam Agreement, and under prior agreements, Germany surrendered or was compelled to surrender a great deal of her area to Russia and to Poland, East Prussia, and a great deal of Silesia. Those areas which were surrendered contained about 30 percent of the industrial potential of Germany. The Potsdam agreement also permitted Russia to get all of the dismantled plants taken from her own zone and 25 percent of the plants dismantled in the western zones. Of the remaining 75 percent in the three western zones, Russian satellite countries get an additional 14 percent. The total result is that Russia has access to about 55 percent of the industrial potential of old Germany.

Of course, that policy was initiated on the ground of demilitarizing Germany, but by the very same term, if it disarms Germany, it rearms Russia.

There is reason for thinking that many of the plants should have remained in Germany on simple economic grounds. There was one very large ballbearing plant which was so large that it was split. One half of it went to Russia and half of it went to the Western Powers. Under the agreement based upon the Potsdam agreement, no ballbearings are to be manufactured in Germany. Now, no one can contemplate the industrial recovery of Germany in any degree unless she has a few ballbearings. When the request is made for the Marshall plan you will find that the United States will be required to furnish ballbearings which otherwise would have been made in Germany.

I brought to the attention of the Foreign Affairs Committee a large soap manufacturing plant that is on the list for dismantling.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. If half of that ball-bearing plant went to Russia, where did the other half go?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. To various powers of the west, but not the United States.

Mr. DONDERO. It was completely removed from Germany?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It was completely removed from Germany. Under the current rationing in Germany, they are allowed about 50 percent of the soap and cleaning powders which they had during the war. That is, the current rationing is only 50 percent of what they had during the rationing of war, yet this soap factory is one of those now to be dismantled. And we have testimony that women and children are dying in Germany today because of unsanitary conditions in German hospitals, due to the lack of proper cleansing agencies.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Is that not the precise policy that was adopted by our Government, to starve to death and to destroy all vestige of the German people? Is that not what the Morgenthau plan was?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think that is probably a part of what has been referred to as the Morgenthau plan. Of course, we say today we are not following the Morgenthau plan.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has again expired.

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

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I realize that this whole question of reparations goes into the related question of security for the Western Powers. I know France has her fears about Germany, but I want to express the thought here that if security for the small powers of western Europe is to be established, if security for France is to be established, if stability in Europe is to be established, it will require the reimplementing of some of Germany's industrial capacity. Germany does not have the raw materials to establish a balanced economy by exporting them alone.

If Russia ever wants to move to the west, she will not be stopped if our reliance for stopping her is France, Holland, and Belgium. She will be stopped from moving to the west only if there is strength in Germany, too. That does not mean that you must rebuild a strong nationalized Germany, but it does mean that you must permit economic development along with her neighbors east and west.

Personally, I hope that out of this situation there can come the development of the free states of Europe, which will include Bavaria, Hesse, Wurttemberg-Baden, Westphalia, and the other

old states of Germany, along with Belgium, Luxemburg, the Netherlands, and France, and thereby build a bulwark for western civilization to hold the line until mankind, some way, with more wisdom than now seems apparent, finds a way for all the peoples of the world to live together in peace.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. In the hearings was any consideration given to the increase or change of that amount allotted to Germany with regard to education of children?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. There is about \$1,450,000, but the main part of the educational program is carried on in the funds originally appropriated for the fiscal year. The estimates before us were primarily for subsistence, as far as Germany is concerned now. In the funds provided for Austria I would not say that that is true because she shares in both funds. Austria's share in the money for occupied areas goes largely for informational and educational purposes. It is quite substantial and is in addition to the \$58,000,000 for relief.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Was any consideration given to any change in the amount allowed for protective clothing for workers in Germany and so on?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I do not recall any testimony on that at all.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. It was purely on a food basis; is that right?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON].

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, the President of the United States, under the power he claims was delegated to him by the Trade Agreements Act, has just issued a proclamation which will reduce tariff duties on imports into this country to the lowest level in many, many years.

It is quite apparent that he feels confident the Congress will not upset any foreign commitments he has made, regardless of how disadvantageous they may prove to us, and therefore the Congress will not dare meddle with any one of the thousands of new low rates of duty he has agreed to.

The State Department has presented the President with one massive trade agreement which has not yet been accepted by a number of the negotiating countries. I am not at liberty to give names, but I have information from a high Government source that Mr. Truman is very anxious to put these new rates into effect as of January 1, 1948, and he is having considerable difficulty in finding how he can sign only part of the agreement and yet adhere strictly to the rules.

Reports from the State Department as late as yesterday indicate that the President will refuse to name the separate countries to which individual concessions were made, but that he will temporarily exempt certain products in his proclamation, possibly until more

nations formally accept the terms of the agreement.

Because of the importance of the pending agreement to the American farmer, laboring man, and industrialist, and the uncertainty of its status, and also because the Ways and Means Committee has held extensive hearings to determine whether the Trade Agreements Act, which expires next June, should be renewed, I wrote the President a courteous letter on December 8 requesting from him certain information which I felt would be helpful to our committee. My letter was inspired by a sincere desire to secure light on what appears to be a chaotic situation. Without taking time to read my letter, which was prompted by information given me by American officials who were closely connected with the negotiations at Geneva, I will insert it at this point:

DECEMBER 8, 1947.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House.

MR. PRESIDENT: I have been hearing persistent rumors from reliable sources that you will soon proclaim the tariff concessions the United States recently made in the negotiations at Geneva. These same rumors indicate the possibility that you will sign all of the concessions listed in schedule XX of the general agreement regardless of how many nations will have actually formally accepted the agreement.

It is difficult for me to believe that the executive department would make tariff concessions effective unless the principal supplying nations had offered at least some token or quid pro quo. I am sure I speak for a substantial number of my colleagues when I say that such action would be contrary to the intent of Congress which passed or extended the Trade Agreements Act.

The Ways and Means Committee was given assurance by certain of the United States delegates to Geneva that negotiations would only be conducted with principal supplier nations. Neither the United Nations' publications nor the documents released by the State Department give any indication of which concessions were made to each individual nation. Until the Congress can identify each individual concession with the country to which it was granted, we will not have the information necessary to appraise the value of extending the Trade Agreements Act.

I would appreciate knowing whether it is planned to make all of the concessions listed in schedule XX effective on January 1, 1948, and whether there will be released the name of each country to which the United States made individual concessions.

Respectfully,

HAROLD KNUTSON.

In reply I received from the President a most amazing reply. I read:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
December 11, 1947.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KNUTSON: Replying to yours of December 8, rumors from reliable sources are not much on which to come to conclusions.

When the Trade Agreements Act is ready to be approved and implemented you will be informed officially through channels which will have no foundation through rumors.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to comment on the composition of the letter, but rather, the spirit that prompted its writing.

Mr. Chairman, May I say parenthetically that the term "reliable rumors" to which the President and I have referred

were more than rumors. The information came to me from highly placed Americans who were at Geneva during the negotiations and were at all times fully advised as to what was being done to us.

Mr. Chairman, I had not come to any conclusions with reference to an extension of the Trade Act, or I would not have written to the President in the first place.

The iron curtain of secrecy behind which the agreement was negotiated, is a travesty on the word democracy. The President's letter can only mean that he will continue to keep the Congress in the dark until he is sure there is nothing the Congress can do about it.

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

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. Regardless of what merit is found in these trade agreements, the State Department must stand convicted of not showing its hand to the American people. It lacks forthrightness. It heralded from one end of the country to the other the fact they had secured a concession from Great Britain that Great Britain would reduce or eliminate certain of their imperial preferences. They never told the American people that this concession was conditioned upon our synthetic rubber program in this country. But in the reports published by the United Nations it was revealed that if at any time the United States Government required the use of more than 25 percent synthetic in our rubber consumption Great Britain would be relieved from the concession she granted to eliminate or reduce imperial preferences.

This particular concession is rendering it very embarrassing to the Congress in extending the Synthetic Rubber Act which expires in some 60 or 90 days.

Mr. KNUTSON. Well, it may be well to note at this point that we have about seven or eight hundred million dollars invested in our synthetic rubber industry which we had to build up from scratch after the attack on Pearl Harbor and as a war measure. It is my opinion that the action agreed upon at Geneva is such as will practically destroy the synthetic rubber industry that we have so carefully nurtured and built up in this country in the last 6 or 7 years against future contingencies and emergencies.

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

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

Mr. GEARHART. Is it not a fact that every concession we have been able to obtain, or very nearly every concession we have been able to obtain, from other countries has been conditioned upon the sacrifice of an American industry. The synthetic-rubber industry is but one example. The wool industry is another; the American jewel and watch industry is another. The list could be greatly enlarged upon.

Mr. KNUTSON. How about the dairy industry when they cut the tariff in two on butter for 6 months each year and it will be effective during the winter

months when our production costs are at the peak?

Mr. GEARHART. The list could be enlarged many times, but the result all along the line, in obtaining concessions for this country, has been to the detriment and sacrifice of American industry.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman is quite right. I well recall back in 1913, after the Democrats got control of the Government, they passed the so-called Underwood Free Trade Act, which gradually dried up industry in this country, and had it not been for the outbreak of World War I early in August 1914, we would have had a depression such as we went through back in the 1930's.

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

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes, gladly.

Mr. GEARHART. We came out of the blighting effects of the Underwood tariff only when the war broke out. During the war, of course, we had what was in effect an embargo tariff, and that was the war itself. But, when we came out of the war and the outside world got back into production, America became the dumping ground of the world.

Mr. KNUTSON. Right, I well recall it.

Mr. GEARHART. It became so critical to American business, labor and agriculture, that it was necessary to assemble the Congress of the United States in special session and enact an emergency tariff law. Now, since we have a tariff, as a result of all these agreements, which is lower than the Underwood tariff adopted in 1913, which precipitated dumping in this country, is it not to be anticipated in the days that lie ahead, when the outside world gets back in full production, that America will again become the dumping ground of the world, and again we will have to take drastic measures to remedy the situation.

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes. Unfortunately we Americans have short memories and we do not seem to learn from past experiences. Of course, we must have a certain amount of protection for the American producer, and more particularly since we are on a 40-hour basis, and all overtime is paid at the rate of time-and-one-half and double time. But, we will probably have to go through all that painful experience again because the dogooders and the bleeding hearts are in the saddle, and they are not happy unless they are playing Santa Claus to the peoples of other countries. Today we voted to appropriate \$2,000,000 to relieve the starving Navajos, wards of the Government, who are dying from disease and hunger. I believe I was the first man to take the floor and plead for them. I have never heard one of the bleeding hearts get up on this floor and plead for our starving people at home. The farther away the suffering is the more tears they shed and the more their sympathies are aroused. It does not arouse them that thousands and thousands of American children in this country cannot go to school because of insufficient clothing. That does not interest them because it is not front page stuff. It is only when you propose to do something for other lands that our sob sisters become

aroused. Henry Wallace had the idea: A bottle of milk in front of every Hottentot for breakfast every morning. Nothing was said about a bottle of milk in front of each American child each morning, many of whom are badly undernourished. No, that would be too prosaic.

The Trade Agreements Act is due to expire in June—unless renewed. Mr. Truman sends word to the Congress that—and I quote:

When the Trade Agreements Act is ready to be approved and implemented you will be informed.

He has basked so long in artificially-created emergency powers that he unconsciously assumes that the renewal of this act is his prerogative—after which the Ways and Means Committee will be notified officially.

The President is evidently a little worried about having considerably overstepped the authority Congress granted him and I offer his letter as evidence of that. He is going to have great difficulty in explaining his actions when the full impact of these radically lowered tariff rates strikes the American farmer, toiler and producer.

The United States of America is not yet ready for unrestricted free trade. Neither are we ready to surrender to other countries the great American market, which is the only cash market in all the world.

The Republican party in Congress is dedicated to the maintenance of the American standard of living and that can only be done by protecting the producers in America in their jobs and markets.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLEVINGER].

Mr. CLEVINGER. Mr. Chairman, I am glad that some of this emotionalism has subsided. I thought some of you might be interested a little bit in the asset side of this European situation.

Many of you are wondering how long this is going to continue. I want to give you just a few observations as one who has been more or less trained in agriculture and business generally.

I want to disabuse you of the idea many of you have that Europe is a poorhouse. If you would stop to think, many of you would realize that she could not have enjoyed a war about every generation had she been a poorhouse. She has had the greatest example in the world of a way of life right in the center of Europe for more than a century. I refer to the Swiss Republic. The rest of Europe might have followed and expanded the example of the Swiss Government and Swiss culture and enjoyed an economy fully as strong as ours; a United States of Europe, and save a century of bloodshed and suffering.

I had a lot of misleading information from my own Government before I went abroad. By way of preface, may I remind you that I was on the Scarce Foods Committee of the House Committee on Agriculture. We were told last January, as you remember, that it would be impossible to lift the rationing of sugar. This committee, under the leadership of

the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN], did nothing but lay facts before the American people and the American Congress in regard to the supply of sugar in the world, and out of the window went sugar rationing and 33,000 jobs of rationing sugar and bedeviling and bothering the American people. Our memories are short about that. Sugar goes where it is wanted, naturally and readily.

Then this same committee was told that it would be necessary to take from 7½ to 8 pounds of fat away from every American, cooking fats and oils, and this committee after research in that field developed information as to the supply of fats and oils in the world. We now have soap chips and we have shortening and we have cooking fats. Such is the force of truth when people and their Representatives know the truth.

When we got ready to go to Europe I think everybody on the committee except myself bought food to take with us, because we were told there was a great shortage of food in Europe, but the Scottish side of me sort of rebelled at that and I carried nothing with me but about half a dozen bars of soap, which were really the thing we needed. Did we find a poorhouse in Europe? We were told that the flooded polders of Holland would be sterile for 30 years, well 75 percent of them produced better than normal in 1947—all will produce in 1948. I am excepting the occupied areas of Europe, Austria and Germany, from any remarks I make. By way of comment on that, I think it is going to be to the everlasting shame of this Government as long as men's memory lasts at the operation of this hard peace on a fallen foe. I think it will make us blush a century from now when the story of that is told. Most of the suffering you have heard of and most of the shortage of food you have been told about is the story of Germany and the occupied areas. For that someone besides ourselves must make atonement.

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

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

Mr. KNUTSON. Is it true that a number of European countries that are now applying for more aid from America have between 20 and 24 billion dollars invested in gilt-edge securities in this country?

Mr. CLEVINGER. I cannot make reply to the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means as to that. His information should be better than mine. I am speaking now just for a moment about food, because this bill relates mostly to food.

Mr. KNUTSON. They do have enormous sums invested in this country. Why not make them sell their securities and feed their own people before they ask us to feed them?

Mr. CLEVINGER. I am quite willing to do that. I think it makes a man smile when he talks about carrying relief to Antwerp, Brussels, or Rotterdam, probably three of the greatest centers of capital in all this world.

I want to tell you a little something of the trip of this committee. After going

through Colonel Hester's—United States commander in charge of food and food production—gardens, 8,000 acres of them in Berlin, we went down into the Austrian area first. I want to show you now something about the effect of the worthless currencies. In the exchange of farmers' produce, and this is true in France and Italy as well, and the product of men's hands in industry suffer likewise. Driving by car from Berchtesgaden through the French occupied area of Austria, we came upon a sale of cattle. To my amazement most of those cattle were 3- or 4- or 5-year-old steers. In speaking with the men there I found that the auction at the behest of the French Government was largely a sale of cattle from one owner to another, and that many of the cattle would go back to their rightful owners as soon as the French departed. But there they were, being sold. If you were a peasant, which would you rather have, a handful of wallpaper which they call money, or a 1,400-pound steer? One of the things they have got to do is to get rid first of all of these currencies and restore value to the new—and thus confidence to the producer.

I can say to you without any fear of contradiction that probably three-quarters of the French wheat crop is still in bundles. They do not thresh their wheat the way we do here. They either thatch them in the field so that they can stand for years without taking any moisture, or it is under cover and it is threshed as they need it. I say to you I am done, in the absence of an act of God or a drought, with voting any more money to western Europe outside of the occupied areas. They would not have needed this now except for this drought which was an excuse, and if the Frenchmen had planted a full crop of wheat instead of about three-quarters of a crop of wheat.

I am tired of seeing people in this country, many of them old, tired people 80 years old in my district, for example, raising this wheat to send over to these people in the cities who work only 4 days a week. Three days of holiday per week is too long. I told them in several places if they would mine more coal and raise more wheat and less hell, they would have more coal for heat and power and more wheat for bread. But we are off on a do-gooding spree, and there is no question about that. No; there are not dead and dying in the streets from starvation.

We went to Denmark. The story of Denmark is the story of Scandinavia. The first thing they talk about needing is coal. The second is steel products. The third is fertilizer, and the fourth is agricultural implements. The next thing is the restoration of Germany, because Germany was their best customer. That was true in every country except France. They admitted it openly. Down in south Germany we came to a place in Bavaria where 50,000 tons of fruit and vegetables used to be traded across the line with Italy. A commerce centuries old and now forbidden. Now that was forbidden for some reason or another, because the French and the British do not even seem to want the people in the German area to taste fruit or to have

fruit. The story was told that the fruit decayed and vegetables could not be used because for some reason or another the frontier was closed. We must get rid of these economic bloodclots in the European economic system or else we will have to go on supplying them forever and a day. I want to tell you if anybody thinks for a moment that we have a city of a million population which will compare with Copenhagen, much less with Stockholm, they are deluded and foolish. There you have a million people who are housed better than any million people that you could find in America, with not a slum area in either one of those cities of like millions of our ill-fed, ill-clad, and ill-housed here at home. Generally, their farmers are better housed than ours here at home. You will find the same if you go to Belgium or Holland. Belgium, by virtue of being brave enough to have a free economy, is so far ahead of the rest of occupied Europe that they will never catch up with her. In these countries when we started to make a survey on the basis of the questions in the questionnaire which the chairman sent along for information regarding the Marshall plan, they politely told us, "We asked your Government for nothing. We were invited to come down to Paris and tell you what we could use." One of the Scandinavian countries was quite bold about it, and they so stated that without any varnish. I say to you that we had better stop this unnecessary relief or we will have the same thing that exists in Paris and Rome where you cannot stop to look at a store window but what there is a money changer who wants to sell you the currency at 40 percent of the going rate. I do not want to see that here, and it can happen here if we forget the caution lights and keep up the spending.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, does he recall after the war when the GI's would go to a United States Employment Office to get a job, they would say, "Why take a job? Draw your \$20 a week for 52 weeks." That is precisely what we are doing in Europe. We are telling them, "Why produce? We will take care of you."

Mr. CLEVINGER. Certainly let us encourage them to produce; France and Italy are finally facing up to the strike situation as we did here. They have handled that manfully as our Congress did here. They must face up to a sound currency, cut civil expenses, restore frugality and honesty in government.

We have nearly broken Europe in their "keeping up with the Joneses," that is ourselves in extravagant domestic and foreign government policies we pursue. Let us set an example on that. On one farm in Italy we saw 600 fine Holstein cows, the herd headed by a \$25,000 Carnation bull from the United States. They were selling young bulls at \$1,000 each to other breeders, and again on another state farm were 2,200 dairy cows, fine stallions, jacks, and 5,500 people living on this farm of 14,000 acres in the Pontine Marshes, reclaimed under Mussolini. No; Europe is not a poorhouse.

I want to say to the gentleman that in the city of Stockholm one lady minister of the government giped at the commit-

tee about our having a tariff so high that they could not sell their products in America. I waited for seniority to take its course, and then I asked this lady minister what it was that they could not send to America because of the tariff. She said, "Steel products and steel."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLEVINGER] has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. CLEVINGER. I asked her to tell me what it was in steel products that she could not ship to America, because God knows all Europe wanted steel if they could get it. Finally she said, "Ball bearings." I said to the lady, "That is SKF." She said, "Yes." I said, "I am sure if the people in America working in the SKF plants were asked, they would not want our Government to admit Swedish ball bearings that would cut their wages during the high cost of living or destroy their employment." Then she rode over to the American Embassy with me, and she said, "I know you have ball bearings on your mind." But she said, "You are the first American that has been over here that seemed to know about it." We know Sweden expanded her bearing production many fold for Germany during the war. She now makes them for Russia under her 10-year trade treaty with that country.

That is what alarmed me, all over Europe, the fact that our State Department attachés do not go to bat for America. They can be giped at all over the country and they do not seem to react in the way of speaking up for America. You cannot tell what country they are working for. That was an alarming thing to me. They seem ready to plead America guilty before she is charged.

Down in France and Italy I say to you I agree with Dr. Heiser formerly of the United States Public Health Service, that these people are probably eating better today than they have in 30 years. Their hungry time is not here. It will come in March, April, and May. I would like to see some of this grain conserved. We talked to them about conserving some food. The agriculture official said, "You know, our people are like children. They say a great ship was in from America last week and there will be another one next week." So they eat, drink, and are merry. I am afraid possibly we will turn up with a shortage of wheat in the world, along about June or July.

Then, the same minister, when asked by Mr. ANDERSEN what steps had been taken to make use of potatoes to piece out, he said, "Potatoes are not so important in our diet." Well, they are 45 percent of the diet in Germany in peacetime and they are very important here. I do not want our people led astray by emotionalism and by all this story that this is a great poorhouse. If it has the sense to live a proper existence, follow the example of Switzerland, they can have an economy just as good or better than ours. I am wondering how much they are afraid of communism. To me, their fear seemed to be not of communism but fear that the Russians might come over and take their pigeon. After all, what kind of governments are we subsidizing

and supporting over there. Communism, socialism, fascism, nazism, New Dealism, they are Marxist in theory, they vary only in degree in their practice. They all proceed toward the same end result, a loss of property, of liberty, ultimately of life itself. Let us rededicate ourselves to the Republic here at home. Let government of the people, by the people, for the people not perish from the earth.

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

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER].

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, I have requested this time to announce to the House that tomorrow is the forty-fourth anniversary of the first air flight made by the Wright brothers at Kitty Hawk, N. C. The Government has erected a beautiful monument on Kill Devil Isle to commemorate this event. In North Carolina what is known as the Wright Memorial Association was organized some years ago. Each year this association holds proper exercises commemorating this event. There was planned a small delegation of the Members of this House to go down tomorrow to attend these exercises. Due to the important business that has arisen, this trip has been called off. Each year these exercises are held, and I take pleasure in inviting such Members of the House as may be able to attend in the future to visit Kitty Hawk and visit the shrine of the Wrights, visit the shrine of this great event.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the bill be read.

The Clerk read down to and including page 1, line 6.

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

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HARNES of Indiana, 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. 4748) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

Mr. WOLCOTT submitted a conference report and statement on the bill S. 1770, an act to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, for printing under the rule.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole today and to include certain tables.

Mr. HALLECK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the Record and include an article from the Washington Times-Herald.

Mr. BOYKIN (at the request of Mr. HAVENNER) was given permission to extend his remarks in two separate in-

stances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two separate instances and in each to include two articles.

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter from a constituent.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may revise and extend the remarks I made in the Committee of the Whole this afternoon and insert certain tables from justifications which were presented and also that I may extend my remarks and insert a letter supplied by the Office of the Secretary of the Interior relative to our petroleum resources.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD as part of my remarks an address I gave at Arlington, Mass., regarding Good Neighbor Day and Pearl Harbor Day. It should have gone in earlier but the previous permission granted me has expired.

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

There was no objection.

INQUIRY AS TO PROGRAM

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentlewoman will state it.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. What is the program for the remainder of the week?

The SPEAKER. The Chair is unable to answer that parliamentary inquiry. That is a matter within the jurisdiction of the leadership of the House.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask the Republican floor leader what the anticipated program will be for the rest of the week.

Mr. HALLECK. We will, of course, continue with consideration of the appropriation bill tomorrow. How long it will take I do not know. I cannot make any further statement as to the program for the balance of the week.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. O'HARA, for the balance of the week, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CANFIELD). Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from New York (Mr. JAVITS) is recognized for 30 minutes.

(Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks

and to include as part of his remarks an article in the New York Times Magazine by Prof. Sumner Slichter.)

UNITY OF UNITED STATES DOMESTIC AND FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, like so many of my colleagues this summer and early fall, I spent some weeks in the work of the Congress on a mission of inquiry in the occupied areas of Germany and Austria, and in Czechoslovakia, Poland, France, Belgium, Switzerland, Great Britain and Eire. I have now been back for 2 months and have had an opportunity to observe the juxtaposition of the domestic problems with which I am well familiar and the foreign situation. I find they are of one piece and that they demand such urgent action by the Congress that I am impelled to speak out for a policy of boldness and vitality on the part of our country at this moment without which western Europe and perhaps the world may be lost to the forces of democracy and individual freedom for which we stand. For just as the crises in western Europe are politically and economically at their height, so we are facing in the midst of unprecedented plenty, an abnormal crisis in our country, the fear that somehow the present situation will not last and that we shall have an economic crash even greater than that which followed 1929.

The high priests of communism are dinning into the ears of Europe and the world, the certainty of just such a cataclysmic depression, and by any evidence of fear and hesitation at this juncture we may underscore their every charge. Unless we kick ourselves loose and act the part which our position and our resources, material and moral, demand of us in the world of today we are in real danger of losing the initiative, if we have not lost it already, and of seeing democracy yield western Europe and Asia to the Communists by next spring.

As a member of the Economic Policy Subcommittee of the Foreign Affairs Committee and on the detailed job of inquiry on the International Trade Organization, which I shared with Congressman FULTON in Europe, I paid close attention to Europe's economic problems. At the root of these problems is the catastrophic destruction of Europe's economy.

Immediately following the war, the production of the individual nations of western Europe other than Germany had fallen to unbelievable lows. In France and the Netherlands this production stood at about 30 percent of normal. In Italy it was 20 percent. The whole transportation system of Europe had come close to destruction; for example, out of 2,000,000 freight cars normally in use, 1,100,000 were either damaged or destroyed. In addition to the factors of actual destruction of homes and factories, economic prostration was also attributable to the complete distortion of the European economic machine; for the Nazis had channeled all of Europe's production into Germany to feed their war machine, and with its collapse Europe found itself channeled into a ruin with the need for completely changing the direction of its economy.

If this were not enough, the Nazis had critically damaged the European economy in yet another way. Production needs management, and in Europe the Nazis had liquidated all the leaders they could find who would not collaborate and as a result there had been an enormous destruction of managerial talent. Despite these factors leading to economic paralysis there was some recovery in 1946 in western Europe, but the 1947 drought which cut western Europe's already inadequate food supply in half, effectively halted recovery and turned the situation perilously downward. For example, France, which normally produces about 9,000,000 metric tons of bread grains produced only 3,800,000 metric tons in 1947, and Italy, which normally produces seven and one-half million metric tons of bread grains, produced in 1947 about 4,700,000 metric tons. These deficiencies in grain production coincided with a drastic rise in the price of bread grains in the United States and other world dollar markets, and placed a great strain on the meager available dollar resources of the affected countries leaving them helpless.

The result, as I saw it, this summer has been a wave of fear in western Europe reflecting the complete lack of confidence of the people in their own governments and in their own futures. This fear and lack of confidence is reflected in the fall of currency values which depend almost entirely on credit standing, and has brought in its train the flourishing black market and the refusal of farmers to exchange their produce for francs and lire. Under such circumstances city people come close to the use of force in order to obtain grain collections, and as soon as that happens it is a short step to the police state. Without substantial United States aid this very winter, that is exactly what would have happened in France and in Italy.

Yes, western Europe is prostrate and must have our help if we are all to survive as free peoples; but there are some crying needs in the United States, and the question is whether we are going to do something about these, too.

I have fought for major Federal aid to housing through the T-E-W bill which I offered in the House, but so far to no avail. Housing construction is inadequate to meet the need even of the veterans of World War II. As against a demonstrated minimum need of at the very least 2,000,000 new home units in 1947, we shall be lucky to get 850,000. Two million to four million veterans, it is authoritatively estimated, urgently and immediately need adequate shelter. Not less than 20,000 of them are in my own district.

Inflationary forces at work in our economy are driving up the cost of living so as to multiply the difficulties of people with low and moderate incomes and to imperil the savings and security of millions of civil servants, retired workers, and others dependent on fixed incomes. Food prices stand almost double what they were before World War II at 196.5 percent of the 1935-39 price and are at the point above the highest range in the inflation which followed World War I. Construction materials are almost double their normal price, and

manufactured goods are 40 to 60 percent higher than before the war. Added to all of this, taxation, Federal, State, and local, is taking between 25 and 30 percent of the income of all the people. Under these circumstances the people of the United States have a right to ask, "What of the foreign problems—they are very great but must we not do something about our own great problems, too?"

There is, indeed, grave danger that right now our whole will to aid in avoiding hunger in western Europe, in helping China, and in economic cooperation with Latin America may be jettisoned by the insistence of our people that action must be taken on our own problems, first. Now that the interim aid for western Europe has been approved, the American people have a perfect moral right to expect action on domestic problems.

The American people must be assured of stability in prices. At least they will then know where they are and so prices of industrial and food products as well as wages should be frozen for a year with such adjustments in wages as may be necessary to retain the standard of living enjoyed in 1946. As production in some items is short of demand and additional work may increase it, that work should be applied but without breaking down existing wage structures. In order to bring about suitable balance between what we have and what we export and in order to avoid hoarding and profiteering, the Government should have renewed powers of export and transportation controls and the right to allocate scarce items and to control inventories in key items.

One of the greatest deterrents to run-away inflation has been national rent control. The Federal rent control law passed last spring has many loopholes. Nevertheless, it is a rent control law. It must be extended for at least a year, as the pressing housing shortage is still with us, but at the same time the loopholes which experience has demonstrated to be real must be closed. So serious are these loopholes that in New York City the municipal government acted to close some of them, but ensuing legal difficulties have imperiled this action. The present rent control law does not adequately protect tenants against eviction. Further, landlords have neglected maintenance and decoration of rented premises even every 3 years as is contemplated by present laws, and this obligation must be recognized and enforced. Finally, there has been much abuse of the so-called voluntary 15-percent increase which landlords have tried to make mandatory by their own actions. Especially bad is that section which states that when an increase agreement is made by the landlord and tenant, the particular premises affected are promptly removed from rent control. The extension of Federal rent control will bring home to the individual citizen the determination to protect him against inflation, and we must fight for its reform as indicated.

The run-away cost of food must be dealt with decisively. First—we all have a right to help ourselves, but such a movement needs leadership. As a result we must have not a superficial 60-day

food-conservation program such as we have just had under the direction of the President's Food Conservation Committee, which has already ceased operations, but an agency for food conservation to take us through the emergency and which will really guide consumers in their own best interests to avoid by their own actions further boosting the price of food.

But this alone under present conditions is unlikely to be a whole cure in items like butter, milk, and meat, prices have already skyrocketed so far that we must be ready to face rationing and price control even in peacetime. The President has asked for blanket powers to impose rationing and price control in his discretion on selected items. Our experience with the President in 1946, when the rationing and price-control program was taken off at a time when it should not have been taken off, and which has largely contributed to our present troubles, does not inspire confidence or warrant the grant of authority now requested. It is the Congress which is to legislate for the people and the Congress which must protect the people. Accordingly, the Congress itself should enact the necessary rationing and price controls, specifying the items to be covered. That will be the best assurance that such controls will have a broad base of acceptance with the people and that administration and enforcement will be vigorous and well financed. Administration and enforcement should, of course, rest with the President, but the responsibility for establishing the controls should rest with the Congress.

One other group in the community fully entitled to the solicitude of the Congress are the veterans who are studying at schools and colleges or as apprentices in business. They are sorely pressed by the high cost of living, and allowances to them must be reviewed with this in mind.

How can we balance the solution of the problems of our own country with the urgent demands upon us of the world and the real necessity—in the interests of our national security and to preserve the freedoms we hold dearer than life itself—for taking that position of leadership which our resources and our capabilities demand?

Before we can answer this question we must consider the alternatives. It is by now clear that if we fail to take world leadership the Soviets will take it. They are already on the offensive in every quarter of the world. They have taken over the eastern European countries and made them satellites. Now their ideological brothers seem to be trying, through the revolutionary activities of Communist-dominated trades unions, to take over the Governments of France and Italy and ultimately of all Europe. The only hope of leadership other than that of the U. S. S. R. is that of the United States. The essential difference between these two kinds of leadership is that whereas communism is the counsel of despair, democracy is the counsel of hope; whereas the Soviets can win by default, by default we must as surely lose.

Should Europe and Asia fall into the Soviet orbit we shall be cut off, not only politically but economically, too, from our natural friends and allies, and as the Soviets preach that the existence of a Communist and a private economy side by side in the world are incompatible, we shall have to proceed thereafter to protect against heavy attacks from within or without. The United States will have to be put on a strict defense footing and enormous sums will have to be spent for defensive operations in the whole Western Hemisphere, as well as in Africa, if that still remains feasible, and in Oceania. As an estimate it would call for tripling our present national-defense budget, increasing it from about eleven to about thirty billion dollars per annum, and tripling our manpower in the armed services from the present 1,500,000 to 5,000,000. Nor would this be all, for in its train would be required such discipline internally that many individual freedoms would have to be surrendered voluntarily or involuntarily in aid of the national effort. The need for such a large defense establishment would very materially reduce our standard of living both through the diversion of money and the necessary manpower for defense purposes and would deprive us of many of the very freedoms for which we fought. The Soviet temper being what it is, that kind of cold war, far more serious to us than the present one, could be waged for 10 or 20 years or more, until in sheer exasperation we might ourselves attack and the Armageddon of the world would indeed be on.

This is not a pretty picture, but those are the alternatives for all who will to read. Under these circumstances, it is clear that the time is not for fear or vacillation; the time is for a policy of vitality and boldness. Some counsel the boldness of attack on the Soviets in the seat of their power, and its destruction now. We all realize that this is unthinkable for us. Our people are, quite naturally, against it; and if it were done, it would fail disastrously, for it would enlist the sympathy of the whole world in the Soviet cause and would result in such destruction as to multiply inconceivably the problems of already prostrate Europe. But the policy of boldness now called for is a boldness of which we are uniquely capable. It is a boldness in production, a boldness in planning, and a boldness in management. We must at the same time deal with the problems of our own economy and lead in the solution of the problems of the European economy, of the Latin-American economy, and ultimately, of Asia's economy. We must share fairly, even short items like fertilizer, steel, farm machinery, and electrical generators and motors with western Europe and Asia, on the theory that we shall all prevail or hang together, and just as we shared to win the war in exactly the same way, must we share to win the peace.

The first principle we must accept is that of striking a rough balance of equity. We shall have to share not only what we have in plentiful supply but what we have in short supply, because what is short with us is short with the rest of the world, too; and in this way we

can most strongly emphasize our position that democracy delivers while Communist promises.

But we must go much further than that, for Americans were never people to be content with items in short supply, but always people to struggle until that which was in short supply became plentiful. It is exactly at this point that our policy, one of boldness, comes in; for not only is Europe in the depths of a production crisis but we are here, and the very root of our own difficulties and our own lack of confidence in ourselves is our production deficiency.

A distinguished economist, Sumner H. Slichter, Lamont University professor at Harvard, and chairman of the Research Advisory Board of the Committee for Economic Development, writing in the New York Times in an article entitled "Is America's Industrial Plant Too Small?" which I am inserting as part of my remarks, says that we are producing one-third to one-half less than we ought to produce with our labor force, because our machinery and equipment and production methods are in a material way obsolete, and that we are employing about one-fifth less capital per worker today than in 1929.

Professor Slichter calls for an expenditure in American industry of about \$50,000,000,000 to raise capital per worker to the level of 1929 and a considerably larger outlay to raise capital per worker to the level which would be normal in view of the long-term tendency of capital per worker to increase at the rate of about 2 percent per year." He points out that though our steelmaking capacity at 91,000,000 tons per year is greater than that of the rest of the world combined, it has still increased only two-thirds over what it should have increased since 1929, and has been materially less than the increase of industrial production generally, which it paralleled closely before 1929. With the raw materials of South and Central America, Africa, Asia, and the East Indies available and with a vastly increased production here and in the other nations under the democratic system the chance to save them for democracy, and to establish their peoples on a new plateau of a higher standard of living is greater than ever, and we can assure for ourselves a century of the greatest prosperity mankind has ever known.

An analysis of the income figures of the United States and of other democratic nations indicates how much room there is for improvement and what a great deal, even a little improvement will mean. The United Nations Conference on Trade and Employment now meeting in Habana has gotten together some interesting figures on national income in terms of United States dollars. Our national income of \$1,200 per year is probably the greatest attained by any people at any time in history. Contrast that with the national income of peoples of other democratic nations. In France it is \$300 per year, in Great Britain it is \$400 per year, in Italy and in Austria it is but \$100 per year and in Greece it is about \$70 per year. Among our neighbors in Latin America the situation is no better, in Argentina, probably the richest

country in South America, the national income per person is \$300 per year, in Brazil it is less than \$100 a year, in Chile it is about \$150 per year. The world is in its infancy insofar as the development of its resources and of its standards of living are concerned. Certainly if we rest supinely on the theory that as long as we are doing fairly well that is all we have to worry about, Communist promises though empty will seem more glittering all the time and will gain converts by the millions.

To appraise what we must do at home and abroad, it is essential that we reorient our whole thinking to figures based on the new productive factors in the world. The single most important figure in the world today is the increase in the productivity of the United States industrial machine by not less than 50 percent in the years from 1929 to 1947, yet we may take it from Professor Slichter's analysis that this should be not 50 percent but 75 percent now, and should increase more rapidly in the future. If we adopt a policy of boldness and a policy of investment in our own productive machine with confidence as to its role in the world, we have a right to look forward to a national income not at the rate of \$200,000,000,000 which it is now, but at the rate of \$300,000,000,000 within 10 years, or about \$1,800 per annum for every man, woman, and child in the United States. What is more, if we increase our productive machine in this way and utilize our productive and managerial talents to increase the productivity of other democratic nations who look to us for leadership, we can raise the standards of living in western Europe, and among the other American republics who rely on us for economic leadership, by not less than 50 percent in the same period of time and in this way sustain our own economy.

This is a time when domestic inflation and foreign affairs come close to being one and the same problem. Accordingly, I suggest the following seven-point program relating our foreign policy to the fight against domestic inflation and shortages:

First. That the President issue a call for conferences of industry and labor to be held in key industries—steel, automobiles, textiles, petroleum, construction, and so forth—to agree upon a freeze of prices and wages for 1 year to December 31, 1948, with necessary wage adjustments to maintain living standards at the 1946 level; and that the trades unions agree on working overtime where increased production is possible in industries in which the unsatisfied demand is greatest.

Second. That the Government seek to bring about agreement with food producers and processors to freeze prices for 1 year, and use the farm-credit and farm-price stabilization programs to implement this freeze.

Third. That the Congress enact export, transportation, and bank-credit controls; restore powers of allocation and inventory control of key items like steel; extend the Federal rent-control law for 1 year to February 29, 1949, and close loopholes in the present law favor-

ing landlords regarding rent increases, eviction of tenants, and obligations of maintenance and decoration on the part of the landlords; provide for the quicker amortization out of taxes payable by industry and agriculture of production facilities required to increase production of goods in short supply, and otherwise modernize the income-tax law, for instance, by permitting husbands and wives to report jointly the husbands' income and to reduce their taxes accordingly. As selected items like steel, grain, butter, milk, and meat are being subjected to much greater demand against limited supply, the Congress should itself authorize rationing and price control on these items, leaving only administration to the President.

Fourth. In the spirit of sharing and the willingness to accept some sacrifice to accomplish great objectives, that an over-all adequately financed food-conservation program be established under a food administrator to seek to reduce by voluntary action the pressures of demand which are increasing drastically the family food budget.

Fifth. That the Taft-Ellender-Wagner comprehensive housing bill be promptly enacted; and that a broad-scale housing program for veterans and other middle-income families be authorized providing assistance by the Federal Government in cooperation with State and municipal governments to bring down the cost of new homes to reasonable levels.

Sixth. That the program for aid to veterans be reviewed with special emphasis on the increase of subsistence allowances for students and learners to enable them to meet higher living costs, and for correction of inequalities in the veterans program.

Seventh. That as part of this program we declare and implement the following foreign-policy principles:

(a) Our forces intend to remain in Europe and we intend to assist in Asia until our international responsibilities have been discharged; and we will "sit out" the refusal of the Soviets to work out the world's problems for as long as it takes.

(b) We are ready to back with resources of production management, and with appropriate amounts of goods and money, a recovery program of self-help and mutual cooperation without political conditions, for the democratic nations of Europe, Asia, and Latin America, in proper regional groupings, and under conditions adequate to guarantee that our skill and money, and the investments of our citizens, will be used for purposes of increasing the production of goods for the benefit of the peoples of these nations, and not as a WPA program.

(c) The doors of the democratic world will remain open to commercial interchange with eastern Europe and the U. S. S. R., if they will cooperate in economic self-help and will not abuse economic relations or the hospitality afforded in the course of economic relations.

A policy of vitality and boldness with our first purpose, the enormous expansion of our own production and that all the countries we would help, will be the greatest adventure, the greatest exploration the American people have ever

known. Our people are young and virile, they are not old and stodgy, their imagination will not be captured by timid counsels of safety; their imagination will be captured by the world magnitude of a great job and by the goal of a world really secure which affords greater satisfaction to the individual. If we will undertake the job in this fashion, we will have a hundred years of the most productive and most rewarding work any nation or government on earth was ever privileged to undertake. Such a program will fire the American people and spur them on to the kind of magnificent effort which will surely do this job. With that spirit and that surge in our hearts we will make the "fishmongering abuse" of the police state look as puerile and reactionary as it really is. If we advance with such a program all mankind will have no trouble distinguishing its friends from its enemies.

[From the New York Times Magazine]

IS AMERICA'S INDUSTRIAL PLANT TOO SMALL?
PROFESSOR SLICHTER, BELIEVING THAT IT IS, HERE
OUTLINES A PROGRAM FOR ITS SAFE EX-
PANSION

(By Sumner H. Slichter)

At the present time American industry is producing 10 percent more goods and services than the Brookings Institution recently estimated. It would be able to produce by 1950 and about 2.5 percent more than the careful estimates of capacity in 1950 made by the Twentieth Century Fund. This high rate of production is not the result of a rapid rise in output per man-hour. In fact, the postwar increase in output per man-hour has been slower than was generally expected. The high level of output is the result of the large number of people at work. During the war the labor force was expanded to about 7,000,000 above normal by prewar standards. Many wartime employees have remained at work, with the result that during 1947 the labor force will average about 2,800,000 above normal by prewar standards. It will average about 1,800,000 more than the Bureau of the Census estimated it would be in 1950.

Despite the huge production of goods, demand substantially exceeds supply. The total expenditures of the country for goods and services are even running about 10 percent above the wartime peak of 1945. Best indication of the excessive demand, of course, is the rise in prices. Since the beginning of 1947, the average price of finished manufactured goods has risen about 13 percent and the entire wholesale price level by about the same amount.

Does the inability of the American economy to meet the demand for goods, even with a labor force of 2,800,000 above normal, mean that the plant of American industry is too small, too old, and too inefficient? Should American industry promptly enlarge and speed up its programs for plant expansion and improvement? Or is the present demand for goods largely a temporary and inflated one—the result of needs which accumulated during the war and of abnormally large and temporary buying by the rest of the world? If industry were greatly to expand and to improve its plants now, would it soon find itself burdened with large excess capacity?

In most industries every available man and machine is working, except as lack of raw material may force shutdowns. Would an attempt by industry to step up the building of plants and machines aggravate the current shortages of houses, automobiles, and many other things which consumers are insistently demanding? Would it push up the price level still higher, and make more

difficult the shift which the economy must eventually make to more normal conditions?

There can be no doubt that the plant of industry is too small for the present labor force and that much of it is old and obsolete. During the last 18 years (from 1929 to 1947) there has been very little net capital formation in American industry. It is true that large amounts have been spent on plant and equipment. Indeed, had not capital worn out, the expenditures during the thirties would have increased the plant and equipment of American industry by over 80 percent. In most of the last 18 years, however, plant and equipment were wearing out or becoming obsolete at a faster rate than they were being replaced. Furthermore, the work force was increasing, so that today about 9,000,000 more people are employed in private industry than in 1929—a rise of about 23 percent.

Of course, the capital which wore out or became obsolete was in many cases not scrapped but kept as stand-by equipment. Consequently, America has more machines and other equipment in place than it had in 1929. Otherwise, it would not today be possible for industry to give jobs to so many men. If one measures capital, however, as one should, by its unused life, American industry has about one-fifth less capital per worker today than in 1929. An expenditure of about \$50,000,000,000 would be required to raise capital per worker to the level of 1929 and a considerably larger outlay to raise capital per worker to the level which would be normal in view of the long-term tendency of capital per worker to increase at the rate of about 2 percent per year. The unsatisfactory rise in output per man-hour during the last year or two undoubtedly reflects in part the large amount of ancient and obsolete equipment which is still in place and which must be used in order to give employment to the present record-breaking labor force.

Although industry as a whole has been producing at substantially above prewar rates, some parts of industry have been unable to do so. The automobile industry is an example. Although the country now has only about the same number of cars as at the time of Pearl Harbor, and the backlog of demand is greater than ever, the automobile industry in 1947 will produce less than three-fourths as many cars as in 1929. The principal limit on the output of cars is said to be the supply of steel. Furthermore, shortage of steel is said to be limiting the output of many other industries.

Whether past earnings and present and prospective break-even points justify steel companies in risking new capital on expansion is a question which the management of each steel producer must decide for itself. There can be no doubt, however, that the capacity of the steel industry is low in relation to the capacity of manufacturing as a whole, and to the durable-goods industries in particular. Between 1900 and 1930, for example, the capacity of the steel industry increased at about the same rate as industrial production—each roughly trebling. Since 1929, however, the capacity of the steel industry has increased only 25 percent and output of the steel industry about 41 percent. Industrial production in the summer of 1947 was running about 73 percent above 1929, and the output of durable manufactured goods about 61 percent above 1929.

A rise of capacity in the steel industry, however, would make possible only a limited increase in the output of industry as a whole, because a gain in steel output would quickly reveal other bottlenecks. If the automobile industry, for example, were given substantially more steel, it would soon be short of lead for batteries, copper for electrical parts, tin, and many other items. Indeed, if the steel industry were to give the automobile

industry enough steel for 6,000,000 cars a year and were able to supply other steel users in proportion, the expansion of output would be retarded by shortages of railroad cars. The railroads should be thankful that shortages of steel have gone far to conceal the limited capacity of the country's transportation system.

Does the fact that the industrial plant of the country is too small for the present labor force and that much old and inefficient equipment must be used in order to give men work mean that the plant should be enlarged? Is not the present work force abnormally large and is not the present great demand for goods in large measure the result of temporary conditions?

The increase in the labor force has occurred largely in the older and younger age groups. At the present time, as during the peak of the war, nearly half of the males above 65 are in the labor force. Before the war the proportion was about 40 percent. It is safe to say that the present labor force will stay as large as it is so long as the demand for labor enables the present number of workers to find jobs. The reason is that working is popular. The 40-hour week, improvement in plant conditions, and the spread of trade unions, which protect workers from arbitrary treatment by managers, all help to increase the popularity of working.

But will the demand for labor hold up? Is not the present demand for goods abnormally large—the result in large measure of the great needs which accumulated during the war? It is true that only moderate progress has been made in satisfying the huge accumulated need for goods—in fact, in some fields, such as automobiles and housing, very limited progress has been made. It does not follow, however, that the present expenditures for goods are larger than will be maintained in the long run. The pent-up demand, huge as it is, has thus far very incompletely affected the amounts which people are spending for goods. This is shown by three facts:

1. Present prices of goods are low relative to incomes, and are still rising.
2. The present rate of saving is abnormally high, which means that less than the normal proportion of incomes is being spent for consumer goods.
3. The present rate of private domestic spending for capital goods is not abnormally large relative to present incomes, which means that the demand for capital goods by industry is not abnormally large.

Let us examine these three facts:

1. Most prices are still low relative to incomes. Prices of consumer goods on the whole have risen about 60 percent since 1940. In the same period, per capita incomes, after taxes, have risen over 100 percent. In view of the great accumulation of needs, people would undoubtedly be willing to pay considerably higher prices in relation to their incomes than they paid in 1940. The steady rise in prices indicates that prices are too low to equate supply and demand and that the present volume of production could be sold at higher prices.

2. The present rate of saving is abnormally high. In the case of individuals, the rate of saving is about normal. In the first half of 1947 the proportion of incomes after taxes which was saved was almost 50 percent greater than in 1929—6.3 percent against 4.5 percent in 1929. The purchasing power of per capita incomes after taxes, however, was about 37 percent greater than in 1929. As incomes go up, the rate of saving tends to increase, but a rise of 37 percent in the purchasing power of incomes would scarcely be expected to produce more than a 50-percent rise in the rate of saving. Hence, the rate of saving by individuals must be regarded as about normal.

The rate of saving by business corporations, however, is far above normal. During the first half of 1947, corporations retained in the business about 64 percent of profits after taxes and disbursed about 36 percent in dividends. Dividends are usually over 60 percent of profits.

3. The present rate of private domestic spending for capital goods is not abnormally large. Private-investment spending represents the demand for capital goods by business enterprises plus expenditures of individuals on housing. During the first half of 1947, domestic investment (including expenditures for replacements) was 13.1 percent of the gross national product in comparison with 12.9 percent in 1940, 12.5 percent in 1937, and 15.2 percent in 1929. Expenditures to increase inventories were above normal and so were expenditures on industrial equipment. Expenditures on industrial plant and housing, however, were below normal.

In the long run, the volume of investment opportunities, and hence expenditures for capital goods, depends less upon the level of income than upon the rate at which technological discoveries are creating new needs for capital. Industrial research is growing by leaps and bounds. Nearly twice as many people were engaged in it in 1946 as in 1940. Between 1920 and 1940, expenditures on industrial research increased ninefold. Hence it is reasonable to expect that technological research will create investment opportunities even faster in the future than in the past and that the expenditures of industry on capital goods will be at least as large as in the first half of 1947 and probably larger.

In one important respect the present demand for goods is far above the long-run normal. That is demand by foreign countries. During the first half of 1947, the exports of goods and services by the United States was running at the rate of \$10,000,000,000 a year above imports. By September the excess of exports over imports had dropped to an annual rate of well below \$8,000,000,000, but that was still far above normal. Indeed, in the long run, the United States should endeavor to avoid any net export balance because such a balance introduces instability.

This analysis may be summed up thus: Expenditures on consumer goods are still below normal, expenditures on capital goods are fairly close to normal but probably below it, and the expenditures of foreigners in this country are abnormally high relative to the expenditures of Americans for foreign goods. All of this means that approximately the present volume of output, and possibly more, could be sold more or less indefinitely (subject to cyclical ups and downs) at present prices or better. Hence the present labor force, though large by prewar standards, seems to be needed, and the plant of industry ought to be substantially enlarged in order to raise capital per worker to the prewar level and more. In addition, huge quantities of old and inefficient equipment are badly in need of replacement.

Does it follow that business should immediately step up its expenditures on plant and equipment? It may sound like Alice-in-Wonderland economics, but the answer to that question is "No." The very fact that the plant is too small, too old, and too inefficient for the present demand for goods limits the rate at which industry can safely expand and improve its plant. Business, foreigners, and consumers are attempting to buy goods faster than industry can produce them. An attempt by business to raise its expenditures on plant and equipment would intensify the present stiff competition for goods—except as business might reduce its expenditures on inventories or cut its dividend payments to stockholders.

Incidentally, so stiff is this competition for goods that consumers and business concerns are seeking to increase their purchasing power by borrowing from banks. Personal loans and commercial, agricultural, and industrial loans have increased over one-third during the last year and are rapidly rising. The growth in consumer and business debts is stimulating to the economy today, but eventually the demand for additional credit will fall off and repayments of old debts will exceed the amount of new debts. Then paying debts will become a powerful deflationary influence. That will be "the morning after" the present inflationary spree.

Quite different would be the situation, of course, if consumers could be persuaded to reduce temporarily their purchases of automobiles, houses, television sets, radios, washing machines, and other goods and to increase the amount of money which they were willing to invest in industry. Productive capacity in the steel industry, coal industry, railroad industry, lumber industry, and other industries, which is now being used to make goods for consumers, would become available to increase the output of industrial plant and equipment.

What conclusions and policies are indicated by this analysis?

1. The plant of industry is too small and inefficient both for the present labor force and the present demand for goods and also for the prospective labor force and the prospective demand for goods.

2. Business is already attempting to improve and enlarge its plant at a rate which is too fast in view of the large demand for goods by consumers and foreigners.

3. In order to reduce the competition between business and consumers for goods, either the community needs to increase its rate of saving or business needs to reduce the rate at which it attempts to expand and improve its plant.

4. Business should assume a major part of the responsibility for controlling the present dangerous competition between business and consumers for goods by postponing expenditures of capital and equipment which do not promise a quick reduction in costs or a quick increase in production and by postponing dividend increases. The postponement of dividend increases would limit the increase in consumer purchasing power and would also diminish the necessity of enterprises' borrowing from the banks.

5. It is high time that the Government act vigorously to help control the keen competition between business and consumers for goods. Two steps should be taken. A vigorous effort should be made to increase the sales of Government savings bonds and a small forced saving levy should be added to the income tax—say 5 percent on all incomes above \$3,000 a year. The securities given in return for the forced levy should be nonnegotiable and also nonredeemable (except in certain emergencies) within 3 years. Since the levy would be a forced one, the Government should pay the savers substantially more than current artificially depressed interest rates—say 6-percent exempt from Federal income taxes.

With part of the proceeds from Government savings bonds and the forced levy, the Government would be able to pay off some of its debt held by the Federal Reserve banks, thus limiting the reserves of member banks and controlling at long last the dangerous expansion of bank credit. Some increase in private bank loans, however, would be possible because the rest of the proceeds of the bond sales and the forced levy could be used to pay off part of the public debt.

This would permit them to expand private loans, but there would be no net increase in demand deposits. The temporary reduction of incomes available for the purchase of consumer goods would enable business to increase its expenditures on plant and equip-

ment without pushing the general price level still higher. The drop in the demand for consumer goods induced by the forced saving levy would tend to hold down the price of consumer goods so that the immediate net loss of purchasing power by consumers would be small. Consumers receiving less than \$3,000 a year would gain in purchasing power. Furthermore, the acquisition of more Government savings bonds by millions of consumers would give them future purchasing power that would help sustain the long-run demand for goods.

6. The problem of controlling the competition between business and consumers for goods will be greatly aggravated if Congress reduces the personal income tax this winter, as is likely. The income tax is undoubtedly unfairly high, particularly on persons in the middle and upper income brackets. It is difficult, for example, to justify the Government's taking more than half of any increment in income which a man may receive. The present, however, is not a good time to reduce taxes. If a reduction is made, the size of the saving levy should be increased above 5 percent. It should be sufficient to prevent reductions from raising purchasing power.

The Communists assert that capitalism is inherently unstable and that its instability will bring about its collapse. Today the community has an opportunity to demonstrate that the Communists are wrong. Let us not look back in 1950 or 1951 and wish that we had shown more foresight and more self-restraint in the fall of 1947. Now is the time to act. By limiting competition between consumers and business for goods, by checking the dangerous increase in short-term debts, and by making the process of expanding and improving the plant of industry and of aiding Europe increase the future purchasing power of consumers, the community can halt the developments which are slowly laying the foundation for a future depression and can make the economy less susceptible to recession.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CANFIELD). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] is recognized for 10 minutes.

UNITED NATIONS SESSIONS SHOULD OPEN WITH PRAYER

Mr. REES. Mr Speaker, we will, in a few days, celebrate another Christmas, the most widely observed religious festival in the world. If Christmas means anything beneath outward forms and customs, it is the guidance of God in human life and history. So I feel prompted to address the House on a matter that deeply concerns the welfare of the world. It is the success of the United Nations.

My attention was recently called to the fact that prayer for the guidance of God does not appear on the agenda of the United Nations. We humans too often act as if we are owners of this planet instead of guests for a few years. In this connection I was interested in an editorial appearing in the Lutheran, a nationally circulated religious magazine, written by Dr. Oscar F. Blackwelder, pastor of the Lutheran Church of the Reformation in this city. Dr. Blackwelder is one of the outstanding religious leaders in this country. This editorial refers to recent correspondence between W. M. Ritter, of this city, with the White House and State Department. Mr. Ritter is one of the country's outstanding businessmen. Mr. Ritter urged the placing of prayer on the agenda of

the UN. I shall refer to the reply from the State Department in a moment. Mr. Ritter is on sound ground in his position.

The State Department refers to the Constitution and its philosophy of complete religious freedom. May I remind the Department and the Congress that the Constitutional Convention of our country was in session from May to September, unable to compose their differences. The majority of the delegates had returned home in despair. Patrick Henry cried out, "Plague on both your houses." He then returned to Richmond. Then Benjamin Franklin addressed George Washington, who presided over the assembly, substantially as follows: "Mr. President, it seems to me the longer we are debating the issues before us the wider and deeper we seem to be apart. I have been wondering what might be the reason for our lack of unity and I think, sir, I have found it. Not once has the voice of prayer been heard within these four walls. If the Almighty knows of every sparrow that falls and if even the very hairs of our heads are numbered, He knows all about our feeble attempts to lay the foundations of a Nation. I move, Mr. President, that a chaplain be appointed and that every succeeding session of this convention shall be opened with prayer, seeking that wisdom that cometh down from above, from the Father of lights in whom is no variableness, neither shadow of turning." The motion carried. In addition, and at the suggestion of Mr. Franklin, a service of prayer was held in Christ Church and the Holy Communion observed. Returning to Independence Hall, differences, were composed, and in a comparatively few days, the Constitution was adopted. The remainder is a matter of history.

We have all been gravely concerned with many evidences of lack of unity in the UN. Perhaps we have failed because we have not done what Benjamin Franklin proposed. And yet the following two paragraphs are contained in the letter from the State Department to Mr. Ritter, taken from the Lutheran to which I have just referred:

The advisability of suggesting that prayers be included on the agenda of such meetings has been the subject of a thoughtful and thorough study by officers of this Department. Although the matter remains under consideration, it is believed that in view of the varying religious beliefs of the different representatives and of long-established international tradition, the United States at the present time should make no formal proposal that meetings of the United Nations be opened with prayer.

Great difficulties would arise, as I am sure you realize, in attempting to arrange for any international gathering a religious observance which would be acceptable to the many different religious faiths and philosophies of the participating delegates. In order to ensure that the representatives of international conferences have complete freedom to seek guidance in any of the ways consistent with their beliefs, the tradition has long been established that religious ceremonies are not included on the agenda. The continuation of this practice seems entirely consistent with our basic American philosophy of complete religious freedom as expressed in the Constitution, and with the United Nations Charter which emphasizes

tolerance and respect for "fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion."

Mr. Speaker, I am prompted to ask some questions and make several observations. This reply from the State Department reads well until you carefully analyze it. Is not the omission of prayer from the UN agenda freedom from religion rather than freedom of religion? Is not the response of the State Department only another illustration of democracy's effort to face its job apart from the religious rootage that gave it birth?

Take a look at the State Department's quotation from the UN Charter—"fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion." Race is certainly respected at UN sessions. Both sexes are heard. All languages are translated. Why must the fourth freedom alone, that of religion, be silent?

Why could not all of the various viewpoints and practices of religion, represented in the UN, be given a chance to lead in prayer in their several individual ways?

A world of justice, freedom, and peace will never be built by people whose intellectual ceilings are so low that a public prayer for the guidance of God is an offense.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled, bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 4469. An act to amend the act of July 7, 1947, so as to authorize the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government to procure the temporary or intermittent services of experts or consultants or organizations thereof; and

H. R. 4627. An act to authorize an appropriation for the immediate relief of the Navajo and Hopi Indians, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 37 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, December 17, 1947, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

1151. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to establish two additional offices of Assistant Secretaries of Agriculture, and for other purposes, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Agriculture.

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. TABER: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 4748. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June

30, 1948, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1191). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. REEVES: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 99. An act for the relief of John T. Hollandsworth, Jr.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1165). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. REEVES: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 258. An act for the relief of Troy Charles Davis, Jr.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1166). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. REEVES: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 339. An act for the relief of Lucy Jefferson Well; without amendment (Rept. No. 1167). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. REEVES: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 957. An act for the relief of Col. William J. Kennard; without amendment (Rept. No. 1168). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. REEVES: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1039. An act for the relief of Ada B. Foss; without amendment (Rept. No. 1169). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. REEVES: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1043. An act for the relief of Frank J. Shaughnessy, collector of internal revenue, Syracuse, N. Y.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1170). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. REEVES: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1100. An act for the relief of Frankie Stalnaker; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1171). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 350. A bill for the relief of Caffey Robertson-Smith, Inc.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1172). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. REEVES: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 927. A bill for the relief of the estate of Mary D. Briggs, deceased; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1173). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CRAVENS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1169. A bill for the relief of Samuel W. Poorvu; without amendment (Rept. No. 1174). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CRAVENS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1286. A bill for the relief of Lawrence Reves; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1175). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. REEVES: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1516. A bill for the relief of A. S. Osten, certifying officer, and for the relief of Guy F. Allen, former chief disbursing officer; without amendment (Rept. No. 1176). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. REEVES: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1653. A bill for the relief of Edward W. Bigger; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1177). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. REEVES: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1747. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Harry L. Novick and others; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1178). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CRAVENS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2069. A bill for the relief of Michael Abarno; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1179). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2269. A bill for the relief of Frank A. Constable; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1189). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. REEVES: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2386. A bill for the relief of Oran Curry; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1181). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CRAVENS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2479. A bill for the relief of Hardy H. Bryant; without amendment (Rept. No. 1182). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CRAVENS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2489. A bill for the relief of James W. Adkins and Mary Clark Adkins; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1183). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2697. A bill for the relief of E. W. Eaton Coal Co.; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1184). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CRAVENS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2729. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Rose Mary Ammirato, a minor; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1185). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CRAVENS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3067. A bill for the relief of E. J. Brennan and Janet Howell; without amendment (Rept. No. 1186). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. REEVES: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3159. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mae H. Fitzgerald; with amendment (Rept. No. 1187). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. REEVES: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3300. A bill for the relief of Martin A. King; without amendment (Rept. No. 1188). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CRAVENS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3550. A bill for the relief of Jesse L. Purdy; without amendment (Rept. No. 1189). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CRAVENS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3937. A bill for the relief of William C. Reese; without amendment (Rept. No. 1190). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 84. An act for the relief of Mrs. Clinton R. Sharp; without amendment (Rept. No. 1192). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 136. An act for the relief of Ioannis Stephanes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1193). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 166. An act for the relief of Anna M. Kinat (Mrs. John P. Taylor); without amendment (Rept. No. 1194). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 167. An act for the relief of Mrs. Yoneko Nakazawa; without amendment (Rept. No. 1195). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 185. An act for the relief of Thomas Abadia; without amendment (Rept. No. 1196). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 186. An act for the relief of Santiago Naveran; without amendment (Rept. No. 1197). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 187. An act for the relief of Antonio Argunzonis; without amendment (Rept. No. 1198). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 189. An act for the relief of Simon Fermin Ibarra; without amendment (Rept. No. 1199). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 190. An act for the relief of Pedro Ugalde; without amendment (Rept. No. 1200). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 191. An act for the relief of Julian Uriarte; without amendment (Rept. No. 1201). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 192. An act for the relief of Juan Llona; without amendment (Rept. No. 1202). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 298. An act for the relief of certain Basque aliens; without amendment (Rept. No. 1203). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1579. An act for the relief of Damian Gandiaga; without amendment (Rept. No. 1204). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 358. A bill for the relief of Hilario A. Goitia; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1205). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 421. A bill for the relief of Betty Isabel Schunke; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1206). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 892. A bill for the relief of Michel Ferapontow; without amendment (Rept. No. 1207). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 896. A bill for the relief of Viktor A. Kravchenko; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1208). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1572. A bill for the relief of Basque aliens; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1209). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1859. A bill for the relief of Philip Lee Sjoerd Huizenga; without amendment (Rept. No. 1210). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1927. A bill for the relief of Margaret Katherine Hume; without amendment (Rept. No. 1211). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3039. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marian D. McC. Plein; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1212). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. TABER:

H. R. 4748. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 4749. A bill to provide additional compensation for employees of the Federal Government and of the government of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 4750. A bill to reduce postage rates on parcels containing food, clothing, or medicines mailed to certain foreign countries; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.:

H. R. 4751. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to permit lump-sum death payments to be made in certain cases to non-profit institutions to the extent they have paid certain burial expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

H. R. 4752. A bill to improve and maintain the soil resources of the Nation and their use through the establishment of a National Fertilizer and Soil Fertility Laboratory, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 4753. A bill to amend section 23 of the Internal Revenue Code (26 U. S. C., sec. 23), as amended, to provide for deductions from gross income of the fair value of relief parcels sent to persons in foreign countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. LUSK:

H. R. 4754. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, to provide homes for veterans, through veterans' homestead associations, and the public facilities essential therefor; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNGBLOOD:

H. R. 4755. A bill to provide the most expeditious transportation and delivery of first-class mail; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 4756. A bill to provide additional compensation for employees of the Federal Government and of the government of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin:

H. R. 4757. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, to provide homes for veterans, through veterans' homestead associations, and the public facilities essential therefor; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 4758. A bill to control the export to foreign countries of all goods and materials, including building materials, coal, fuel oil, food, farm machinery, grain, meats, metals, fats, motor vehicles, scientific equipment, scrap iron, wood products, steel products, lumber, steel, or iron from the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. R. 4759. A bill to provide for the temporary control of prices on certain vital commodities in short supply that basically affect the cost of living or agricultural or industrial production, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 4760. A bill to exempt from income tax compensation and benefits paid to seamen on account of their internment by the enemy; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MEADE of Kentucky:

H. R. 4761. A bill to provide that pensions shall be extended to the widows and children of deceased World War II veterans on the same conditions as they are now extended to the widows and children of deceased World War I veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MUNDT:

H. J. Res. 276. Joint resolution to provide that any future payments by the Republic of Finland on the principal or interest of its debt of the First World War to the United States shall be used to provide educational and technical instruction and training in the United States for citizens of Finland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HORAN:

H. Con. Res. 123. Concurrent resolution to provide for an annual pay-out test on all reimbursable public-works projects; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN:

H. Res. 404. Resolution creating a select committee to investigate transactions on commodity exchanges; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PLOESER:

H. Res. 405. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 18; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois:

H. Res. 406. Resolution directing the United States Department of Agriculture to release its estimate of the numbers of livestock on farms and ranches as of January 1 each year, by not later than January 18 of each year; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BYRNE of New York:

H. R. 4762. A bill for the relief of the estate of Robert W. Hewitt, deceased; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. DOUGLAS:

H. R. 4763. A bill for the relief of Anna and Solomon Lagstein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 4764. A bill for the relief of Theodoros Manolis Sofios; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4765. A bill for the relief of Carl Eggers; 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:

940. By Mr. BUCK: Petition of Arthur E. Buchanan, commander, Livingston Post, No. 1369, American Legion, and 185 other residents of Staten Island, N. Y., in support of legislation establishing a system of universal military training as recommended by the President's Advisory Commission on Military Training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

941. By Mr. CASE of South Dakota: Petition of Mrs. William Dahl and 22 others, of Clear Lake, S. Dak., urging legislation to prohibit the advertising of liquor in interstate commerce and over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

942. Also, petition of Mrs. Ransom Knutson and seven others, of Ralph, S. Dak., urging the enactment of legislation which would prohibit advertising liquor in interstate commerce and over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

943. Also, petition of Mrs. Andrew Pederson and eight others, of Firesteel, S. Dak., and vicinity urging the enactment of legislation to prohibit the advertising of liquor in interstate commerce and over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

944. Also, petition of Mrs. Ray Dalen and 12 others, of Colton, S. Dak., urging enactment of legislation to prohibit the advertising of liquor in interstate commerce and over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

945. Also, petition of Mrs. Grant Hogle, Astoria, S. Dak., and 18 others, urging the enactment of legislation to prohibit the advertising of liquor in interstate commerce and over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

946. By Mr. HART: Petition of National Committee of Americans of Polish Descent, Inc., Local Chapter No. 9, of Jersey City, N. J., regarding decisions reached at the Yalta, Tehran, and Potsdam Conferences; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

947. By Mr. MILLER of California: Petition of Glen D. Oppie, of San Pablo, Calif., relative to taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

948. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Petition by residents of the First Congressional District of Wisconsin, urging passage of universal military training legislation; to the Committee on Armed Services.

949. By Mr. TOWE: Petitions of Norwood Unit, No. 272, American Legion Auxiliary, Norwood, N. J.; National Defense Unit, No. 106, American Legion Auxiliary, Hasbrouck Heights, N. J.; Ladies' Auxiliary, North Bergen Post, No. 33, American Legion, North Bergen, N. J.; American Legion Auxiliary, Camp Merritt Post, No. 21, Cresskill, N. J.; Ladies' Auxiliary, Fairview Memorial Post, No. 365, Fairview, N. J.; Wallington Memorial Post, No. 381, American Legion, Wallington, N. J.; all in support of legislation establishing a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

950. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Mrs. C. E. Cooley, Townsend Club No. 1, St. Cloud, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

951. Also, petition of Orlo Vista Townsend Club, No. 1, Orlo Vista, Fla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to signing of Discharge Petition No. 7, relative to the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

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

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

954. Also, petition of Emmet Arthur Hinkelman and Robert Davis Best, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to enactment of H. R. 4459; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 17, 1947

(Legislative day of Thursday, December 4, 1947)

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

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

Let us now rejoice, most gracious God, in the love Thou hast shown toward us, opening up to us a way whereby we might be delivered from our sin and foolishness. We have found out that we cannot do wrong and feel right. By our tolerance of some wrongs, we have come close to being intolerant of the right. Make us bold enough to confront the face of evil and of wrong, even when it bears our own image. May we see that in every choice we make we are for Thee or against Thee. God, help us to keep our moral voting record straight. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHITE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, December 16, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting a nomination was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 4469) to amend the act of July 7, 1947, so as to authorize the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government to procure the temporary or intermittent services of experts or consultants or organizations thereof, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

PERSHING HALL MEMORIAL FUND

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, an itemized report covering transactions during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947, for account of the Pershing Hall Memorial Fund (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report reciting the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 145 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months by the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization Service under the authority vested in the Attorney General, together with a statement of the reason for such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS

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

A letter in the nature of a petition from Harbaugh Miller, chairman, Public Affairs Committee, Federation of Social Agencies of Pittsburgh and Allegheny County, Pittsburgh, Pa., relating to the so-called Taft-Ellender-Wagner national housing bill (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The petition of Thomas J. Reardon, of Hartford, Conn., praying for the enactment of legislation to stop inflation; to the Committee on Finance.

The petition of Thomas J. Reardon, of Hartford, Conn., relating to the national economy; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The petition of Thomas J. Reardon, of Hartford, Conn., relating to the extension and maintenance of credits for the purchase and carrying of securities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A resolution adopted by the Conference of Eastern College Libraries, New York City, N. Y., relating to the freedom of conscience and of free inquiry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PROTEST AGAINST COMPULSORY MILITARY TRAINING

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and to have printed in the RECORD a brief letter from P. L. Mawdsley, of Udall, Kans., transmitting a memorial signed by 116 residents of