

Training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1146. By Mr. TOWE: Petition of Mrs. Frances Peterson and 90 other members of Barringer-Walker Post, No. 139, American Legion Auxiliary, Lyndhurst, N. J.; also petition of Roland E. Waller, of Hasbrouck Heights, N. J., and 36 others, urging enactment of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1147. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the American Legion, of Albuquerque, N. Mex., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to legislation to establish a commission to hear claims of American nationals who were prisoners of the Japanese; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1148. Also, petition of the Los Angeles branch of the National Customs Service Association, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of certain amendments to the retirement plan for Federal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

SENATE

FRIDAY, JANUARY 16, 1948

(Legislative day of Wednesday, January 14, 1948)

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:

Our Father, we turn to Thee because we are sore vexed with our own thoughts. Our minds plague us with questionings we cannot answer, and history confronts us with responsibilities we cannot evade. Who among us is sufficient for these things?

We are humbled by our experience of failure and driven by pressure to act before we are sure what Thou wouldst have us do. Thou knowest our deadlines as Thou knowest our need. We cannot push Thee, for Thou wilt not be hurried. But only Thou canst keep us from being pushed.

Give us, therefore, the unhurried mind and the untroubled heart, by the mercies of Christ our Lord. Amen.

ATTENDANCE OF A SENATOR

JOHN SHERMAN COOPER, a Senator from the State of Kentucky, appeared in his seat today.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of Wednesday, January 14, 1948, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, notified the Senate that Mr. D'EWART and Mr. MURDOCK had been appointed additional managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses

on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1317) to give members of the Crow Tribe the power to manage and assume charge of their restricted lands, for their own use or for lease purposes, while such lands remain under trust patents.

The message announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4055) to provide increases in the rates of pension payable to veterans of Indian wars and the dependents of such veterans.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 2575) to amend the Articles of War to improve the administration of military justice, to provide for more effective appellate review, to insure the equalization of sentences, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 4055) to provide increases in the rates of pension payable to veterans of Indian wars and the dependents of such veterans, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

READING OF WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the order of the Senate of January 24, 1901, the Senate listens to the reading of Washington's Farewell Address annually on Washington's Birthday. It is read by a Senator designated by the Chair. The designation has faithfully alternated from one side of the aisle to the other each year. The Chair enters an order that this year Washington's Farewell Address will be read on Monday, February 23, inasmuch as February 22 falls on Sunday, and the Chair designates the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] to read the address.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. CAPEHART asked and obtained consent to be excused from attendance on sessions of the Senate on Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday next.

Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained consent to be excused from attendance on the session of the Senate today after 12:45 p. m.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SESSION OF THE SENATE

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a subcommittee of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service dealing with the pay increase may be authorized to sit during the remainder of the session of the Senate today.

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

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare may sit this afternoon for the purpose of hearing testimony on Senate bill 984, the antidiscrimination in employment bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE COST OF FOREIGN AID

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, tables prepared by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress at my request show that the loans, property credits, advances, relief, and rehabilitation grants and other authorizations to foreign countries by the United States Government from July 1, 1940, through June 30, 1947, total \$73,092,058,013, and that the same items—partly estimated—for the period of July 1, 1945, through June 30, 1947, amount to \$24,099,211,087.

Funds used prior to July 1, 1945, are considered, by and large, to be war expenditures; and authorizations since that time are considered to be peacetime expenditures for foreign aid. I should like to make some observations regarding the sum of \$24,000,000,000 foreign aid provided during the period of July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1947, and the sum of \$19,000,000,000 as requested by 16 nations at the Paris conference in September 1947.

HOW MUCH IS \$24,000,000,000?

This sum of \$24,099,211,087 is \$183 for every man, woman, and child in America on the basis of the last official census. It is \$616 for every American family. Think of it. Foreign aid has cost each American family more than \$25 a month for each of the past 24 months. This tidy sum would pay all the income tax a married man with two children pays on a \$4,000-a-year income.

In order to take a look at the cost of foreign aid to the average man, we have prepared a table showing with reference to each county and principal city in Missouri: (1) The cost of foreign aid since VJ-day to the residents of each county and city; (2) the cost of the proposed Marshall plan; and (3) the county revenue received from all sources in a 1-year period. I ask unanimous consent to have this table incorporated as a part of my remarks at this point.

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

County and cities	Foreign aid July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1947	Foreign aid proposed by Marshall plan	Total foreign aid provided and proposed	Annual tax receipts ¹
Adair	\$3,705,018	\$2,955,916	\$6,660,934	\$317,155
Kirksville	1,844,640	1,471,680	3,316,320	-----
Novinger	145,119	115,778	260,897	-----
Andrew	2,381,745	1,900,190	4,281,935	256,575
Savannah	385,764	307,768	693,532	-----
Atchison	2,360,151	1,882,962	4,243,113	286,879
Fairfax	148,779	118,698	267,477	-----
Rockport	257,298	205,276	462,574	-----
Tarkio	386,862	308,644	695,506	-----
Watson	49,227	39,274	88,501	-----
Audrain	4,149,159	3,310,258	7,459,417	378,581
Ladonna	107,604	85,848	193,452	-----
Martinsburg	77,226	61,612	138,838	-----
Mexico	1,656,699	1,321,738	2,978,437	-----
Vandalia	488,976	390,112	879,088	-----
Barry	4,308,918	3,437,716	7,746,634	198,897
Cassville	222,162	177,244	399,406	-----
Monett	804,285	641,670	1,445,955	-----
Wheaton	71,919	57,378	129,297	-----
Barton	2,589,084	2,065,608	4,654,692	164,274
Golden City	158,661	126,582	285,243	-----
Lamar	547,536	436,832	984,368	-----
Liberal	141,093	112,566	253,659	-----

¹ Net amount of taxes received by each county for county, county road and bridge, special road and bridge, and school purposes. The county tax total was derived from real estate, personal property, merchants and manufacturers, railroads and utilities, and covers a period from Mar. 1, 1945, to Feb. 28, 1946, inclusive. Tax receipts for the city of St. Louis and Kansas City include all property taxes, licenses, franchise and other taxes and fees for the fiscal year 1947.

County and cities	Foreign aid July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1947	Foreign aid proposed by Marshall plan	Total foreign aid provided and proposed	Annual tax receipts	County and cities	Foreign aid July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1947	Foreign aid proposed by Marshall plan	Total foreign aid provided and proposed	Annual tax receipts	County and cities	Foreign aid July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1947	Foreign aid proposed by Marshall plan	Total foreign aid provided and proposed	Annual tax receipts
Bates	\$3,574,173	\$2,751,526	\$6,325,699	\$249,503	De Kalb	\$1,784,433	\$1,423,646	\$3,208,079	\$170,266	Lafayette	\$5,097,648	\$4,066,976	\$9,164,624	\$498,657
Adrian	158,844	126,728	285,572		Maysville	187,758	149,796	337,554		Concordia	197,091	157,242	354,333	
Amsterdam	31,476	25,112	56,588		Osborn	65,514	52,268	117,782		Corder	115,230	91,980	207,210	
Butler	541,314	431,868	973,182		Stewartsville	87,474	69,788	157,262		Higginsville	646,539	615,818	1,262,357	
Hume	80,121	71,102	150,223		Union Star	75,213	60,906	136,119		Lexington	977,403	779,786	1,757,189	
Rich Hill	364,902	291,124	656,026		Dent	2,152,629	1,717,398	3,870,027	88,357	Odessa	944,223	774,636	1,718,859	
Rockville	61,488	49,056	110,544		Salem	576,633	460,946	1,037,579		Waverly	160,308	127,896	288,204	
Benton	2,038,986	1,626,732	3,665,718	146,642	Douglas	2,854,800	2,277,606	5,132,406	81,674	Lawrence	4,508,571	3,567,002	8,075,573	270,534
Warsaw	175,131	139,722	314,853		Ava	254,919	203,378	458,297		Atross	742,248	592,176	1,334,424	
Bollinger	2,360,334	1,883,108	4,243,442	73,742	Dunklin	8,227,131	6,563,728	14,790,859	363,789	Marionville	208,241	164,542	372,783	
Marble Hill	77,043	61,466	138,509		Campbell	326,838	260,756	587,594		Miller	94,977	75,774	170,751	
Boone	6,403,353	5,108,686	11,512,039	472,488	Kennett	1,159,335	924,910	2,084,245		Mount Vernon	362,706	289,372	652,078	
Centralia	365,268	291,416	656,684		Makem	489,159	390,258	879,417		Pierce City	221,064	178,368	399,432	
Columbia	3,367,017	2,686,254	6,053,271		Franklin	6,197,844	4,944,728	11,142,572	368,486	Lewis	2,102,670	1,677,540	3,780,210	189,345
Hartsburg	28,182	22,484	50,666		Gerald	67,893	54,166	122,059		Canton	388,875	310,250	699,125	
Sturgeon	104,493	83,366	187,859		New Haven	183,366	146,292	329,658		La Belle	152,439	121,618	274,057	
Buchanan	17,214,261	13,733,782	30,948,043	1,631,689	Pacific	308,721	246,302	555,023		La Grange	223,626	178,412	402,038	
Rushville	56,547	45,114	101,661		St. Clair	228,030	205,860	433,890		Lewistown	75,945	60,590	136,535	
St. Joseph	13,855,113	11,053,306	24,908,419	257,615	Sullivan	460,611	367,482	828,093		Lincoln	2,634,285	2,101,670	4,735,955	228,928
Butler	6,272,308	5,004,290	11,276,598	257,615	Union	388,875	310,250	699,125		Elsberry	283,284	226,008	509,292	
Poplar Bluff	2,042,829	1,629,736	3,672,565	216,503	Washington	1,236,348	986,372	2,222,724		Troy	273,219	217,978	491,197	
Caldwell	2,128,107	1,697,834	3,825,941	216,503	Gasconade	2,271,762	1,812,444	4,084,206	144,104	Linn	3,919,128	3,126,736	7,045,864	308,757
Breckenridge	133,224	106,288	239,512		Bland	103,395	82,490	185,885		Brookfield	1,129,842	901,404	2,031,246	
Braymer	178,425	142,350	320,775		Hermann	422,364	336,968	759,332		Browning	97,173	77,526	174,699	
Hamilton	302,865	241,630	544,495		Owensville	263,337	210,094	473,431		Bucklin	154,086	122,932	277,018	
Kidder	49,410	39,420	88,830		Gentry	2,444,697	1,950,414	4,395,111	197,472	Linneus	128,832	102,784	231,616	
Kingston	72,102	57,524	129,626		Albany	367,830	293,460	661,290		Marceline	586,698	468,076	1,054,774	
Polo	107,970	86,140	194,110		King City	201,849	161,038	362,887		Meadville	93,147	74,314	167,461	
Callaway	4,226,202	3,371,724	7,597,926	250,978	Stanberry	346,419	270,378	622,797		Livingston	3,294,000	2,628,000	5,922,000	194,088
Auxvasse	89,670	71,540	161,210		Greene	16,569,003	13,218,986	29,787,989	1,48,942	Chillicothe	1,466,196	1,169,762	2,635,948	
Fulton	1,518,351	1,211,362	2,729,713		Ash Grove	201,483	160,746	362,229		McDonald	2,882,067	2,269,354	5,151,421	110,639
Mokane	99,552	79,424	178,976		Republic	144,570	115,340	259,910		Anderson	171,654	136,948	308,602	
New Bloomfield	91,500	73,000	164,500		Springfield	11,206,554	8,940,748	20,147,302		Noel	94,245	75,190	169,435	
Camden	1,641,603	1,309,766	2,951,459	124,465	Grundy	2,876,028	2,294,536	5,170,564	186,968	Pineville	95,892	76,504	172,396	
Camdenton	163,419	130,378	293,797		Trenton	1,289,418	1,028,716	2,318,134		South West City	96,075	76,650	172,725	
Cape Girardeau	6,912,825	5,515,150	12,427,975	435,537	Harrison	3,024,075	2,412,650	5,436,725	300,598	Macon	3,915,468	3,123,816	7,039,284	332,332
Cape Girardeau	3,554,958	2,836,196	6,391,154		Bethany	490,806	391,572	882,378		Atlanta	92,781	74,022	166,803	
Jackson	569,679	454,438	1,024,117		Cainsville	139,995	111,690	251,685		La Plata	260,943	207,466	468,509	
Carroll	3,250,962	2,600,844	5,851,806	404,120	Gilman City	101,565	81,030	182,595		Macon	769,698	614,076	1,383,774	
Bosworth	92,415	73,730	166,145		Henry	4,083,279	3,257,698	7,340,977	301,548	New Cambria	58,194	46,428	104,622	
Carrollton	744,810	594,220	1,339,030		Clinton	1,105,503	881,986	1,987,489		Madison	1,767,948	1,409,776	3,177,724	87,467
Hale	102,846	82,052	184,898		Uriah	85,095	67,890	152,985		Fredericktown	624,762	498,444	1,123,206	
Norborne	226,737	180,894	407,631		Windsor	434,259	346,458	780,717		Marion	1,680,754	1,261,148	2,941,902	72,925
Dewitt	57,462	45,844	103,306		Hickory	1,190,598	949,576	2,140,174	68,369	Belle	113,643	90,666	204,309	
Carter	1,131,358	908,996	2,040,354	48,063	Hermitage	36,000	29,200	65,200		Vienna	79,239	63,108	142,347	
Van Buren	83,814	66,808	150,622		Holt	2,388,108	1,821,496	4,209,604	239,351	Marion	5,778,408	4,610,906	10,389,314	395,461
Cass	3,574,722	2,851,964	6,426,686	306,637	Forest City	1,040,284	80,008	1,120,292		Hannibal	3,818,295	3,046,290	6,864,585	
Belton	177,693	141,766	319,459		Maitland	98,637	78,694	177,331		Palmyra	418,155	333,610	751,765	
Creighton	49,776	39,712	89,488		Mound City	263,898	234,476	498,374		Mercer	1,604,178	1,279,836	2,884,014	130,528
Drexel	82,350	65,700	148,050		Oregon	178,974	142,788	321,762		Princeton	289,872	231,264	521,136	
Garden City	109,617	87,454	197,071		Howard	2,388,758	1,901,796	4,290,554	191,501	Miller	2,708,034	2,160,508	4,868,542	198,515
Harrisonville	424,926	339,012	763,938		Armstrong	85,644	68,328	153,972		Eldon	473,970	378,140	852,110	
Pleasant Hill	387,594	309,228	696,822		Fayette	477,264	380,768	858,032		Iberia	88,938	70,956	159,894	
Cedar	2,140,551	1,707,762	3,848,313	92,443	Gasnow	272,670	217,540	490,210		Tuscumbia	49,227	39,274	88,501	
El Dorado Springs	428,586	341,932	770,518		New Franklin	209,352	167,024	376,376		Mississippi	4,236,267	3,379,754	7,616,021	188,926
Stockton	146,583	116,946	263,529		Howell	4,075,410	3,251,420	7,326,830	171,462	Charleston	948,306	756,572	1,704,878	
Chariton	3,309,372	2,640,264	5,949,636	307,564	Mountain View	132,675	105,850	238,525		East Prairie	451,827	360,474	812,301	
Brumswick	320,067	255,354	575,421		West Plains	736,758	587,796	1,324,554		Monteau	2,154,825	1,719,150	3,873,975	150,447
Keytesville	156,282	124,684	280,966		Willow Springs	279,990	223,280	503,270		California	462,075	368,650	830,725	
Mendon	64,050	51,100	115,150		Iron	1,910,520	1,524,240	3,434,760	80,430	Tipton	223,077	177,974	401,051	
Sailsbury	321,897	256,814	578,711		Ironton	198,189	158,118	356,307		Monroe	2,414,685	1,926,470	4,341,155	210,803
Christian	2,477,454	1,976,548	4,454,002	129,193	Jackson	87,442,524	69,762,888	157,205,412	11,845,409	Madison	114,376	91,250	205,626	
Billings	82,716	65,992	148,708		Blue Springs	144,204	115,048	259,252		Monroe City	361,974	288,788	650,762	
Ozark	178,893	140,306	319,199		Buckner	104,493	83,366	187,859		Paris	269,559	215,058	484,617	
Clark	1,860,378	1,484,236	3,344,614	185,318	Fairmount	458,415	365,730	824,145		Montgomery	2,276,886	1,816,532	4,093,418	183,645
Kahoka	325,923	260,026	585,949		Grandview	109,068	87,016	196,084		Midway	44,460	35,478	79,947	
Clay	5,566,311	4,440,882	10,007,193	678,600	Independence	2,940,078	2,345,636	5,285,714		Montgomery City	305,793	243,966	549,759	
Excelsior Springs	890,112	710,144	1,600,256		Lee's Summit	414,129	330,398	744,527		New Florence	103,395	82,490	185,885	
Kearney	99,369	79,278	178,647		Oak Grove	124,440	99,280	223,720		Rhineland	37,332	29,784	67,116	
Liberty	658,434	525,308	1,183,742		Raytown	91,500	73,000	164,500		Wellsville	240,462	191,844	432,306	
North Kansas City	491,904	392,448	884,352		Sugar Creek	299,754	239,148	538,902		Morgan	2,038,620	1,626,440	3,665,060	140,184
Smithville	141,276	112,712	253,988		Kansas City	73,049,574	58,279,988	131,329,562	16,748,682	Stover	106,872	85,264	192,136	
Clinton	2,426,763	1,936,106	4,362,869	282,947	Jasper	14,403,015	11,490,930	25,893,945	980,344	Versailles	328,923	260,026	588,949	
Cameron	661,545	527,790	1,189,335		Carl Junction	190,137	151,694	341,831		New Madrid	7,281,021	5,808,902	13,089,923	361,455

County and cities	Foreign aid July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1947	Foreign aid proposed by Marshall plan	Total foreign aid provided and proposed	Annual tax receipts
Ozark.....	\$1,970,178	\$1,571,836	\$3,542,014	\$55,450
Bakersfield.....	32,391	25,842	58,233	-----
Gainesville.....	46,665	37,230	83,895	-----
Pemissot.....	8,574,831	6,841,122	15,415,953	385,072
Caruthersville.....	1,209,966	965,352	2,175,348	-----
Hayti.....	480,924	383,688	864,612	-----
Steele.....	290,055	231,410	521,465	-----
Perry.....	2,810,514	2,242,268	5,052,782	118,760
Perryville.....	714,981	570,422	1,285,403	-----
Pettis.....	6,100,488	4,867,056	10,967,544	562,254
Green Ridge.....	64,050	51,100	115,150	-----
La Monte.....	89,853	71,686	161,539	-----
Sedalia.....	3,738,324	2,982,488	6,720,812	-----
Smithton.....	73,932	58,984	132,916	-----
Phelps.....	3,190,971	2,545,802	5,736,773	178,826
Newburg.....	193,248	154,176	347,424	-----
Rolla.....	940,803	750,586	1,691,389	-----
St. James.....	331,596	264,552	596,148	-----
Pike.....	3,353,841	2,675,742	6,029,583	231,052
Bowling Green.....	361,425	288,500	649,775	-----
Clarksville.....	160,857	128,394	289,191	-----
Louisiana.....	854,427	681,074	1,536,101	-----
Platte.....	2,536,746	2,023,852	4,560,598	285,214
Dearborn.....	83,448	66,576	150,024	-----
Parkville.....	122,793	97,966	220,759	-----
Platte City.....	123,525	98,550	222,075	-----
Weston.....	205,143	163,666	368,809	-----
Polk.....	3,184,200	2,540,400	5,724,600	183,549
Bolivar.....	482,388	384,856	867,244	-----
Humansville.....	143,838	114,756	258,594	-----
Fulaski.....	1,971,823	1,573,150	3,544,975	101,636
Crocker.....	82,899	66,138	149,037	-----
Dixon.....	135,603	108,186	243,789	-----
Richland.....	180,255	143,810	324,065	-----
Waynesville.....	85,644	68,328	153,972	-----
Putnam.....	2,072,841	1,653,742	3,726,583	116,009
Unionville.....	375,516	299,592	675,108	-----
Ralls.....	1,837,320	1,465,840	3,303,160	170,192
Center.....	89,304	71,248	160,552	-----
Perry.....	151,890	121,180	273,070	-----
Randolph.....	4,475,814	3,570,868	8,046,682	359,700
Clifton Hill.....	90,874	40,588	131,462	-----
Higbee.....	160,491	128,402	288,893	-----
Huntsville.....	318,237	253,894	572,131	-----
Moberly.....	2,364,360	1,886,320	4,250,680	-----
Ray.....	3,400,872	2,713,264	6,114,136	343,894
Hardin.....	147,315	117,530	264,845	-----
Lawson.....	98,513	74,606	173,119	-----
Orrick.....	121,878	97,236	219,114	-----
Richmond.....	775,920	619,040	1,394,960	-----
Reynolds.....	1,714,710	1,368,020	3,082,730	53,475
Centerville.....	54,900	43,800	98,700	-----
Ellington.....	155,367	123,954	279,321	-----
Ripley.....	2,306,898	1,840,476	4,147,374	82,554
Doniphan.....	293,532	234,184	527,716	-----
St. Charles.....	4,677,846	3,732,052	8,409,898	306,109
St. Charles.....	1,976,949	1,577,238	3,554,187	-----
Wentzville.....	137,616	109,792	247,408	-----
St. Clair.....	2,405,718	1,919,316	4,325,034	126,172
Appleton City.....	217,404	173,448	390,852	-----
Osecola.....	217,770	173,740	391,510	-----
St. Francois.....	6,578,850	5,248,700	11,827,550	605,784
Bismarck.....	238,266	190,092	428,358	-----
Bonne Terre.....	682,590	544,880	1,227,170	-----
Farmington.....	684,054	545,748	1,229,802	-----
Flat River.....	988,383	788,546	1,776,929	-----
Ste. Genevieve.....	1,995,615	1,592,130	3,587,745	111,215
Ste. Genevieve.....	510,021	406,902	916,923	-----
St. Louis.....	50,184,090	40,037,580	90,221,670	7,483,711
Ballwin.....	68,625	54,750	123,375	-----
Clayton.....	2,391,627	1,908,074	4,299,701	-----
Ferguson.....	1,047,492	835,704	1,883,196	-----
Kirkwood.....	2,220,150	1,771,272	3,991,422	-----
Maplewood.....	2,356,125	1,879,750	4,235,875	-----
Lemay.....	2,298,846	1,834,052	4,132,898	-----
Overland.....	536,922	428,304	965,226	-----
Nonrandy.....	1,270,569	1,013,678	2,284,247	-----
Pineblawn.....	3,686,718	2,941,316	6,628,034	-----
University City.....	6,043,209	4,821,358	10,864,567	-----
Webster Groves.....	3,366,102	2,685,524	6,051,626	-----
Wellston.....	2,079,429	1,658,998	3,738,427	-----
St. Louis City.....	149,336,784	119,143,008	268,479,792	27,195,548
Saline.....	5,383,128	4,294,736	9,677,864	545,336
Marshall.....	1,561,539	1,245,818	2,807,357	-----
Slater.....	561,810	448,220	1,010,030	-----
Sweet Springs.....	258,379	206,298	464,677	-----
Schuyler.....	1,212,741	967,542	2,180,283	95,908
Downing.....	92,781	74,022	166,803	-----
Greentop.....	46,482	37,084	83,566	-----
Lancaster.....	162,138	129,356	291,494	-----
Queen City.....	118,218	94,316	212,534	-----
Scotland.....	1,565,931	1,249,322	2,815,253	57,046
Gorin.....	91,500	73,000	164,500	-----
Memphis.....	354,105	282,510	636,615	-----
Scott.....	5,558,991	4,435,042	9,994,033	207,065
Benton.....	74,644	58,584	133,228	-----
Chaffee.....	557,967	445,154	1,003,121	-----
Illmo.....	223,992	178,704	402,696	-----
Sikeston.....	1,453,752	1,159,824	2,613,576	-----

County and cities	Foreign aid July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1947	Foreign aid proposed by Marshall plan	Total foreign aid provided and proposed	Annual tax receipts
Shannon.....	\$2,165,073	\$1,727,326	\$3,892,399	\$141,940
Birch Tree.....	90,585	72,270	162,855	-----
Eminence.....	76,311	60,882	137,193	-----
Winona.....	87,840	70,080	157,920	-----
Shelby.....	2,053,992	1,638,704	3,692,696	201,103
Clarence.....	211,731	168,922	380,653	-----
Hunnewell.....	57,096	45,552	102,648	-----
Shelbina.....	385,581	307,622	693,203	-----
Shelbyville.....	138,348	110,376	248,724	-----
Stoddard.....	6,040,647	4,819,314	10,859,961	316,474
Bloomfield.....	221,064	176,368	397,432	-----
Bernie.....	212,280	169,360	381,640	-----
Dexter.....	568,764	453,768	1,022,532	-----
Puxico.....	144,936	115,632	260,568	-----
Stone.....	2,067,534	1,649,508	3,717,042	90,531
Crane.....	185,379	147,898	333,277	-----
Galena.....	92,781	74,022	166,803	-----
Sullivan.....	2,507,283	2,000,346	4,507,629	174,975
Green City.....	127,551	101,762	229,313	-----
Milan.....	368,928	294,336	663,264	-----
Taney.....	1,889,109	1,507,158	3,396,267	89,599
Branson.....	185,013	147,606	332,619	-----
Forsyth.....	53,070	42,340	95,410	-----
Texas.....	3,625,779	2,892,698	6,518,477	160,161
Cabool.....	195,627	156,074	351,701	-----
Houston.....	150,060	119,720	269,780	-----
Licking.....	109,434	87,308	196,742	-----
Vernon.....	4,682,238	3,735,556	8,417,794	282,149
Bronaugh.....	48,498	38,690	87,188	-----
Nevada.....	1,497,123	1,194,426	2,691,549	-----
Sheldon.....	84,729	67,598	152,327	-----
Warren.....	1,415,322	1,129,104	2,544,426	108,461
Martinsville.....	58,743	46,866	105,609	-----
Warrenton.....	229,482	183,084	412,566	-----
Washington.....	3,201,036	2,533,832	5,734,868	121,104
Potosi.....	369,111	294,482	663,593	-----
Wayne.....	2,341,312	1,867,924	4,209,236	78,774
Greenview.....	104,676	83,512	188,188	-----
Piedmont.....	215,391	171,842	387,233	-----
Webster.....	3,152,358	2,514,996	5,667,354	140,941
Marshfield.....	322,812	257,544	580,356	-----
Seymour.....	137,433	109,646	247,079	-----
Worth.....	1,161,135	926,370	2,087,505	132,451
Grant City.....	221,247	176,514	397,761	-----
Wright.....	3,287,961	2,623,182	5,911,143	100,912
Hartsville.....	71,919	57,378	129,297	-----
Mansfield.....	168,726	134,612	303,338	-----
Mountain Grove.....	444,873	354,926	799,799	-----
Norwood.....	72,834	58,108	130,942	-----

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, it will be observed from this table that the residents of my native county of Macon, a typical northeast Missouri county, have since VJ-day paid, on a per capita basis, a total of \$3,915,468 for foreign aid; the Marshall plan, as proposed at the Paris conference, will cost them \$3,123,816 more in the next 4 years, making a total foreign-aid bill of \$7,039,284 for this county in northeastern Missouri. That is more money than Macon County, Mo., has collected in taxes during the past 20 years.

For 2 years the Federal Government has collected, on a per capita basis, a foreign-aid tax bill from the people of Macon County that is 11 times their county annual tax bill of \$332,332.76. The Marshall plan, if adopted, will cost them as much in the next 4 years as all their county, county road, and school taxes will cost in the next 9 years.

Taney County, Mo., lies in what is known as the Shepherd of the Hills country. The residents of this Ozark county have a \$90,000 annual county, road, and school tax bill, but their foreign-aid bill from July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1947, is 20 times their annual tax bill. Those people can multiply the tax bill they get from the county collector, for county, county road, and school purposes by 10 if they want to know what their annual share of the \$24,000,-000,000 foreign aid provided since VJ-day amounts to. Similar comparisons can be made for the residents of every

county in Missouri. I dare say it is substantially the same for every county in the United States.

The civic-minded, progressive citizens of Kansas City, Mo., my own home city, recently concluded a successful campaign for approval at the polls of a \$41,500,000 bond issue to pay for public improvements to be completed within the next 15 years. These bonds will run for 20 years, so we will probably be paying on them for the next 35 years. Since VJ-day, on the other hand, the people of Kansas City have provided \$73,049,524 in foreign aid. If the Federal Government had distributed foreign aid to our own people, on a per capita basis, the people of Kansas City could have their bonds already paid and have enough left over to pay all the city taxes and license fees for the next 22 months.

The proposed Marshall plan will cost the people of Kansas City another \$58,000,000 in the next 4 years. We may well contemplate the slums this would clear, the hospitals, homes, schools, and streets this would build; the playgrounds, parks, airports, and other improvements it would provide.

It takes a two-thirds vote by the people of Kansas City to pass a bond issue for their own public works and improvements; but foreign aid, costing nearly twice the recent bond issue, has already been appropriated by the Congress without the people of this country having had an opportunity to pass on the matter at the polls. It is interesting to speculate how the people of Kansas City would vote on a \$58,000,000 bond issue to pay their share of the Marshall plan. It would be even more interesting to see what would happen to city officials who would raise every city tax and license fee in Kansas City the necessary 85 percent for the next 4 years just to pay Kansas Citizens' per capita share of the Marshall plan.

Every major city in Missouri and most of the large cities in the United States can barely make ends meet. They have increased taxes time after time until they have about reached the limits set by the Constitution or by the taxpayers. The city of St. Louis has had a very economical administration. A city income tax was recently declared invalid by the Missouri Supreme Court with the result that there has been no alternative but to economize. The city administration has been compelled to reduce the number of city employees. The mayor has even asked the police and fire departments to reduce their personnel. Employees in some departments voluntarily have taken pay cuts in order that sufficient people may be kept on the city pay roll to render necessary service to the public. The maintenance of public buildings and streets has been allowed to lag. The building of public improvements has been postponed.

It is interesting to compare the financial predicament of the cities with the price their residents have paid and are being asked to pay for foreign aid. Since VJ-day the residents of St. Louis have provided for foreign aid \$149,336,-784, figured on a per capita basis. Under the 4-year Marshall plan they will provide an additional \$119,143,008, making

the 6-year total \$268,479,792. This is enough to pay all the city taxes in St. Louis for 10 years.

Unfortunately this is only the first cost of foreign aid. An additional cost is found on the price tag of every essential product. The high cost of giving is a major cause of the high cost of living in this country today. Every dollar sent to Europe weakens by that much our own national economy. We are distributing our wealth and resources around the world without the benefit that comes from ordinary foreign trade. Every such expenditure not only increases our national debt and the burden of taxation but causes shortages of scarce goods in our own country. This process raises prices, promotes inflation, and intensifies our own difficulties. The ultimate result will inevitably be to reduce our own national economy to the level of the countries we want to help and to make us as vulnerable as they are to communism. Instead of setting an example to lead Europe out of her economic and political chaos we may be forced to adopt the same economic planning and controls that we find plaguing Europe today, with such tragic results.

DEATH OF JOSEPHUS DANIELS

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I am deeply grieved to announce to the Senate the death of Hon. Josephus Daniels, which occurred at his home in Raleigh, N. C., on Thursday afternoon, January 15, 1948, after an illness of 10 days.

Mr. Daniels was North Carolina's most distinguished citizen. For the past 50 years he has held many positions of prominence and power in the Nation and has always discharged the high duties imposed upon him with great distinction to himself and credit to his State.

Mr. Daniels was 85 years of age but still in full vigor of physical and mental strength, and he was actively engaged in the editorship of the Raleigh News and Observer, one of the influential papers of the Nation. He was editor of this paper for 50 years.

Mr. Daniels first became known to the Nation when he was appointed Secretary of the Navy by President Woodrow Wilson in 1913, and he served 8 years in that important position. His record received the stamp of approval of the whole Nation. He inaugurated many reforms in the Navy which were at first unpopular but which added tremendously to the morale of the Navy, and later received the approval of the Navy and the public. Mr. Daniels was proud of the achievement of the Navy in conveying more than 2,000,000 American troops to Europe during World War I without the loss of a single life, notwithstanding the fact that the ocean was infested with submarines, and the voyages were made in the face of constant danger and hazard. He was the last survivor of the Wilson Cabinet.

After his retirement, on March 4, 1921, Mr. Daniels returned to the editorship of his paper and remained at this post until he was appointed Ambassador to Mexico by President Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1933. It so happened that President Roosevelt was Assistant Secretary of the Navy under Mr. Daniels, and was acquainted with his great ability, high integrity, and fine diplomacy. The serv-

ice of Mr. Daniels justified this appraisal of him by the President, because he was able to establish and maintain good relationships with our neighbor to the South, and during his 8 years of service as Ambassador to Mexico the good-neighbor policy reached full fruition. The good results of his tenure of office continue to this day.

In 1941 Mr. Daniels returned to Raleigh, having resigned the Ambassadorship, and resumed again the editorship of his paper and the writing of many valuable books, which proved a great contribution to the history of the era in which he was such a vital factor. These books have gained large circulation.

In a brief word, Mr. Daniels, as editor, statesman, diplomat, and author, achieved distinction and renown, and in each field was able to make an outstanding contribution to his day and generation.

He was a crusader for any cause which enlisted his sympathy and stirred his enthusiasm. He believed definitely in popular government and democratic processes of life. He had an unflinching faith in the God whom he worshipped with sincerity and devotion, and reposed unshaken confidence in his fellow man.

All North Carolina mourns his passing, and friends and acquaintances throughout the Nation will shed a tear in honor of his memory.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, yesterday, at his home in Raleigh, N. C., surrounded by family and friends and those he loved best, Josephus Daniels, suffering from pneumonia, quietly slipped out of the company of living men.

The Nation mourns his passing. He was a great American, who loved his country, and served it nobly and well. Three great Presidents called him into the public service. He first served under Grover Cleveland, was Secretary of the Navy under Woodrow Wilson, and Ambassador to Mexico under Franklin Roosevelt.

As Secretary of the Navy he did much to fashion and direct the mighty Navy that swept the seas free of German U-boats and German ships of war, and that contributed in such large measure to the winning of World War I. With fine courage and over powerful opposition, he accorded new rights to the enlisted personnel, giving them new worth and new dignity, and building a sturdier, finer morale.

As Ambassador to Mexico, he broke precedents, set aside conventions, became an apostle of America's humanity, dispelled old animosities, won the hearts of the Mexican people, and bound them to us with ties of friendship and affection. He was the Ambassador of the good neighbor.

Josephus Daniels enjoyed the unique distinction of being the confidant, the counselor, the intimate friend of both Woodrow Wilson and Franklin Roosevelt.

As newspaper editor and publisher he was ever in the fight for truth and justice and democracy, battling for the people and the advancement of their welfare, battling for all that touches and concerns human need. He was a valiant warrior who never lowered his arm in battle, never turned back, but marched on and fought on. Defeat held no terror

for him, and he lived to see most of his causes triumph.

Josephus Daniels never grew old. The last time I saw him was exactly 4 weeks ago, when he lunched with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. McGRATH], my colleague from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and myself. In spite of his 85 years he was as vital, as vibrant, as joyous as ever, interested in all about him, concerned with all the momentous events and problems of the world today.

He did not grow old because he was too busy—too busy with fine achievements, too busy looking to the future with its challenges and its opportunities. His face was always to the rising sun, leaving the shadows to fall behind. He was ever pressing forward to new goals.

Josephus Daniels—editor, publisher, politician, statesman, churchman, Cabinet member, diplomat, author, and lecturer—was a remarkable man, but in nothing more remarkable than in his rare gift for friendship. Many in this Chamber were privileged to know the warmth, the sweetness, and the light of that friendship. It helped us on.

Josephus Daniels was one of God's great, good men. He has gone to a better place, to join the choice and master spirits of the ages.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I should like to add a word to the fine remarks of the Senator from Alabama. Speaking from only a very slight acquaintance with the late Josephus Daniels, I pay my tribute of deep respect at this time on his passing.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks made by the Senator from Alabama and the Senator from New Jersey in tribute to Josephus Daniels.

I had known of Mr. Daniels by reputation a good many years before I ever knew him personally. I think my first acquaintance with him was when he came to Washington as Secretary of the Navy. I became intimately acquainted not only with him, but with his very charming wife, who came from a distinguished family, and who preceded him to the grave by several years.

I may be mistaken regarding this, but I think I am correct when I say that he never became a candidate for any office in North Carolina. Under Woodrow Wilson he served as Secretary of the Navy, and subsequently he became Ambassador to Mexico, as we all know.

Josephus Daniels was a man who was fundamentally devoted to the American Government and to the principles of American democracy. He was a simple man in his tastes, but profound as a thinker and writer. He inaugurated some practices in the Navy when he became Secretary, and discontinued other practices in the Navy, which subjected him at the time to a considerable amount of ridicule throughout the country. But I dare say that no man as Secretary of the Navy ever did more to build up and strengthen the morale of the American Navy than did Josephus Daniels.

As a counselor and adviser he was wise and friendly. One always felt, after consulting him and asking his advice regarding any subject, that he

had disassociated himself from any selfish consideration, and tried to put himself in the other man's place, and tell him what he would do under the circumstances.

Though he was a man of the strictest morality and of the strictest and almost abstemious habits, to such a point that he was sometimes called a Puritan, he was tolerant and liberal in his views in regard to other men and their opinions. He enjoyed the affectionate respect of all those who knew him.

He wrote two or three very interesting books. One of his sons, Jonathan Daniels, has written a very interesting and valuable book which is a contribution to American literature and to American history.

I mourn the loss of Josephus Daniels at 85 years of age as being a loss to the American people. His quiet influence, the fact that he was still around, afforded a good deal of consolation to many people who knew him. In addition, I mourn his loss as a personal friend. I grieve with all his millions of friends in this country. He lived to a ripe age, to a mellow age, a decade and a half beyond the allotted time of three score years and ten. He has left an influence in the minds and hearts of the American people which will not soon be forgotten.

I wish to express to his sons in North Carolina and in Washington—one of whom is a distinguished physician in the city of Washington, one of the outstanding physicians in the Nation's Capital—my profound sympathy, and my affectionate hope that their father's long and distinguished life and his contribution to America will be in some degree a consolation for his loss to them.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, the press of yesterday and today has carried the sad news of the demise of a distinguished American, the Honorable Josephus Daniels, former Secretary of the Navy of the United States, and Ambassador from the United States to the Republic of Mexico. I knew Mr. Daniels and his family well. I could call him my friend, and he could call me his friend. In my observation of American men of letters and American statesmen, I would say that the Honorable Josephus Daniels represented the best of American ideals and traditions, and that the United States of America is a better country because Josephus Daniels lived and served it. I shall miss him. The United States will miss him.

REPORT OF COMMISSION ON ERECTION OF MEMORIALS AND ENTOMBMENT OF BODIES IN THE ARLINGTON MEMORIAL AMPHITHEATER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

To the Congress of the United States:

In compliance with the requirements of the Public Act No. 397, Sixty-sixth Congress, I transmit herewith the Annual Report of the Commission on the Erection of Memorials and Entombment

of Bodies in the Arlington Memorial Amphitheater.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 16, 1948.

(NOTE.—The original report accompanied a similar message to the House of Representatives.)

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

EXCHANGE OF CERTAIN LANDS FOR RECREATIONAL PURPOSES

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, that no exchanges were consummated under the act of June 14, 1926 (44 Stat. 741, 43 U. S. C. sec. 869) providing, among other things, for the patenting to States, counties, and municipalities of lands classified chiefly valuable for recreational purposes in exchange for lands of equal value or equal quantity; to the Committee on Public Lands.

TRANSFER BY NAVY DEPARTMENT OF NAVAL PICKET BOAT TO STATE OF TEXAS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, reporting, pursuant to law, that the State of Texas had requested the Navy Department to transfer a picket boat for use by the Texas Game, Fish and Oyster Commission in law enforcement work; to the Committee on Armed Services.

DONATIONS BY NAVY DEPARTMENT TO NONPROFIT INSTITUTIONS AND ORGANIZATIONS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, reporting, pursuant to law, a list of institutions and organizations, all nonprofit and eligible, which have requested donations from the Navy Department; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Works Agency, transmitting the eighth annual report of that Agency for the fiscal year 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Public Works.

QUARTERLY REPORT OF UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the quarterly report of that Commission for the period October 1, through December 31, 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PROHIBITION AGAINST LIQUOR ADVERTISING—PETITION

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and to have printed in the RECORD a petition signed by about 25 very fine citizens of Orange City, Fla., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 265, to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce, and the broadcasting of alcoholic beverage advertising over the radio, being a bill introduced by the distinguished senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER].

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, without the signatures attached, as follows:

DECEMBER 12, 1947.

To our Senators and Representatives in Congress:

We respectfully request that you use your influence and vote for the passage of S. 265,

as introduced, without amendments, a bill to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the 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 \$8,770,000,000 for alcoholic beverages in 1946 as compared with \$3,700,000,000 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.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. AIKEN, from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, to which was referred the resolution (S. Res. 189) authorizing the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments to make certain expenditures and to employ temporary assistants, reported it without amendment, and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

PERSONS EMPLOYED BY COMMITTEES WHO ARE NOT FULL-TIME SENATE OR COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a report of the month of December 1947, from the chairman of a certain committee, in response to Senate Resolution 319, Seventy-eighth Congress, relative to persons employed by committees who are not full-time employees of the Senate or any committee thereof, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS OF THE COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

UNITED STATES SENATE,
January 7, 1948.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the name of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of December, 1947, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

James H. Cunningham, care P. M. S. and T. University of Connecticut, Storrs, Conn., United States Army; annual rate of salary, \$3,912.

W. E. JENNER,
Chairman, Subcommittee on
Privileges and Elections.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PERSONNEL AND FUNDS

Pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, the following reports were received by the Secretary of the Senate:

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

UNITED STATES SENATE,
January 14, 1948.

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1947, to December 31, 1947, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name	Profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Everard H. Smith...	Chief Clerk...	\$10,000.00	\$4,999.98
Cecil H. Tolbert...	Assistant Chief Clerk.	9,524.13	4,762.02
Adelbert F. Teague.	Assistant clerk.	7,075.06	3,537.48
Herman E. Downey.	do.	5,447.37	2,723.64
Edmund T. King:			
July 1 to Oct. 3.	do.	7,075.06	1,827.69
Oct. 4 to Dec. 31.	do.	7,549.08	1,824.35
H. Maurice Joyce.	do.	6,522.05	3,261.00
Lawrence H. Wendrich, Oct. 13 to Dec. 31.	do.	6,522.05	1,413.10
Mary K. Yanick...	Clerical assistant.	3,212.74	1,606.32
Marie Jeneau:			
July 1 to Sept. 1.	do.	3,461.04	586.45
Sept. 10 to Dec. 31.	do.	3,461.04	1,067.15
Bernadine Wassam.	do.	3,047.22	1,523.58
Yvonne A. Beaudry, Oct. 22 to Dec. 31.	do.	3,047.22	584.04
Thomas J. Graves.	Professional staff member.	8,576.10	4,288.02
Robert H. Montgomery.	do.	8,023.09	4,011.54
Earl W. Cooper.	do.	8,023.09	4,011.54
Cele G. Knight.	do.	8,023.09	4,011.54
Francis S. Hewitt.	do.	8,023.09	4,011.54
Harold F. Merrick.	do.	8,023.09	4,011.54
Thomas J. Scott.	do.	8,023.09	4,011.54
John Pillsbury:			
Sept. 15 to Dec. 15.	Clerical assistant.	5,033.55	1,272.36
Dec. 16 to Dec. 31.	Professional staff member.	7,075.06	294.79
Kimball Sanborn, Oct. 9 to Dec. 31.	do.	7,075.06	1,611.52
EMPLOYED TEMPORARILY			
Philip M. Darling, July 1 to July 22.	Assistant clerk.	7,075.06	432.36
Rita J. Mackey, July 1 to Nov. 4.	Clerical assistant.	3,047.22	1,049.57
Charles M. Mills, Sept. 2 to Nov. 30.	Professional staff member.	7,075.06	1,749.09

STYLES BRIDGES,
Chairman.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS
UNITED STATES SENATE,
January 15, 1948.

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:
The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1947, to December 31, 1947, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

EMPLOYED TEMPORARILY

Name	Profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Leslie M. Gravin, July 1-2.	Consultant.	1,335.00	\$70.00
H. C. M. Case, July 1-15.	do.	10,000.00	416.66
Marianne S. Futterer, July 1-27.	Typist.	2,716.16	203.70

¹ Per diem.
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure..... \$50,000.00
Amount expended..... 690.36
Balance unexpended..... 49,309.64

STYLES BRIDGES,
Chairman.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS
UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
January 14, 1948.

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:
The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress,

submits the following report in addition to the statement showing the name, profession, and total salary of persons employed, for the period from July 1 to December 31, 1947:

Miscellaneous expenses

Unexpended balance of funds authorized by Reorganization Act and S. Res. 130, as of July 1, 1947..... \$14,232.47
Amount expended July 1 to Dec. 31, 1947..... 8,357.10
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1947..... 5,875.37
Amount authorized by S. Res. 129, June 26, 1947..... 50,000.00
Amount expended July 1 to Dec. 31, 1947..... 6,841.11
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1947..... 43,158.89

STYLES BRIDGES,
Chairman.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
UNITED STATES SENATE,
December 31, 1947.

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:
The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1947, to December 31, 1947, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name	Profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
John G. Adams	Chief clerk	\$10,000.00	\$4,604.23
Herbert S. Atkinson.	Assistant clerk.	5,281.24	2,640.62
Justice M. Chambers.	Staff adviser.	9,050.11	4,525.05
Georgia P. Earle.	Clerical assistant.	3,626.56	1,813.28
Mark H. Galusha.	Staff adviser.	9,050.11	4,525.05
Verne D. Mudge.	do.	9,050.11	4,525.05
Irene Posey.	Clerical assistant.	3,626.56	1,813.28
Walter I. Smalley.	Assistant clerk.	5,281.24	2,640.62
Roberta Van Beek.	Clerical assistant.	3,626.56	1,813.28

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure..... \$10,000.00
Amount expended..... 4,903.60
Balance unexpended..... 5,096.40

CHAN GURNEY,
Chairman.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY
UNITED STATES SENATE,
January 9, 1948.

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:
The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1947, to December 31, 1947, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name	Profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Philip Levy	Professional staff member.	\$10,000.00	\$1,634.35
Robert D. L'Heureux.	do.	7,075.06	3,537.48

Name	Profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Robert C. Hill.	Chief clerk.	\$7,944.09	\$2,648.00
Eunice V. Avery.	Clerical assistant.	4,950.79	2,475.36
Caro McNeill Pugh.	do.	3,543.80	1,771.86
Edna A. Stewart.	do.	3,543.80	1,739.67
Pauline C. Beam.	do.	3,543.80	1,739.67
William F. McKenna.	Professional staff member.	9,761.13	1,626.84

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure; balance remaining July 1, 1947..... \$5,498.32
Amount expended July 1, 1947, to Dec. 31, 1947..... 2,873.25
Balance unexpended..... 2,625.07

CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Chairman.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS
UNITED STATES SENATE,
January 14, 1948.

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:
The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1947, to December 31, 1947, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name	Profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
J. H. Macomber, Jr.	Chief clerk	\$9,524.13	\$4,762.02
Glenn K. Shriver.	Assistant chief clerk.	7,391.07	3,695.52
E. B. Van Horn.	Staff director.	10,000.00	4,900.32
Walter L. Reynolds.	Staff member.	8,734.11	4,367.04
Thomas A. Sappington.	do.	7,075.06	3,537.48
Ann M. Grickis.	Clerk-secretary.	5,116.32	2,551.26
Emily I. Tennyson (Mrs.).	Clerk.	3,295.51	1,640.82
Marie C. Tylor.	do.	3,295.51	1,640.82
Velda Blanche Holder.	do.	3,047.22	1,516.68

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure, 80th Cong..... \$10,000.00
Amount expended to June 30, 1947, \$1,150.70; amount expended July 1, 1947, to Dec. 31, 1947, \$1,473.83; total..... 2,624.53
Balance unexpended..... 7,375.47

GEORGE D. AIKEN,
Chairman.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS—SUBCOMMITTEE TO STUDY INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS
UNITED STATES SENATE,
January 14, 1948.

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:
The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1947, to December 31, 1947, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name	Profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Dr. Clarence Heer.	Staff director.	\$10,000.00	\$1,777.76
Carl H. Chatters.	Special consultant.	10,000.00	1,333.32

Name	Profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Joe S. Floyd, Jr.	Staff member	\$5,033.55	\$531.31
Everett M. Schadt	do	5,033.55	447.42
Mary Helen Woods	do	2,467.87	219.35
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure, 80th Congress			\$30,000.00
Amount expended			5,782.62
Balance unexpended			24,217.38

GEORGE D. AIKEN,
Chairman.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS—SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE WAR SURPLUS DISPOSAL
UNITED STATES SENATE,
January 14, 1948.

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1947, to December 31, 1947, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name	Profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
George F. Boos	Chief investigator	\$7,707.08	\$3,853.50
Pauline Chaternuck	Stenographer	2,633.40	1,316.70
Kathleen M. Colson	do	2,633.40	1,316.70
Edward A. Connors	Investigator	5,695.66	2,847.78
Caira May Cook, from July 14	Secretary to counsel	3,626.56	1,682.30
Miles N. Culehan	Counsel	10,000.00	4,999.98
Sylvia Deane, July 1 to 19	Secretary to counsel	3,626.56	191.40
Philip F. King, from September 13	Technical consultant	7,470.07	2,241.00
John D. Leadbetter, July 1 to August 31	Messenger	2,467.87	411.30
Myles C. McCahill	Investigator	5,695.66	2,847.78
John B. McDonald, July 1 to November 23	do	5,695.66	2,262.40
Hubert R. Moody	do	5,695.66	2,847.78
O. J. Peterson, July 1 to 22	do	5,695.66	348.06
Ray H. Pincomb, July 1 to 26	do	5,695.66	411.35
Robert L. Piper	Chief clerk and investigator	5,695.66	2,847.78
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure			\$100,000.00
Amount expended			54,972.65
Balance unexpended			45,027.35

GEORGE D. AIKEN,
Chairman.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS
UNITED STATES SENATE,
January 15, 1948.

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1947, to December 31, 1947, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name	Profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Hugh R. Brown	Chief clerk	\$10,000.00	\$5,000.00
Albert A. Grorud	Professional staff	7,022.40	3,511.20
Elmer K. Nelson	do	7,075.00	1,768.75
Orville Watkins	Clerical assistant	5,116.32	2,558.16
Nellie D. McSherry	Assistant Chief Clerk	7,075.00	3,493.80
Estelle Bedsworth	Clerical assistant	3,295.51	1,647.75
Charlotte Mickle	do	2,964.45	1,482.22
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure			\$32,551.50
Amount expended			14,704.36
Balance unexpended			17,847.14

NOTE.—With further reference to the "Note" on the report of this committee for the first period of this year, it should be noted that the stenographic reporter's account for the first session remaining unpaid totaled \$6,244.45.

HUGH BUTLER,
Chairman.

REPORT OF SENATE COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS
UNITED STATES SENATE,
January 15, 1948.

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from June 30, 1947, to January 1, 1948, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name	Profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
George F. Meredith	Executive director	\$10,000.00	\$5,000.00
Raymond R. Dickey	Chief counsel	9,050.11	4,525.06
Bertram H. Wimer	Chief investigator	8,418.10	4,057.63
Albert J. Wolken	Investigator	8,418.10	4,057.63
Guyon, Catherine L.	Consultant	6,522.05	3,261.03
Ailene J. Loveland	Secretary	3,792.09	1,896.05
Pearl Mae Nichols	do	3,792.09	1,896.05
Dorothy J. Holschouser	Editorial secretary	3,792.09	1,896.05
Charlotte M. Southmayd	Clerk	2,964.45	1,482.23
Alma M. Youse	Secretary	2,964.45	1,482.23
Catherine G. McNamara	do	2,964.45	1,482.23
Virginia Lee Bauer	File clerk	2,633.40	1,316.70
Gene Wynes	Messenger	2,004.20	1,002.10
Albert E. Johnson	Special consultant	7,233.07	3,616.54
John M. Frier	do	7,233.07	2,388.00
William C. Broadgate	do	7,233.07	1,467.66
Walton C. Groce	do	7,233.07	700.22
Paul E. Hadlick	do	7,233.07	1,287.74
Alice M. Dodd	Secretary-stenographer	2,964.45	213.00
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure			\$100,000.00
Amount expended			86,450.94
Balance unexpended			13,549.06

KENNETH S. WHERRY,
Chairman.

REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE INVESTIGATING NATIONAL DEFENSE
UNITED STATES SENATE,
January 15, 1948.

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report

showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1947, to January 1, 1948, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name	Profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Jerome S. Adlerman	Assistant counsel	\$6,495.72	\$3,247.86
Robert B. Barker	Investigator	8,075.76	471.08
Bernard S. Berco-vici	do	8,075.76	4,037.88
Lucille Bruskin	Assistant clerk	3,378.27	1,568.40
William S. Cole	Assistant counsel	9,366.12	4,162.95
Frederick N. Coughlin	do	6,026.72	3,013.32
Philip R. Davis	do	10,000.00	3,111.09
Agnes F. Dodge	Assistant clerk	2,886.69	1,409.34
Francis D. Flanagan	Chief assistant counsel	9,998.14	4,856.42
Thomas F. Flynn, Jr.	Investigator	5,392.22	898.70
Phelps Hunt	Editorial clerk	1,931.60	965.76
Linton W. Jeffery	Investigator	8,075.76	2,332.99
Jean F. Kerr	Assistant clerk	2,798.92	559.77
Kathryn L. Kohler	do	2,964.45	741.09
Felix E. Larkin	Assistant counsel	9,050.11	1,835.14
Lydia Lee	Editor	5,033.55	2,516.76
Joseph M. Mannix	Investigator	6,026.72	2,875.37
George Meader	Consulting counsel	10,000.00	2,361.09
Gladys E. Montier	Assistant clerk	3,543.80	1,716.70
Constance L. Morris	do	2,881.69	1,358.08
Eric Nordholm	Messenger	1,188.00	956.39
Franklin N. Parks	Assistant counsel	6,680.05	3,340.02
Jeanie M. Pritchard	Assistant clerk	3,212.74	1,716.70
William P. Rogers	Chief counsel	10,000.00	4,999.98
Haven Sawyer	Investigator	5,392.22	2,696.10
James F. Sheridan	do	5,392.22	2,696.10
Dorothy Smithson	Assistant clerk	3,212.74	1,523.56
M. Louise Spilman	do	3,957.62	1,220.25
Eleanor L. Taylor	do	3,212.74	1,523.56
Franklyn Yearsley	Investigator	4,205.91	700.98
Ruth M. Young	Clerk	3,792.09	1,840.84
Funds on hand July 1, 1947, plus funds authorized by S. Res. 145 agreed to July 23, 1947			
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure			\$132,162.36
Amount expended			94,216.28
Balance unexpended			62,946.08

OWEN BREWSTER,
Chairman.

INTERIM REPORT OF COMMITTEE TO STUDY PROBLEMS OF AMERICAN SMALL BUSINESS RELATING TO STEEL SUPPLY AND DISTRIBUTION (REPT. NO. 825)

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I have been designated by the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], chairman of the Senate Special Committee To Study Problems of American Small Business, to submit to the Senate a report on steel supply and distribution, which is the result of investigations over the past 6 months by the Steel Subcommittee, of which I am chairman. It seems particularly timely to call to the attention of the Senate the situation with respect to the Nation's most vital resource—steel.

Steel is the basic commodity of our economy—and of the world's economy.

No other material is of such value in the construction and reconstruction of the world's commerce and trade.

The job opportunity of every worker, the market for every farmer, the success

of every businessman depends, in some degree, upon the production and distribution of steel.

We cannot have prosperity today unless we have enough steel to make that prosperity possible.

Balance in the domestic economy and success of a European recovery program will depend, in the final analysis, upon steel.

The steel subcommittee in its investigations and hearings has given attention to disruptions to normal channels of trade and to increased integration in the steel industry which are cutting off sources of supply for the smaller businessman.

It has studied remedies for the shortages of basic raw materials which go into the manufacture of steel.

The subcommittee has heard from both sides of the question as to whether steel capacity should be increased. Testimony ranged from demands for no expansion to statistical projections calling for a 20,000,000-ton increase. The fact that no executive agency of Government has made any survey of actual, over-all demands for steel since the early days of the war has made it impractical for the subcommittee to make a recommendation as to the necessity for steel expansion. The subcommittee has recommended that an over-all survey of steel requirements be undertaken by the executive agencies as the only intelligent basis for demands upon the industry or commitments abroad.

It takes steel to make steel, to build new facilities, to transport basic materials. Increased production and capacity are limited by these factors.

In the world picture, large exports of critically short steel products have thrown the domestic economy out of gear. It is the fear of the steel subcommittee that present export levels will be maintained and further inroads made upon domestic supplies. In such case, the smaller independent businessman in the steel industry, suffering from extreme shortage now, will be forced to the wall.

Although the subcommittee has dealt with emergency supply situations, has obtained relief for many distress cases, and has been successful in revealing and discouraging the steel gray market, the basic problems which are threatening small business in the steel industry are as urgent today as when the subcommittee began its investigations in May 1947.

The maintenance of free competitive enterprise—large or small—is the keystone of our democracy and of our form of government.

It will profit us little either in the immediate problems or in longer-range considerations to foster the flame of free enterprise in western Europe, if we must submit our own economy to regimentation.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to submit the interim report and request that it be printed, with an illustration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the report will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from Pennsylvania.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. MOORE (for himself, Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. HAWKES, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. O'CONNOR, Mr. O'DANIEL, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. BYRD, Mr. OVERTON, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, and Mr. BROOKS):

S. 1988. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands and resources in and beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ECTON:

S. 1989. A bill to provide for the payment of certain Government employees for accumulated or accrued annual leave in cases involving transfers to other Government agencies under different leave systems; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WATKINS:

S. 1990. A bill to provide a means for the orderly continuation and completion of the Deer Creek and Aqueduct divisions of the Provo River project, Utah; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 1991. A bill for the relief of Louis J. Waline; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1992. A bill to authorize the purchase of a new post-office site at Omaha, Nebr.; and

S. 1993. A bill to authorize the alteration of certain highway bridges at Federal expense in connection with flood-control projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CAPEHART:

S. 1994. A bill for the relief of Barbara O'Brien Farquer;

S. 1995. A bill for the relief of George Bailey; and

S. 1996. A bill to legalize the admission into the United States of Chang Ha Kim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN:

S. 1997. A bill for the relief of Sister Anna M. Alzbeta Sijarto-Hajdukova (also known as Sister M. Elizabeth); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1998. A bill to authorize the Administrator, War Assets Administration, to convey the Tobyhanna Military Reservation to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. YOUNG:

S. 1999. A bill for the relief of Lloyd F. Stewart; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia introduced Senate bill 2000, to repeal the authority to assess certain owners of nonmilitary buildings situated within the limits of the Fort Monroe Military Reservation, and for other purposes; which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. SPARKMAN introduced Senate bill 2001, to continue rent control until April 30, 1949, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. GURNEY:

S. 2002. A bill to amend the Canal Zone Code for the purpose of incorporating the Panama Railroad Company; and

S. 2003. A bill to amend the Canal Zone Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BALDWIN:

S. 2004. A bill for the relief of the Housing Authority of the City of Bridgeport, Conn.;

S. 2005. A bill relating to the disposition of permanent housing acquired or constructed by the United States; and

S. 2006. A bill authorizing contributions to local public housing agencies with respect to certain payments in lieu of taxes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 2007. A bill to reserve to the United States all oil, gas, coal, and other minerals contained in lands included within the Fort Reno Military Reservation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah:

S. 2008. A bill to allow a deduction for income-tax purposes of premiums paid on national service life insurance and United States Government life insurance; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 2009. A bill to provide for the security of the United States through the development and construction of air weapons of advanced design, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 2010. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Silvia Mapelli;

S. 2011. A bill for the relief of Giacomo Spano and his family; and

S. 2012. A bill for the relief of Frank Arnim, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MYERS:

S. 2013. A bill for the relief of Sister Stefania Cuprys; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURRAY (for himself and Mr. WAGNER):

S. 2014. A bill to establish effective rent control until June 30, 1950, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPEAL OF AUTHORITY TO ASSESS CERTAIN OWNERS OF NONMILITARY BUILDINGS AT FORT MONROE, VA.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to repeal the authority to assess certain owners of nonmilitary buildings situated within the limits of the Fort Monroe Military Reservation, and for other purposes.

Some years ago the Senate passed a similar bill, but it included other matters, and did not pass the House. Fort Monroe is the only military reservation as to which the law requires specific charges to be made against civilians who use the reservation. The Secretary of the Army favors the repeal of the act of 1894, which requires him to impose such charges on civilians at Fort Monroe, in order that he may be free to treat all civilian users of military reservations alike.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2000) to repeal the authority to assess certain owners of nonmilitary buildings situated within the limits of the Fort Monroe Military Reservation, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

CONTINUATION OF RENT CONTROL

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to continue rent control. This bill seeks to amend the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, and would be known as the Housing and Rent Extension Act of 1948. Essentially, it would continue the programs of rent control,

limitations on construction for amusement or recreational purposes, and veterans' preference until April 30, 1949, and would continue the Office of the Housing Expediter to that date for the purpose of administering them. In addition, it clarifies the purposes of the Housing and Rent Act by adding a declaration of purposes, sets the rent agreed upon under the present 15-percent lease provision as the maximum rent for the effective period of the lease, but deletes the provisions removing housing accommodations so leased from rent control, gives the Housing Expediter the right to sue for overcharges if the tenant does not, strengthens the enforcement and eviction provisions by providing for criminal sanctions for willful violations of the act and by authorizing the Housing Expediter to conduct investigations and hearings, and provides for the allocation of materials or facilities in short supply to increase the supply of housing accommodations.

Under the present Rent Act, units on which landlord and tenant sign a voluntary lease for not more than 15 percent above the maximum rent, and which carry over until at least January 1, 1949, are decontrolled as of December 31, 1947. This means that should any tenant violate an obligation of his tenancy or otherwise terminate his lease, the unit is thereafter free from control. It is fairly evident that there would be tremendous pressure to void these leases so as to remove these units from all controls. This bill would amend the present act so as to continue to hold these units under rent control but to honor the 15-percent rent increase for as long as the lease exists.

This bill continues the local advisory boards with all the powers they now have to recommend to the Housing Expediter actions on decontrol, the adequacy of the general rent level, operations of the local rent office and individual hardship cases. It would continue to allow the Housing Expediter to exercise his judgment as to whether a local board recommendation has been properly substantiated and is in accordance with the provisions of the act.

This bill strengthens the enforcement provisions so as to give the Housing Expediter the right of treble-damage action against willful and flagrant violators and also to permit the Housing Expediter to refer to the Attorney General willful and flagrant violators for criminal action. This is a necessary amendment because the present provision of the act giving the tenant the right of treble damage has failed to cure violations. It is not working because tenants are more afraid of losing the roof over their heads than they are desirous of obtaining monetary damages. Experience shows that generally law-abiding landlords who always obey the law are still obeying but that the old violators are boldly overcharging and accepting bonuses and side payments. When they are caught, they simply make restitution and unless an injunction is obtained proceed to commit the same violations all over again.

This bill contains a restatement of the general allocation powers which were in

the Second War Powers Act and the limited ones in the Veterans' Emergency Housing Act. The power in this bill, however, is to be used solely for the purpose of increasing the supply of housing accommodations. The bill thus provides that if a shortage of materials needed for an increased supply of housing accommodations exists or is likely to exist, the Housing Expediter may allocate such materials for housing construction.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2001) to continue rent control until April 30, 1949, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. SPARKMAN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PRINTING OF FIFTIETH ANNUAL REPORT OF SOCIETY OF DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

Mr. JENNER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 190), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the Fiftieth Annual Report of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution for the year ended April 1, 1947, be printed as a Senate document.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 2575) to amend the Articles of War to improve the administration of military justice, to provide for more effective appellate review, to insure the equalization of sentences, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF PHILIPPINE REHABILITATION ACT OF 1946—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I submit a conference report on Senate bill 1020, to amend the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946, as amended, 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 House to the bill (S. 1020) to amend the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946, as amended, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "\$12,000,000"; and the House agree to the same.

HUGH BUTLER,
SHERIDAN DOWNEY,
ERNEST W. MCFARLAND,
GEO. W. MALONE,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOHN M. VORYS,
WALTER H. JUDD,
JAMES G. FULTON,
JAS. P. RICHARDS,
MIKE MANSFIELD,

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, the conference report has to do with the Philippine rehabilitation bill which was passed by the Senate on July 25 last, before the close of the first session. The Senate made available for administrative purposes \$16,000,000 of the funds appropriated. The House action reduced that amount to \$8,400,000. Conferees were appointed, and the report is now in agreement on the sum of \$12,000,000. I should like to have the report adopted.

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 conference report was agreed to.

NATIONAL DEFENSE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR LUCAS

[Mr. LUCAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him before the Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense, at Washington, D. C., January 16, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY HON. CHARLES A. HALLECK BEFORE THE NATIONAL SMALL BUSINESSMEN'S ASSOCIATION

[Mr. WHERRY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Representative CHARLES A. HALLECK, of Indiana, before the National Small Businessmen's Association, at the Wardman Park Hotel, Washington, D. C., on January 14, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADMIRAL NIMITZ' VALEDICTORY

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the final statement made by Fleet Adm. Chester W. Nimitz, United States Navy, and an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of January 7, 1948, summarizing the context of Admiral Nimitz' statement, which appears in the Appendix.]

LABOR AND THE ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAY—ADDRESS BY MATTHEW WOLL

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject, Labor and the St. Lawrence Waterway, by Mr. Matthew Woll, vice president of the American Federation of Labor, before the New England Project Conference at Boston, Mass., which appears in the Appendix.]

THE CAUSES OF INDUSTRIAL PEACE—ADDRESS BY CLARENCE FRANCIS

[Mr. SPARKMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Causes of Industrial Peace," delivered by Clarence Francis, chairman of the board, General Foods Corp., before the fifty-second annual congress of American industry, National Association of Manufacturers, at New York City, on December 4, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

OUR CONGRESS—EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK DAILY MIRROR

[Mr. BALDWIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Our Congress," published in the New York Daily Mirror for January 12, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

WE MUST SAVE EUROPE WITHOUT LOSING AMERICA—ARTICLE IN THE NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION JOURNAL

[Mr. FULBRIGHT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "We Must Save Europe Without Losing

America," published in the National Education Association Journal of January 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE BATTLE OF THE FAMILY BUDGET—ARTICLE BY RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an article entitled "The Battle of the Family Budget," by Richard L. Neuberger, from the New York Times Magazine of January 11, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

CENSORSHIP THROUGH FEAR—ARTICLE BY WILLIAM WYLER

[Mr. TAYLOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an article entitled "Censorship Through Fear," by William Wyler, published in the December 1947 issue of the Screen Writer, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY—EDITORIAL FROM THE DETROIT NEWS

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an editorial regarding the St. Lawrence seaway, from the Detroit News of January 5, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

TWO HUNDRED AND FORTY-SECOND ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF BENJAMIN FRANKLIN

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, in the peaceful burying ground of historic Old Christ Church in the city of Philadelphia a simple flat stone marks the last resting place of an illustrious American patriot and statesman who was born 242 years ago tomorrow. The fading inscription on that stone recounts that here is buried all that was mortal of Benjamin Franklin, printer.

So deep was the humility, so sincere the simplicity, of this great man that his vast achievements in public service and his tremendous contributions to the welfare of human society were ignored in the epitaph he wrote for his grave, describing himself simply as "Benjamin Franklin, printer." But the light of his genius continues to illuminate the world. It shines more brightly with the passing years, and, therefore, on the anniversary of his birth, it is a sacred duty to recall, with proper tribute of homage and honor, the greatness of Benjamin Franklin, first citizen of Pennsylvania.

As much as any other man of his time he shaped and guided the destiny of our Republic in the struggle for American independence and in the troubled formative years of our country.

Of him it may be truly said, "He walked with kings, nor lost the common touch."

His giant intellect concerned itself with the simple as well as the more complex needs of his fellow man. He helped establish a nation of liberty and freedom on this continent—and he invented a household stove that added to the comfort and convenience of his fellow citizens.

He negotiated with Europe's greatest masters of statecraft and diplomacy on equal terms, yet he preached the virtues of thrift and industry.

His investigations into the laws of nature gave him first rank and fame among the scientists of his day—and he wrote a treatise on the Causes and Cure of Smoky Chimneys.

Every schoolboy is familiar with the kite-flying experiments by which he determined the nature of electricity, an achievement that opened a whole new realm of discovery and invention for human progress and betterment.

Into his philosophy he poured wisdom that stands unchallenged today to guide the affairs of men into the channels of right living.

Franklin's career as a benefactor of humanity was so diversified and his achievements so numerous that it is impossible to enumerate them all.

Throughout his life he held fast to the creed that he drafted at the age of 22, and which he entitled "Articles of Belief and Acts of Religion." In that creed he wrote:

I believe in one God, creator of the universe. That He governs it by His providence. That He ought to be worshiped. That the most acceptable service we render to Him is doing good to His other children. That the soul of man is immortal, and will be treated with justice in another life respecting its conduct in this.

By reason of its great importance, I should like to refer to an incident concerning the drafting of our Constitution. The adoption of our Constitution was one of the greatest accomplishments in all history. It brought a new birth of freedom, and meant that 8 years of suffering and hardship would not go without reward. The great men of the Constitutional Convention met day after day for 4 weeks and had not made any progress.

On the last morning of the fifth week there was heated discussion. They were about to adjourn without completing the great purpose for which they had met. It looked like failure, when Benjamin Franklin, the most mature and tactful man in the convention, arose. Addressing Gen. George Washington, President of the Assembly, he said:

Mr. President, the small progress we have made after 4 or 5 weeks' close attention and continual reasonings with each other, our different sentiments on almost every question, several of the last producing as many noes as ayes, is, methinks, a melancholy proof of the imperfection of the human understanding.

In this situation of this Assembly, groping, as it were, in the dark to find political truth, and scarce able to distinguish it when presented to us, how has it happened, sir, that we have not hitherto once thought of humbly applying to the Father of Light to illuminate our understanding?

I have lived, sir, a long time; and the longer I live the more convincing proofs I see of this truth, that God governs in the affairs of men. And if a sparrow cannot fall to the ground without His notice, is it probable that an empire can rise without His aid?

We have been assured, sir, in the Sacred Writings, that "except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it." I firmly believe this; and I also believe that without His concurring aid we shall succeed in this political building no better than the builders of Babel; we shall be divided by our little, partial, local interests, our project will be confounded, and we ourselves shall become a reproach and a byword down to future ages. And, what is worse, mankind may hereafter, from this unfortunate instance, despair of establishing government by human wisdom and leave it to chance, war, conquest.

I, therefore, beg leave to move: That hereafter, prayers imploring the assistance of Heaven and its blessing on our de-

liberations, be held in this Assembly every morning before we proceed to business, and that one or more of the clergy of this city be requested to officiate in that service.

From then on, history tells us, real progress began to be made in the framing and adoption of our Constitution. Gladstone asserted that this document was "the greatest piece of work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man."

Thus, in the adoption of our Constitution we can almost trace the finger of Divine Providence. Its adoption laid the foundation for peace and prosperity, when it looked as if failure to agree upon a plan of government would result in misery and confusion.

Mr. President, I should like to mention another incident in the career of Benjamin Franklin which is worthy of thoughtful consideration in these critical times.

When the work of the Constitutional Convention had been completed and Franklin stepped into the courtyard of Independence Hall, he was greeted by a great multitude of citizens.

"What kind of government have you given us?" he was asked.

"A Republic, if we can keep it," Franklin replied.

There is patriotic inspiration and guidance in those words. On this notable anniversary they should remind all Americans to rededicate their lives to the perpetuation of the ideals and principles handed down to us by Franklin and the other revered founding fathers of our Nation.

Their deeds of patriotism, their lives of vision, courage, and sacrifice, point the way in which each of us can contribute, in large or small degree, toward carrying out the injunction of Franklin—to keep our Republic, not only for the greater glory of America, but as a beacon light of human liberty and justice throughout the world.

MEAT PRODUCTION

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, during the last few weeks I have been amazed at the way in which a bureaucratic, semi-collectivist philosophy seems to be coming back in fashion. I refer to all the proposals we hear about restoring rationing and price controls and various other regulations covering meat. That is a controversy which I thought was settled by the election of 1946. I thought the American people at that time expressed a pretty clear preference for meat rather than for controls.

Now, apparently, we have the same question back with us. It is being said on all sides that the price of meat is too high. I do not know the basis for that statement. The price of meat is certainly higher than it used to be. So is the price of everything else. If the price of meat is too high, so are wage rates too high; so is the price of coal, the price of lumber, the price of steel, and the price of everything else. The farmer who produces meat must buy all these things in one form or another. He must have a price for his cattle and hogs sufficient to pay his costs of operation.

I speak to the Senate frankly in behalf of the livestock men—the producers of

the meat supply of the country. Their costs have gone up along with the prices they receive. Our State statistician at Lincoln, Nebr., for the Department of Agriculture has just supplied me with the average cost of producing beef in Nebraska within the last few months. That cost is at an all-time high. In October it cost \$20.20 per hundred pounds of beef; in November, \$19; in December, \$20.70. That is the inflationary effect of present conditions on our level of costs. If we can get those costs down, we will get cheaper meat, but not otherwise.

Unfortunately, the people of this country have been told by the dominant political philosophy of the last 15 years to ignore realities and to expect something for nothing. They would like to have cheaper meat, and they would like to have more of it. These twin desires are natural, but they are incompatible with each other. Last year the people of the United States bought and ate far more meat per capita than they could ever afford to buy during the prewar period—but it was not cheap. If the price had not been well above prewar standards, so much meat would not have been produced. That is the hard economic reality which consumers must face.

Now our producers are threatened again with renewed talk of rationing and price controls. The mere fact that these suggestions are made has already done serious damage by discouraging the production we need. The meat supply for next fall and next year is being determined right now or will be within the next few months. Official talk about rationing and price controls will only discourage meat production, and make the shortage later on much worse.

But suppose controls should be adopted again, what will be the result? Will it increase the supply of meat? Of course not; it will decrease it. The only result will be to push the bulk of the meat business out of its normal processing and marketing channels and into the black market.

Consider the impossibility of enforcing such controls at the present time. The OPA and all the other enforcement machinery has been disbanded. Meat controls could not be enforced in 1946 by an organized army of Federal agents. What possible chance would there be to enforce them now with a makeshift group of temporary employees? We will have trouble setting up OPA machinery again, but the black marketeers will have no trouble setting up in business. Their machinery is already set up. If the OPA was the school for black marketeers in this country, new controls would be a postgraduate course.

Some may think controls can easily be enforced against the large packers. Perhaps they can, but the meat would not go to the large packing firms. In livestock marketing, the animals go to the highest bidder, with no questions asked. The highest bidder will be the black market. Nor is rationing the answer. Black market slaughter is just too easy. Any unused barn or shed will serve. From there the meat can be moved directly into channels for the consumer, short cutting the rationing machinery entirely.

Mr. President, I suggest that we stop trying to have our cake and eat it too. The price level has been raised far above prewar prices by the financial and monetary policies that have been followed by the administration during the past 15 years. Costs in every industry have increased by leaps and bounds. Reducing prices means reducing costs first, and that means reducing wages. That is something I have not heard anyone suggest.

If the advocates of this type of control legislation really mean what they say, I suggest that they have their measures brought to the floor for debate as promptly as possible so that we can get this question settled once and for all. In the meantime, I suggest that we have a moratorium on public statements urging meat rationing and price control. Talk of that sort is doing no good for the production of meat, and high-level meat production is the only really satisfactory solution to this problem.

EUROPEAN RELIEF NEEDS

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, many public officials, Members of Congress, newspaper editors, columnists, radio commentators, and many other prominent people of America, have made impressive arguments for European relief needs. Most of the arguments have dealt with the humanitarian side—the need of helping the starving and suffering peoples in Europe—and the need of saving western Europe from Communist domination for our own future security.

I wish at this time to commend former Governor Stassen and Secretary of Agriculture Anderson for the emphasis they have placed on another aspect of foreign aid. Governor Stassen is especially to be commended for being one of the first concerned about the need of maintaining future markets for farm products in Europe after assistance programs come to an end and Europe again has dollars with which to purchase our food.

Governor Stassen and Secretary Anderson correctly take the position that there can be no permanent prosperity in the United States, and particularly among farmers, unless such a market is retained.

Even now, because of a loss of European markets for some farm products, our Government, in order to maintain parity prices, purchased practically all the 1947 tobacco and peanut crops, together with large quantities of eggs, potatoes, and fruits which were in surplus.

While there has been Government price support of a few farm products, this Congress during the past year enacted unusual legislation to hold down the price of wheat, the most important of all food items. As a result of Government controls, the export price of wheat is lower in the United States than in any other nation of the world.

At this point in my remarks I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a part of my remarks a press release by the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], from the Fargo Forum, Fargo, N. Dak., under date of January 1, 1948.

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

SAYS WHEAT "RIDER" AVERTED PRICE OF \$5

WASHINGTON.—Senator BALL, Republican, of Minnesota, said Wednesday a wheat carry-over rider inserted in the interim foreign-aid law recently enacted by Congress may have prevented wheat prices from climbing as high as \$5 a bushel.

He referred to an amendment placed in the \$540,000,000 foreign-aid statute by the appropriations committees of the Senate and House requiring that "exports not reduce our domestic carry-over below 150,000,000 bushels."

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, surely as a result of our large appropriations, and the effort American farmers are putting forth to meet the present food needs of Europe, the United States ought to have a high priority in the future markets of these countries, and, in my opinion, it is most important that both the executive department of our Government and the Congress of the United States at the present time negotiate with European countries to the end that we might retain as much as possible of these markets beyond the period the Marshall plan is intended to cover.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted as a part of my remarks a portion of the testimony by Secretary of Agriculture Anderson before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations on January 13, 1948, as reported by Robert J. Donovan of the New York Herald Tribune; and also a letter addressed by me to Gen. George C. Marshall, Secretary of State.

There being no objection, the testimony and letter referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Secretary Anderson told the committee at a hearing on the aid program: "From the standpoint of our consumers, the effect of our proposed exports should be less noticeable than the effects of the exports in recent years. Our total food exports will actually be smaller than in other recent years, and as the program continues, there will be decreasing emphasis on scarce foods and increasing emphasis on more abundant foods."

Secretary Anderson emphasized that the ERP would have an important bearing on farm prosperity, and he warned the committee that "it is essential that farmers have a good market in Europe."

While he did not use the word "depression," Mr. Anderson stated the case in terms which left no doubt that loss of European markets would have serious consequences for American farmers.

INCREASED YIELD CITED

"As we have studied the question of what this program will mean to our farmers," he said, "we have had to ask ourselves what would happen if the economy of Europe were allowed to disintegrate and if it provided little or no outlet for United States farm products. That prospect would not be pleasant to contemplate."

Secretary Anderson reminded the committee that before the war a high percentage of American farm products was sold to Europe, and he summed up the problem for the future in these words:

"Our farmers are now producing a third more food and fiber than they were before the war. They have revolutionized farm production and the revolution is here to stay. Our farmers are not going to give up their new machines or their high-yielding varieties, their improved insecticides or their improved

methods of cultivation. We are going to have abundance of agricultural production, and we shall continue to need export outlets for some of our most important farm commodities."

Secretary Anderson conceded that ERP exports coming on top of domestic and other foreign requirements, "will continue temporarily the strain on our grain-producing areas." He said, however, that the program was "feasible from the standpoint of our own agriculture" and that the nation had "no practical alternative but to carry through a program of this magnitude."

JANUARY 10, 1948.

The Honorable GEORGE C. MARSHALL,
Secretary of State, Department of State,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Today when there are so many problems of such immediate and vital concern facing our Government, I am afraid that the importance of one long-range problem very closely related to future security and welfare is being overlooked.

For a long time I have been concerned over the future of our agricultural industry. The past great war created demands on our farms, and on our farmers, for agricultural production greater than ever before in history. The record reveals how well our farmers met that need and the even greater need that arose after the war, and that is now playing such a vital role in our crucial struggle to secure the peace.

Following World War I, and until the time that Hitler came to power in Germany, this country enjoyed a fairly good foreign market for agricultural products, particularly wheat and cotton. Then because of the self-sufficiency program adopted by the Axis Powers in preparation for war, we lost most of this market. As a result, we faced tremendous surpluses. This was at a time when our production of wheat was not much more than one-half the present level of production. This in combination with continued imports of large supplies of wheat at a time when we had these great domestic surpluses, led to extremely low prices. In fact, at one time wheat sold for less than 30 cents a bushel.

The effect of this was felt throughout our economy. In looking back, it has always been very evident that our Nation cannot prosper when agriculture is in a depression. The period of the 1930's is known to all. The tempo of our entire economy reached a dangerously low point. Industry closed down, unemployment was rampant, and measures for our national defense lagged at the very time that we were being forced into a world crisis because of the ambitions of the Axis dictators. Luckily, through the efforts and sacrifices of our allies, the United States was given time to recover and through a tremendous expansion of industrial and agricultural production, our defenses were built. If we had faced the Axis without this period in which to recover the results would have been disastrous.

To meet the needs of this emergency, farmers were asked to expand production until it reached the present high level. Now I see signs of a trend that is causing me grave concern. This year the Government, under the farm price support program, had to purchase practically all of the 1947 crop of tobacco and peanuts. The foreign countries were unable to purchase these commodities under our relief aid. With wheat production at a level 500,000,000 bushels greater than can be consumed in the United States, this same situation would exist in wheat and all major agricultural commodities if it were not for the foreign relief program financed by huge American appropriations that is providing a European market for our surpluses.

Europe has, historically, been deficient in food supplies, and many times in the past has been our greatest outlet for agricultural surpluses. I am now somewhat alarmed by

the thinking of many Members of Congress and others high in Government positions. As evidenced by previous European programs, they are apparently striving to make Europe self-sufficient in food supplies even to the extent of endeavoring to establish new food sources in other parts of the world for farm commodities of which we normally have burdensome surpluses.

In my opinion, it is of the greatest concern to our future prosperity to maintain a prosperous agriculture. This, I believe, can only be accomplished by retaining large outlets in Europe. Because of the sacrifices of our people through tremendous relief appropriations, and because of the extreme efforts the American farmers have made to supply vital food necessities for Europe, I believe the United States is rightfully entitled to a high priority in future European markets. I believe it would be in the best interests of not only our farmers but the country as a whole if there was coordination of efforts toward this end by the State Department and the Agriculture Department. Therefore, I think it is highly desirable that the Department of State establish a division under one of the branches of the Department with the responsibility of looking toward future markets in Europe. This, I believe, could be established at little extra expenditure, since the Department already has agriculture attachés in the various embassies who could effectively work out a program in coordination with the Department of Agriculture.

On my two recent trips to Europe this summer I spent a large part of my time seeking information on this subject. I found that some agriculture attachés in some of the embassies were giving intelligent thought to the problem of future markets, but I regret to add others were completely indifferent to the problem.

Many Members of Congress apparently are totally unaware of the fact that if it were not for relief appropriations to Europe most farm products, and particularly wheat, would be in great surplus at the present time. Farm prices would be far below present levels and it is entirely possible that wheat would be selling for \$1 a bushel. Once the relief appropriations are discontinued and unless we begin now to look for these markets, much of our agriculture will have to be supported by price-support program. This would entail great expenditures with the resulting difficulty of disposing of surpluses, or else we would face the problem of liquidating or greatly reducing our farm production.

I need not point out the dangers of this alternative. Our past experiences make them clearly evident. Suffice to say, industry and our whole economy would go into a tailspin and we would undoubtedly have a disastrous depression. In the interests of survival and national security, this must not happen. Never again in a future emergency will we be given an opportunity to prepare to defend ourselves.

I respectfully urge, Mr. Secretary, that the consideration of this problem be given early attention.

With kindest regards,
Sincerely yours,

MILTON R. YOUNG,
United States Senator.

CANCER—NEW JERSEY EDITORIAL CONTEST

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, at this time, when the thoughts of men and women are so filled and so concerned with the complex problems arising out of government and general human welfare, I ask Senators to pause and think specifically of the gallant fight being waged by some of our people against a disease that takes a great toll of lives from among our people. I speak of the dis-

ease of cancer, a malady which to this time has baffled men in their quest for a cure in all cases.

However, there can be no doubt that some headway toward success is being made. Cancer presents a high challenge to science and to medicine. It is a threat which can be successfully met only through general realization of its existence, and the willingness of the people everywhere to be helpful in this great effort to eradicate a destructive disease.

This Government has recognized the existence of this growing menace to life, and in the last few years has made large appropriations to aid in the fight against it.

It is time that the people everywhere, the general public, shall, without fear, and with calmness and earnestness, realize and meet the situation.

While statistics show that 180,000 people die annually in this country from cancer, it is believed by many doctors that more than that number have their lives and their usefulness terminated by this disease. We are told that perhaps one-half of these need not die, because if the existence of the affliction is found in time, it is known that it can be cured.

In addition to the research being made with funds appropriated out of the Public Treasury, the American Cancer Society is spending from five to six millions of dollars yearly in research work to find the cause of this disease. When the cause of it is found, it is believed that its destructive result will be eradicated.

The New Jersey division of the American Cancer Society is recognized as a leader in the fight on cancer. The division is well organized, with active chapters in each county of the State. The success of the cancer-control program in New Jersey, now in its second full year of operation, is due to the cooperation of the medical profession and laymen, and to the complete support given by the press, radio, and citizenry of the State.

Realizing that thousands of lives could be saved from cancer if the public were educated to be alert to the cancer danger signals and to receive early diagnosis, the New Jersey division asked the press of the State to enter an editorial contest, thus insuring wide dissemination of news about cancer.

With the cooperation of the New Jersey Press Association, the contest resulted in awards to three daily newspapers and three weeklies. Award plaques were personally contributed by George E. Stringfellow, vice president of Thomas A. Edison, Inc., and president of the Cancer Society, New Jersey division. Mr. President, I do not know of any citizen in this land who has so unselfishly contributed more of his time and his means in the leadership to find a cure for this affliction than has George E. Stringfellow. I am glad at this time to pay this tribute to this outstanding citizen, and also to the State of New Jersey.

With the aid of the great press and radio of this country, I believe that within a short time a general and active interest can be aroused to even strengthen this fight against a bodily disease and to speed the day when a general cure for it will be found.

The six winning editorials appeared in six newspapers. The three daily newspapers which were chosen were the Union City Hudson Dispatch, the Paterson Evening News, and the Passaic Herald News; the three weeklies which were chosen were the Merchantville Community News, the Cranford Citizen and Chronicle, and the Maplewood News.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these editorials upon this important subject be made a part of my remarks.

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

[From the Union City (N. J.) Hudson Dispatch of April 19, 1947]

CANCER DEATHS UP NEARLY 100 PERCENT; WHAT ARE YOU GOING TO DO ABOUT IT?

Every 3 minutes on the average, somebody in this country dies of cancer.

The death rate from cancer in New Jersey has increased nearly 100 percent in the past quarter century. It killed 183.5 per 100,000 in 1945 compared with 87.5 in 1920.

It is estimated that 17,000,000 Americans now living are doomed to die from cancer. This scourge is the greatest and cruelest killer of those from 35 to 55 years.

Cancer is No. 1 "malady murderer" in the country, only second to heart disease. In New Jersey in 1945 there were 7,077 who died of cancer, compared with an average of 3,107 from 1920 to 1924.

Cancer is killing 184,000 a year throughout the country—that's more than 200 times the number killed in the catastrophe at Texas City.

What are you going to do about it?

"What can I do about it?" you may ask.

You can help to raise the \$12,000,000 to fight cancer during this month's campaign. The quota for New Jersey is \$750,000, for Hudson County, \$95,000, and for Bergen County, \$77,000. Here's what your contribution would be used to accomplish:

1. Inform men, women, and children everywhere of the danger signals and urge people to consult a doctor immediately at any sign of cancer. Remember, one in three may be saved through early diagnosis and prompt treatment. Money spent to spread knowledge will help your doctor help you.

2. Provide better facilities for prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of cancer. Cancer treatment requires radium—X-ray equipment—skilled personnel. Money spent for these facilities will help your doctor help you.

3. Expand widely the scientific research attack now being conducted by the National Research Council in 90 scientific centers in the United States alone. Cancer research must expand its work in radioactive substances which, according to authorities, may open up a new world of possibilities. Research, it is hoped, may lead to more effective treatment and possibly even the elimination of cancer. Money spent on cancer research will help your doctor help you.

Remember, that 25 cents of every dollar you give will be used for research to discover the cause and cure of cancer; 15 cents will be used for a Nation-wide educational campaign, and 60 cents will be spent in New Jersey to aid in improving equipment and services in existing cancer clinics; to establish new clinics, to aid in establishing and maintaining State-wide tissue diagnostic services, for nursing service in homes, and many other activities.

It's up to you to decide what to do about stopping the scourge of cancer in New Jersey and throughout the country.

Make your contribution today.

[From the Paterson (N. J.) Evening News of April 18, 1947]

STOP A MINUTE AND GIVE THOUGHT TO THIS—ARE YOU DOOMED TO A HORRIBLE DEATH?

"Give To Conquer Cancer" is the slogan of the appeal for funds to battle this scourge through research, education, and service. The need is great. An estimated 184,000 persons will die of cancer in the United States this year, an average of one fatality every 3 minutes. No respecter of social position or age, cancer kills four times as many children as does infantile paralysis.

While cancer statistics are horrifying, there is a bright side—a side which has grown brighter since the first extensive effort was organized in 1945, and which will grow even brighter if the present appeal has the wide public support it merits.

With funds raised the last 2 years, 94 research projects have been financed and are being conducted by outstanding scientists. Three times as many projects await funds to be started. Facilities and expert personnel have been provided in numerous hospital clinics, which report many cures. The field army volunteers have been aided in their year-around education and service program. Knowledge is being spread that cancer is curable if the public can be made sufficiently alert to have regular physical examinations. At last progress is being made by the weapons of research, education, and service, weapons which can be put to full use only if everybody will give to conquer cancer.

As a duty, and as a measure of the personal happiness that come from assured health, we must give freely and gladly to save human lives, perhaps your life.

Seventeen million Americans now living are doomed to fall victims to the greatest killer of all time—cancer.

Chances are, based on present conditions, that one out of every two families in America will be bereaved from this cause.

There is one chance in eight that you will be a victim.

Every 3 minutes some American dies of cancer—504 every day, 184,000 every year.

And the rate is going up.

Yet cancer is not necessarily fatal.

Even on the basis of our present slight knowledge of this dread disease, one out of every three victims can be saved through early diagnosis and prompt treatment.

And some day the cause and the remedy will be found.

But the trouble is that we have done so little and spent such a slight sum against this most vicious of all enemies—the greatest and cruelest killer of all women between the ages of 35 and 55, and the second greatest killer of men.

We spent \$317,000,000,000 from Pearl Harbor to VJ-day to win World War II. Our total dead were 280,000.

During the same period our country spent only \$2,000,000 in the research fight against cancer—and the cost in lives for that period was 607,000.

Cancer has claimed more lives than all the wars the world ever has known.

These are the facts and figures which caused Congress and the President to designate April as Cancer Control Month.

Cancer can be combated—and someday can be conquered, medical men believe—by research, education, and service. The American Cancer Society's campaign is directed to those ends.

Whether the appeal is based upon cancer's economic waste, the personal misery it causes, or the family tragedies that result from it, no one can be deaf to a plea for funds to war upon it.

Won't you—as one of the eight who may fall victim or as a member of one of the two families which cancer will strike—do your part?

Police Commissioner Jack Stern is chairman of the Paterson Cancer Fund drive and responsible for the raising of the city's \$40,000 quota. On the shoulders of Harold W. Hutchinson rests the responsibility of raising the county quota of \$60,000 including Paterson's \$40,000.

The Cancer Society has no paid organization and is aided only by the efforts of volunteer workers. There is great need for such workers and the News appeals to them to come forward.

Phone Mrs. Edwin Lee, Lambert 3-6686 and offer your services. Do it now.

Contributions may be sent to headquarters of the Passaic County Cancer Society in room 104 of the County Administration Building.

Have you contributed? Have you done your share or are you just one of those who don't care?

What are you willing to do?

[From the Passaic (N. J.) Herald News of April 30, 1947]

YOU CAN HELP IN THIS GREAT FIGHT

Bob Bremner was editor of the Passaic Daily Herald and a member of the Sixty-third Congress when Dr. Howard A. Kelly came to his bedside in a Baltimore sanitarium in 1914. A million dollars worth of tubed radium was packed into his shoulder.

"There is nothing more that medical science can do for you, Bob," said the great physician from Johns Hopkins.

"Let's talk about something more important—about my industrial safety bill," said the indomitable Scot who smiled at death. "My life hasn't been worth one-tenth of the effort put forth to save it. I am ready for the scrap heap but I feel the cutting and the doctoring has added to our knowledge of how best to fight cancer. The day is coming when science will conquer it. I would rather be with those who were in the fight than be one of those who reap the benefit."

Then Robert Gunn Bremner died, aged 39.

Hugh Lendrim was treasurer of the newspaper in those days. He loved Bob Bremner as though he were a younger brother. Bremner's long illness and cheerful fight impressed him deeply. When Mrs. Lendrim died of the same cruel malady, he provided in his will for the establishment of the Josephine Lendrim Clinic at Paterson General Hospital, where radium, X-ray, and surgery since then have saved many lives.

One of Paterson General's former patients, an elderly man from East Sixth Street, Clifton, was waiting in the Passaic YWCA lobby to greet Dr. George T. Pack, after the famous cancer surgeon concluded an address last year.

"Don't you remember me, Doctor?" he asked. "Perhaps you can't; there are so many. You saved my life 6 years ago when you cut away part of my tongue."

But a Passaic city employee who is now Dr. Pack's patient at Paterson General can't hope for that everyday miracle. Too much time went by. Medical science has not found the answer that Congressman Bremner hoped for 33 years ago.

When it is found, it will be due very likely to the research work which the American Cancer Society is supporting through grants of \$3,500,000 to research laboratories and medical colleges. Many of our ablest scientists are engaged in that humanitarian study of cause and cure.

Passaic County Chapter of the society is appealing to the public this month for \$60,000, of which Passaic is asked to contribute \$18,000 and Clifton \$6,000. The campaign will continue through May.

Passaic General Hospital, whose well-equipped cancer clinic received \$4,678 for radium and equipment from the society, will be helped by this campaign. So will the

clinics at Barnert Memorial, Paterson General and St. Joseph's Hospitals. Special medications will be paid for; nursing service will be supported.

Cancer ranks second to heart disease among all causes of death. It is responsible for one death among every eight. All who reach middle age live within its shadow.

Harold W. Hutchinson, 150 Ellison Street, Paterson, is Passaic County chairman of the cancer campaign. Herman P. J. Hoffman, Administration Building, Hackensack, is Bergen County chairman. Henry C. Whitehead heads the campaign in Passaic, John C. Barbour in Clifton.

Your check, mailed today to any of these campaign directors, will help to speed the day when the malady that kills one out of eight will come under control.

[From the Merchantville (N. J.) Community News of April 17, 1947]

WE CAN THINK OF NO EXCUSE FOR DODGING THE CANCER DRIVE

As president of New Jersey Division, Inc., of the American Cancer Society, George E. Stringfellow has said:

It is the responsibility of the doctors to advise how, where and for what medical facilities, programs and services money shall be spent.

It is the responsibility of the laymen to raise the money and to administer the funds in accordance with sound business practices.

This arrangement would, it can be supposed, be generally accepted by laymen without argument. Still, leading laymen giving their time, effort, and money to the fight against cancer would be concerned in the expenditure of the fund, and there could be some who felt their wardenship included watching the medical end. But Mr. Stringfellow's plan is best.

This agreement seems necessary as well as wise. The public asked to contribute this month to the drive for funds to fight cancer should be assured that its money will be properly spent and not wasted by questionable experiments, medically or administratively.

With the question settled, there will be no excuse for the tightwad and the responsibility-dodger to evade an obligation through asking: "Who spends it, and how?"

Too many people find excuses for their selfishness when drives come along, by knowing something like one of the stories of Red Cross charging for doughnuts, or a snooty girl being rude to a soldier at a Red Cross post. Too many people expect the other fellow to give the share they owe to movements that contribute to national or local relief and welfare.

Most men or women would be offended if asked if they were inferior, or normal good citizens. Yet one falls short of being a normal good citizen if he doesn't contribute what his means permit toward every drive that is necessary to maintain the organized services for reducing suffering and saving lives.

It isn't necessary to repeat the object of this drive for a fund to combat cancer. It is a rare case, indeed, where one of us can't name a relative or friend or an acquaintance who has died of cancer. We don't like the pressure practiced in frightening people to contribute to a war chest with the reminder that they might be victims. Yet that is true.

But the fight is to save future generations. This will be done through having all the money necessary to keep the best scientists on full time in their researches, their experiments; in having plenty of money to buy what science requires for its work.

For the present, the gains in the battle against cancer are many. The constant crusade has made the average physician more cancer-conscious. Like the fight against tuberculosis, now so effective in widespread X-ray examinations, the family doctor is

alert in watching for signs of cancer, the public is being educated to seek immediate medical advice where any ailment indicates a character that could point to cancer.

Cancer is being stopped now, and some day its elusive mysteries will be revealed. But today we should make it possible that the mother of the poorest child, the worker in a factory, the person of moderate circumstances, reluctant to turn to modest savings, should know there is a clinic nearby prepared to give them free examinations and treatment if necessary.

Our hospitals are helped in fighting cancer through the State drive. We can't raise too much money. Camden County should have a hospital department with no other interest than cancer.

As to contributing to the drive, we can add that the failure of a canvasser to call for a donation doesn't excuse nongiving. A contribution left at a bank or at any reliable store will reach the fund.

[From the Cranford (N. J.) Citizen and Chronicle of March 20, 1947]

A TERRIBLE TOLL

Did you know that one in every two families in Cranford will be struck by cancer?

This horrible disease will kill one in every eight persons now living here.

This is a fact not only locally but in every community in this wonderfully rich and beautiful land of ours—this land of wealth and luxury.

The American Cancer Society tells us this terrible toll of death will occur unless we do something about it. And the local chapter, which will conduct a drive for funds in April, tells us what we can do to help avert this appalling tragedy.

First, we can give—give every penny possible to the society's drive for funds so that the goal may be reached. Then we can pay heed to what they tell us about the danger of cancer.

One thing imperative is the need for early detection of the disease, because in this way, lives can be saved. At least one-third of the 17,000,000 Americans now living who are doomed to die of cancer, could be saved if the disease were detected in time and proper treatment given. So another thing that we can do is to become cancer conscious and see our doctors for a complete medical examination at least once a year.

The American Cancer Society points out that there are three acceptable methods of treating cancer—with surgery, radium, and the X-ray. Recognizing this fact, and with the knowledge that in many cases early cancer can be cured, we can face the threat of this scourge with courage and realism.

All the wealth in the world cannot save us from death but there is one way in which we can use our money to keep the grim specter of cancer from us—by putting it to work in research projects where scientists are trying to learn the cause of cancer and perfect a cure for it.

Remember: When you make a contribution to this cause, you are really helping to save the lives of many people right here in Cranford.

[From the Maplewood (N. J.) News of April 3, 1947]

ONE IN EIGHT WILL DIE

No matter how objective one may wish to be, there are times when a person's thoughts, feelings, and actions are influenced directly by his own experiences or by the experiences of those close to him. It is perhaps for that reason that we feel so strongly about the effort now under way, locally and throughout the Nation, to obtain funds with which to fight cancer. We have hated cancer for 18 long years, hated it since the Easter of 1929 when our own mother died of this cruel disease.

There has been progress in the battle against cancer in the intervening years, but not nearly so much progress as in other disease areas. A vast amount of scientific exploration still is necessary before it will be possible to have all the answers about causes, preventives, and cures. And a great amount of general education of the public at large is necessary in order to create an awareness of the disease and its death-dealing blows.

The American Cancer Society, which is leading the attack against cancer, presents these startling statistics:

Cancer strikes on the average one out of every two families.

Cancer is the greatest and cruelest killer of American women between the ages of 35 and 55.

Cancer is the second greatest killer of men. One in every eight living Americans is destined to die of cancer.

And here are some Maplewood statistics: Of a total of 209 deaths here in 1946 from all causes, 27 were from cancer. Only the various kinds of heart ailments exceeded this total, the heart figure being 74. Of the cancer deaths, 15 were of men and 12 of women; by age groups, there was one in the 35-44 class, three in 45-54; nine, 55-64; eight 65-74, and six 75-84.

Money in itself will not stop cancer, but the society, in its bid for at least \$12,000,000 nationally, has a three-pronged program: Inform men, women, and children everywhere of the cancer danger signals in order to promote early diagnosis and treatment; provide better facilities for prevention, diagnosis, and treatment (effective treatment requires radium, X-ray equipment, and more skilled personnel); expand widely the scientific research attack now being conducted by the National Research Council.

The Maplewood committee's objective is to exceed the \$8,900 subscribed by Maplewoodians last year. Since that is an average of considerably less than 50 cents per resident it should be an easy goal to reach. It should be easy to double that amount.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I am very glad, indeed, that the distinguished Senator from West Virginia has made these remarks about a distinguished citizen of my State, Mr. George E. Stringfellow, and I am glad to join with the Senator in paying tribute to Mr. Stringfellow for his work in connection with cancer research.

BUDGET ESTIMATES FOR BUREAU OF RECLAMATION, INTERIOR DEPARTMENT

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, before suggesting the absence of a quorum, as a preliminary to taking up consideration of the unfinished business, I should like to ask unanimous consent to make a brief statement relative to reclamation and irrigation and power, as provided by the program of the Department of the Interior.

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

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, never before in the history of our country has there been more general interest than exists today in the continuing program for the development of our natural resources by the Interior Department's Reclamation Bureau, through reclamation, power, and related projects, and the effort of the Corps of Engineers on river-and-harbor and flood-control projects.

Interest in the efficient and effective progress of these activities extends to almost every resident, both rural and urban, throughout the 17 so-called western reclamation States, but it is of almost

equal interest to the other States because of the great asset value to the Nation at large of a comprehensive and permanent conservation effort.

So that Congress and the general public may have for convenient reference a list of the construction appropriations proposed in the budget just submitted to Congress for the fiscal year beginning next July, I am requesting permission to insert in the RECORD herewith a list of the amounts approved by the Budget Bureau for the use of the Reclamation Bureau in the construction of irrigation works and multiple-purpose projects to develop our land and water power.

It is to be remembered, of course, that these are subject to review and alteration by the Appropriations Committees of Congress, and by the House and Senate, and that the estimates by the Budget Bureau are not necessarily binding.

Also, for the information of those who are interested in having a similar convenient list of construction estimates for flood-control and river-and-harbor work proposed to be carried on in the next fiscal year by the Corps of Engineers, I will say that such a list was published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for January 12, 1948, on page 94, at the request of Representative ENGEL of Michigan.

It will be noted that the total amount of funds approved by the Budget Bureau for submission to Congress for construction activities of the Reclamation Bureau during the next fiscal year is \$257,025,461. This figure is compared with an amount actually approved for the current fiscal year of \$211,102,771.

The total proposed for the various reclamation projects in the Missouri Basin development program amounts to \$58,325,000 for the Reclamation Bureau and \$5,575,000 for other cooperating Department of the Interior units, making a grand total of \$63,900,000. This is indicative of the advancement of many projects into the general-construction phase and is compared with a total during the current fiscal year of \$33,407,110.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nebraska?

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

Bureau of Reclamation—Estimates of new appropriations for construction included in the budget for the fiscal year 1949—Project and amount

RECLAMATION FUND, CONSTRUCTION	
1. Paonia project, Colorado.....	\$471,000
2. Pine River project, Colorado.....	60,000
3. Boise project, Idaho, Payette division.....	750,000
4. Boise project, Anderson Ranch Dam.....	5,800,000
5. Lewiston Orchards project, Idaho.....	1,136,000
6. Minidoka project, Idaho.....	(¹)

¹On the Minidoka project, Idaho, the budget estimate proposes that the limitation on the amount available for surveys and preconstruction work in connection with the north side pumping division stated in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1947, be increased from \$100,000 to \$770,000.

RECLAMATION FUND, CONSTRUCTION—Continued	
7. Sun River project, Montana.....	\$45,000
8. Tucumcari project, New Mexico.....	1,540,000
9. Rio Grande project, New Mexico-Texas.....	100,000
10. W. C. Austin project, Oklahoma.....	320,000
11. Deschutes project, Oregon.....	230,000
12. Owyhee project, Oregon.....	150,000
13. Ogden River project, Utah.....	34,000
14. Provo River project, Utah.....	1,200,000
15. Yakima project, Washington, Roza division.....	1,497,000
16. Riverton project, Wyoming.....	750,000
17. Shoshone project, Wyoming, power division.....	430,000
Total, reclamation fund, construction.....	14,513,000

RECLAMATION FUND, REHABILITATION AND BETTERMENT

The 1949 budget includes estimates for commencement of rehabilitation and betterment on the following completed projects in not to exceed the following amounts, payable from the reclamation fund:

1. Salt River project, Arizona.....	556,500
2. Yuma project, Arizona.....	500,000
3. Orland project, California.....	50,000
4. Bitterroot project, Montana.....	40,000
5. Milk River project, Montana.....	103,500
6. North Platte project, Nebraska-Wyoming.....	750,000
7. Humboldt project, Nevada.....	225,000
8. Carlsbad project, New Mexico.....	400,000
9. Hyrum project, Utah.....	48,000
10. Yakima project, Washington.....	151,000
Total, reclamation fund, rehabilitation and betterment.....	2,824,000
Total, construction and rehabilitation and betterment projects, reclamation fund.....	17,337,000

GENERAL FUND, CONSTRUCTION

1. Gila project, Arizona.....	3,000,000
2. Davis Dam project, Arizona-Nevada.....	24,000,000
3. Parker Dam power project, Arizona-California.....	260,000
4. Central Valley project, California.....	41,500,000
5. Kern River project, California.....	50,000
6. Colorado-Big Thompson project, Colorado.....	23,000,000
7. Hungry Horse project, Montana.....	9,850,000
8. Columbia Basin project, Washington.....	48,000,000
Total, general fund, construction.....	149,660,000

OTHER CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS

1. Fort Peck project, Montana.....	2,200,000
2. Missouri River Basin.....	63,900,000
3. Boulder Canyon project (Hoover Dam).....	1,920,000
4. Boulder Canyon project (All-American Canal).....	4,484,000

²This figure represents the lump sum estimated for the Missouri River Basin, fiscal year 1949. The break-down of this amount is set forth in the table which appears below.

OTHER CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS—Continued	
5. Colorado River front work and levee system.....	\$1,160,000
Total, other construction projects.....	73,664,000
Grand total, 1949 estimates of new appropriations for construction.....	240,661,000
Estimated unobligated balance July 1, 1948, for use on construction projects in fiscal year 1949.....	*16,364,461
Grand total of construction funds, fiscal year 1949.....	257,025,461

³The total estimated unobligated balance July 1, 1948, for construction is \$20,321,056, of which \$3,956,595 is for use on construction projects subsequent to fiscal year 1948, leaving \$16,364,461 available for use on construction projects during fiscal year 1949.

Break-down of Missouri River Basin project program, fiscal years 1948-49

PHASE A—UNITS SELECTED FOR CONSTRUCTION

Angostura, S. Dak.....	\$3,600,000
Bostwick, Nebr.-Kans.....	3,000,000
Boysen, Wyo.....	6,108,000
Belle Fourche, Wyo.....	550,000
Cannonball, N. Dak.....	950,000
Canyon Ferry, Mont.....	3,500,000
Cedar Bluff, Kans.....	3,600,000
Frenchman-Cambridge, Nebr.....	8,900,000
Glendo, Wyo.....	1,000,000
Grand River, S. Dak.....	1,800,000
Heart River, N. Dak.....	2,347,000
Kortes, Wyo.....	4,800,000
Moreau River, S. Dak.....	995,000
Narrows, Colo.....	2,000,000
Powder River, Wyo.-Mont.....	1,000,000
Region 6 headquarters, Montana.....	5,000
St. Francis, Colo.-Kans.....	2,000,000
Transmission lines.....	5,053,000
Yellowstone pumping, Montana-North Dakota.....	700,000
O. & M. during construction.....	50,000
Subtotal, phase A.....	51,958,000

PHASE B—UNITS BEING PREPARED FOR CONSTRUCTION

Bad River, S. Dak.....	15,000
Big Horn pumping, Wyoming.....	20,000
Columbus, Nebr.....	200,000
Grand Island, Nebr.....	500,000
Hardin, Mont.....	500,000
Jefferson River, Mont.....	100,000
Lower Marias, Mont.....	300,000
Middle Loup, Nebr.....	300,000
Missouri-Souris, Mont.-N. Dak.....	700,000
Montana pumping, Montana.....	50,000
North Dakota pumping, North Dakota.....	50,000
Oahe-James River, S. Dak.....	400,000
Rapid Valley, S. Dak.....	55,000
Shoshone extensions, Wyoming.....	100,000
South Dakota pumping, South Dakota.....	30,000
Sun River, Mont.....	50,000
Tongue River, Wyo.....	78,000
White River, S. Dak.....	30,000
Wind River, Wyo.....	20,000
Subtotal, phase B.....	3,498,000

PHASE C—CONTINUING WORK ON THE GENERAL PLAN OF DEVELOPMENT

Big Horn Basin, Wyo.-Mont.....	80,000
Cheyenne River, S. Dak.....	35,000

PHASE C—CONTINUING WORK ON THE GENERAL PLAN OF DEVELOPMENT—CONTINUED

Clarks Fork, Wyo.-Mont.....	\$6,000
Garrison diversion, North Dakota	78,000
Helena Valley, Mont.....	30,000
Judith River, Mont.....	15,000
Kansas Basin, Colo.-Nebr.-Kans.	400,000
Little Missouri, N. Dak.....	15,000
Lower Platte Basin, Nebr.....	700,000
Nilan, Mont.....	8,000
Niobrara Basin, Wyo.-Nebr.....	200,000
North Platte Basin, Colo.-Wyo.-	
Nebr.....	180,000
North Republican, Colo.-Nebr....	14,000
South Platte Basin, Colo.-Wyo.-	
Nebr.....	300,000
Three Forks, Mont.....	428,000
Upper Marias, Mont.....	50,000
Wilson, Kans.....	100,000
General:	
Power studies, region 6.....	\$30,000
Reports staff, region 6.....	100,000
Subtotal, phase C.....	2,769,000
PHASE D	
For work in cooperation or in	
connection with the activities	
of the Corps of Engineers.....	100,000
Total, Bureau of Reclama-	
tion.....	58,325,000
Other Department of the Interior	
agencies:	
Bureau of Land Manage-	
ment.....	450,000
Bureau of Mines.....	150,000
Fish and Wildlife Service....	425,000
Geological Survey.....	4,150,000
National Park Service.....	200,000
Office of Indian Affairs.....	200,000
Total, other departmental	
units.....	5,575,000
Total, Missouri River Basin	
project.....	63,900,000
Total program, Bureau of Recla-	
mation.....	58,325,000
Less transfer to Denver office (in-	
cluded above).....	4,560,000
Total obligations, Bureau	
of Reclamation.....	53,765,000
Appropriations to the Bureau of Reclamation	
for construction, fiscal year 1948	
Fund or project:	
Reclamation fund:	Amount
Regular.....	\$11,876,750
Supplemental.....	72,000
General fund:	
Regular.....	49,841,288
Supplemental.....	31,939,000
Fort Peck project, Mon-	
tana.....	1,500,000
Missouri River Basin:	
Regular.....	17,000,000
Supplemental.....	6,400,000
Boulder Canyon project	
(Hoover Dam).....	435,000
Boulder Canyon project	
(All-American Canal)....	3,245,000
Colorado River front work	
and levee system.....	1,000,000
Total new appropria-	
tions.....	123,309,038
Unobligated balance for con-	
struction, fiscal year 1948....	87,793,733
Total.....	211,102,771

¹Of this amount, it is today estimated by the Interior Department that \$20,321,056 will be carried into the fiscal year 1949 as an unobligated balance.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the Senate has now approached the point at which we are ready to take up the unfinished business, and 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	Gurney	Murray
Baldwin	Hatch	Myers
Ball	Hawkes	O'Connor
Barkley	Hayden	O'Daniel
Brewster	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Hill	Overton
Bridges	Hoyer	Reed
Brooks	Holland	Revercomb
Buck	Ives	Robertson, Va.
Bushfield	Jenner	Robertson, Wyo.
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Byrd	Junston, S. C.	Saitonstall
Cain	Kem	Smith
Capehart	Knowland	Sparkman
Capper	Langer	Stennis
Chavez	Lodge	Stewart
Connally	Lucas	Taft
Cooper	McCarran	Taylor
Donnell	McCarthy	Thomas, Okla.
Downey	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Dworshak	McFarland	Thye
Eastland	McGrath	Vandenberg
Eaton	McKellar	Watkins
Ellender	McMahon	Wherry
Ferguson	Magnuson	Wiley
Flanders	Maybank	Williams
Fulbright	Millikin	Wilson
George	Moore	Young
Green	Morse	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] is necessarily absent on official business of the Committee on Public Lands.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] is absent on account of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on official business.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] is absent on public business.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. UMSTEAD], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

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

PROMOTION OF FOREIGN RELATIONS BY INTERCHANGE OF PERSONS, KNOWLEDGE, ETC.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3342) to enable the Government of the United States more effectively to carry on its foreign relations by means of promotions of the interchange of persons, knowledge, and skill between people of the United States and other countries.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The immediate question now before the Senate is on agreeing to the first amendment of the committee, which the clerk will state.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 5, after the words "Educational Exchange Act of", it is proposed to strike out "1947" and insert "1948."

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, House bill 3342, the pending measure, which, according to its amended title, is "An act to promote a better understanding of the

United States among the peoples of the world and to strengthen cooperative international relations," is the Voice of America program. This bill, which has been the subject of intensive study and considerable debate in the Congress and in its committees for a period of over 2 years, is an attempt to give legislative authority to certain activities that have been carried on by the State Department since the close of the war. Let me repeat that the bill represents an attempt to give legislative authority to certain activities which have already been carried on. It is really the consolidation of the activities of the State Department's Division of Cultural Relations, the Office of Inter-American Affairs and the so-called Office of War Information, which carried on during the war, and which aimed to provide an intelligent understanding of the status and progress of the war effort and of the war policies and activities of the Government. After the close of the war, it was felt advisable to continue these activities which aimed to explain the spirit and purpose of America to other nations of the world.

The so-called Mundt bill, which is the foundation of the present proposed legislation, passed the House of Representatives last June by a vote of 272 to 97. The Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate immediately took up the bill and reported it favorably shortly thereafter with certain amendments, but it did not come to a vote before the end of the first session of the Eightieth Congress. A Senate resolution was adopted, however, providing for the setting up of a special committee to investigate the whole matter and to cooperate with a corresponding committee of the House of Representatives in visiting Europe this past summer and reporting back to the Congress not later than February 1, 1948.

THE TRIP ABROAD

Following up the directive contained in the Senate resolution, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] appointed as a subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, to make this study, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH]—myself—as chairman. Acting with a corresponding committee appointed by the House of Representatives, composed of Representative MUNDT, chairman, and Representatives GORDON, JARMAN, JUDD, LODGE, MANSFIELD, and LAWRENCE SMITH, we visited the capitals of Europe together during the months of September and October. We made a careful study of the operation of the so-called information and educational program of the State Department in these various parts of Europe. The committee is now engaged in preparing a report, country by country, of the places visited and indicating more specifically than it is necessary to do at this moment, the situation as we found it in those countries. It is our hope and belief that the report, which will shortly be presented to the Congress, may be of aid

in bringing about a better understanding of the so-called information and educational exchange program, and may also be a helpful guide to the new administration being set up in the State Department to direct these activities.

Let me emphasize at that point, Mr. President, that a new administration is being set up in the State Department, with a new Assistant Secretary of State at its head, whose name has just been announced, and whose nomination will shortly come before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee for action.

Mr. President, I think it is fitting at this point in my remarks to acknowledge our appreciation to the War Department for its courtesy in extending to us the use of an Army plane—a C-54—with a most excellent and attentive crew, composed of the following members: Capt. R. W. Carroll, Capt. William E. Gregg, Master Sgt. Frank Sayho, Tech. Sgt. Theodore M. Lucas, Capt. Edward M. Rubich, Capt. Paul H. Pflug, Staff Sgt. William P. Truesdell, Staff Sgt. L. M. Harris, and Master Sgt. Steve Fedinick.

The party was in the immediate charge of Col. Paul Tombaugh, to whom we owe our thanks for the effective way in which the strenuous schedule was carried out.

The joint committee staff was made up on the House side of Mr. John Easton, of the House Foreign Affairs Committee; Messrs. Rewinkle and Ravendahl, of the State Department, and Mr. Morrell; on the Senate side, Mr. A. B. Hermann, administrative assistant of the chairman, and Henry Holthusen, of New York.

As chairman of the Senate group, I desire to express my acknowledgment to Chairman MUNDT and his colleagues of the House group and the appreciation of all of us on the Senate side for the effective way the Members of the House worked with us in our common endeavor to understand and make some contribution to our American foreign policy in dealing with this difficult subject.

I desire to add a word of personal appreciation of the fine assistance and counsel I have received from my colleagues in the Senate, and the opportunity that it gave us all to know each other better in taking a trip of this kind, joined as we were in our common interest to serve our country more effectively. While the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] did not actually accompany the party on the trip, he went to Europe independently last summer, and he has filed with the committee a separate and most important report containing his observations made from a somewhat different viewpoint.

The trip as a whole consumed nearly 2 months, and the committee or some of its members at least covered every capital in Europe except Yugoslavia, Albania, Russia, and the Irish Free State. We covered the important countries of western Europe, the Scandinavian countries, Germany, the so-called satellite countries behind the iron curtain, Turkey, Greece, Italy, Spain, and Portugal. We had the unique experience of feeling the comparative "atmospheres" of the free countries of western Europe, now included within the European recovery plan, and the "unfree" police states suffering

in fear behind the iron curtain. We saw with our own eyes and experienced the pattern of the Communist infiltration. We felt the influence of misrepresentation, falsification, division, chaos, compromise, despair, and ultimate absorption.

We moved in the States where we could watch the liquidation of the opposition. We could feel the fear that was engendered in the peoples of these countries when the opposition leaders were seized and charged with treason. We arrived in Bulgaria just after Petkov had been murdered. We were in Rumania after Maniu had been imprisoned, but before he was tried and condemned to a life of solitary confinement. We were in Hungary after Nagy had been thrown out, and before Pfeiffer, with whom we conversed, had been compelled to flee for his life. We were in Poland and talked with Mikolajczyk before he was compelled to flee. And, of course, we knew before any of these incidents of the case of Mihailovich in Yugoslavia.

Mr. President, while we were experiencing these successive nightmares which we could hardly believe there was constantly brought to our attention the incessant falsification of our country and the charges that we in the United States had imperialistic designs on Europe; that the proposals of Secretary Marshall, now known as the Marshall plan, were a frantic effort to divert an inevitable American economic depression by unloading our surplus on Europe—were an attempt to give priority in the recovery of Europe to the German aggressors; that it was a plot to restore the military might of Germany as a United States instrument to dominate Europe; that the recovery program was clearly an act of imperialism to make all of Europe a dependency of the United States.

Perhaps because of these vivid experiences and these outrageous misrepresentations of the spirit and purpose of our country we were peculiarly sensitive to the fact that we were woefully inadequate as a nation, through our embassies and legations, to present our story. We did not have the means adequately to staff our representatives in the various countries of Europe with people equipped to contact the local press, to use the radio, properly to distribute such information agencies as our motion pictures; to aid our pitifully small libraries to meet the daily demands everywhere of people to know more about America and what America really did stand for. Coupled with all this, we found a real eagerness among natives with whom we talked to come to America and to exchange ideas with us, and to have our people come to Europe to tell those in Europe why and how America has become the great nation that she is.

CONCLUSIONS FROM THIS TRIP

Mr. President, I think I am justified in drawing certain conclusions from our trip, for my colleagues as well as myself. I have talked these matters over with them quite fully, and I should like to present our conclusions briefly:

First. The United States today is not understood in these countries, and our present service, acting through our em-

bassies and legations, is wholly inadequate to make us properly understood. This does not mean boastful propaganda, but simply means telling the truth;

Second. The present hostile campaign by Russia, which has been intensified since the European recovery program has begun, makes it imperative that we make it clear to the people of these countries, as distinguished from their rulers, what we are trying to do for Europe and why we are trying to do it. The constant reiteration of lies and misrepresentations does have its effect and does leave questions in the minds of people who otherwise would be friendly to the United States. For example, in Czechoslovakia, which is slowly being absorbed by the Communist movement, the question was seriously asked of us whether we did intend to build up Germany industrially, so that she might become our instrument to control Europe.

The extent to which the official Soviet Government goes in its attacks against the United States and its motives is almost unbelievable to any American who respects honesty and truth.

To illustrate the viciousness of these attacks, I should like to cite several examples.

The first concerns a bitter attack made by Radio Moscow only a few days ago against the efforts of charitably minded Americans to alleviate starvation in the war-torn countries of the world.

I quote this Russian broadcast, which was sent out a few days ago over Radio Moscow in the German language to the German people:

Only simple-minded people could have believed that American aims in the form of CARE parcels would fill the stomachs of the miners. These CARE parcels were advertised to an almost unbelievable extent by Anglo-United States propaganda which stated that the parcels contained 40,000 calories. Examination proved, however, that the parcels contained a multitude of various goods including toilet paper. Moreover, these parcels are being debited against Germany's account and in the future will have to be paid for in hard cash.

Only American manufacturers are benefiting through the CARE parcels. According to reports in the German democratic press (Communist), American racketeers have made a profit of \$15,000,000 already during the first months of the CARE parcel scheme. The CARE parcel system introduced into the Ruhr mines by the Americans is nothing else but the notorious sweated labor system designed to exploit the miners, and its perilous results are already becoming noticeable.

Here are further examples of this vicious propaganda:

To Germany, Radio Moscow said:

No other name than "Hitlerite Anschluss" describes this Austrian federation hatched in Germany, this anti-Communist Catholic state designed to unite Bavaria and Austria and the western territories under the wings of the United States dollar and the Vatican cross. This federation displays only too blatantly the stamp "Made in the U. S. A.," which is born out by the fact that both Cardinal Spellman and the bank of Pierpont Morgan are showing unhealthy interest in it.

In Italian to Italy, Radio Moscow said:

United States warmongers agree in supporting a military aggression against the Soviet Union. Some of them even want the United States to drop atom bombs on Soviet cities even now.

To the Czechs, Radio Moscow said:

The Marshall plan is not merely a plan for the economic and political enslavement of European countries by the United States. It is at the same time a plan to organize military strategic bases in Europe for United States imperialism, a plan to accumulate supplies of strategic raw materials for the United States with the help of European suppliers. United States expansionists circles demand that United States loans and deliveries to certain European countries be made only in exchange for certain territorial concessions.

In English to North America, Radio Moscow said:

The American bankers and monopolists have no desire to combat inflation for they need it as a weapon of attack on the wide masses. Indeed, New York business circles are already discussing what they call the need for a reserve army of four or five million unemployed which will help them to keep wages down and crush the efforts of the trade-unions defending the rights of the working peoples. All of these methods of plundering the United States masses are directly connected with the Marshall plan.

Mr. President, at this point in my remarks I should like to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my address excerpts from other broadcasts from Moscow, which further illustrate what Russia is saying about us. The ones which I have read are illustrative, but I feel that the others are important for the RECORD, to show the extent to which this program of vilification has been carried.

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

[From the Washington Star of December 10, 1947]

WHAT THE RUSSIANS ARE SAYING OF US

The Moscow radio, broadcasting in Persian to the Near and Middle East, said:

"The generous American help in dollars and armaments to international reaction has not had the desired results for United States imperialists. In the struggle between the forces of reaction and those of democracy, the latter have gained the upper hand, and are more and more strengthened. Hence the ruling United States circles are striving with greater obstinacy to weaken the people's resistance from within, and to sow the seeds of discord in the democratic camp.

"These objects must be realized by those statesmen, circles, and parties who are linked with imperialistic policy and foreign capital. Such parties and statesmen are ready to carry out without argument the orders of their overseas masters. Even if these orders run contrary to the interests of their countries they do not fail to obey like slaves."

[From the Washington Star of December 11, 1947]

WHAT THE RUSSIANS ARE SAYING OF US

The Moscow radio, broadcasting in English to the United Kingdom, said:

"The Foreign Ministers Conference in London has been marked by a consistent effort of the Soviet delegation to reach a speedy European peace settlement. In fact it was the sincere desire of the Soviet delegation to reach an agreement which from the outset secured concerted decisions on certain questions of procedure in framing the German treaty. On the other hand, during the discussion of such crucial issues as the creation of a democratic government for the whole of Germany, the future peace conference, in German assets in Austria, the United States delegation, as a rule followed by Bevin and Bidault, took a stand that betrayed not

the slightest desire to reach coordinated decisions. It is a stand aimed at causing a break-down in international cooperation."

[From the Washington Star of December 12, 1947]

WHAT THE RUSSIANS ARE SAYING OF US

The Moscow radio, broadcasting in Persian to the Near and Middle East, said:

"The small Syrian Republic is passing through a severe economic crisis. Local industries are limiting their production and the workers are being deprived of employment and means of earning their bread. Public opinion in Syria places the responsibility for the situation on the shoulders of the United States monopolists.

"The Americans have filled the markets of that country with their goods. They are resorting to numerous intrigues and machinations to undermine the basis of the states. American diplomats arrogantly interfere in the internal affairs of the country, imposing their will on a Majlis of their own making, and support the reactionary circles which are resented by the nation."

[From the Washington Star of December 16, 1947]

WHAT THE RUSSIANS ARE SAYING OF US

The Moscow radio, broadcasting in Polish to Poland, said:

"At the very beginning of the conference the Soviet delegation proposed a number of concrete and definite motions aimed at bringing about agreement on the most pressing matters pertaining to the postwar regime of Germany. It demonstrated to the whole world who really desires peace and who obstructs the agreement.

"The shouts and the conference is over, and the declaration of the United States papers that they have had enough of it equally betray the anger of the reactionary circles on both sides of the ocean with the fact that the Soviet proposals expose those who are trying to put the blame on others."

[From the Washington Star of December 17, 1947]

WHAT THE RUSSIANS ARE SAYING OF US

The Moscow radio, broadcasting in English to the United Kingdom, said:

"The House of Representatives has just passed the bill on interim aid for Europe, after putting some anti-Communist and anti-Soviet amendments into it. These amendments leave no doubt that not only on that pretext of aid the United States means to interfere in the domestic affairs of European countries, but also that this United States interference is aimed at crushing the democratic movement of the peoples of Europe."

[From the Washington Star of December 18, 1947]

WHAT THE RUSSIANS ARE SAYING OF US

The Moscow radio, broadcasting in English to North America, said:

"The Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives has demanded the death sentence for America's most popular stars, simply because they have espoused the lofty human ideals of peace, freedom, and democracy. If an actor does not further the idea of atomic war, he cannot find work in America today. If he opposes racial discrimination, he is prosecuted. If he refuses to devote his talents to anti-Soviet activity, he is threatened with imprisonment. All that is progressive and truly democratic in America has become seditious."

[From the Washington Star of December 20, 1947]

WHAT THE RUSSIANS ARE SAYING OF US

The Moscow radio, broadcasting to the Soviet Union, said:

"The wave of American tourists has transferred from Greece to Turkey to Iran, trans-Atlantic businessmen, sleuths, and corrupt journalists, singly and in parties, make interesting journeys through this country.

"It is not historical remains but oil which lures American imperialism to the Middle East. It is oil that is needed by contemporary American militarism. * * *

"Everywhere in the Middle East the traveler is struck by the potentialities of the future. Naturally this 'future' is described in the Stars and Stripes form of United States colonial domination over the countries of the East."

[From the Washington Star of December 21, 1947]

WHAT THE RUSSIANS ARE SAYING OF US

The Moscow radio, broadcasting in German to Europe, said:

"The Soviet decision to abolish rationing and carry out a currency reform has found a wide echo in the world press. The great Soviet country which had borne the main burden of the war proved once more to the world that the Socialist economic system is immeasurably superior to the chaotic and predatory system of capitalism.

"The venal journalists, on the other hand, who are being kept by the reactionary monopolists in the United States, Britain, and other capitalist countries, have shown once more that they do not draw their money for nothing. They employed every means to distort the historic Soviet measure."

[From the Washington Star of December 22, 1947]

WHAT THE RUSSIANS ARE SAYING OF US

The Moscow radio, broadcasting in Japanese to Japan, said:

"With the help of the Japanese Zaibatsu and militarists, the Americans have transformed Japan into a colony and a military base of the United States. Because of this, the United States adheres to its unilateral policy regarding the Japanese peace treaty. The American imperialists and the Japanese reactionaries, therefore, have started to slander the Soviet Union.

"In order to regain their power, the Japanese reactionaries, with the support of the American imperialists, are turning Japan into a colony of the United States and are wholeheartedly supporting American unilateral policy."

[From the Washington Star of December 23, 1947]

WHAT THE RUSSIANS ARE SAYING OF US

The Moscow radio, broadcasting in Danish to Denmark, said:

"The various plans for setting up regional customs stations, the realization of which threatens the economic independence of European countries, are an important link in the schemes of the United States monopolists who wish to take possession of the European countries' economies.

"The (decision) to establish a Nordic customs union is also dictated by the interests of the United States monopolies and by the attempts of the monopolies to transform the Scandinavian countries into a customs-free dumping market for United States goods."

[From the Washington Star of December 24, 1947]

WHAT THE RUSSIANS ARE SAYING OF US

The Moscow radio, broadcasting in Russian to the Soviet Far East, said:

"In his message to Congress, President Truman tried to conceal the imperialistic essence of the Marshall plan behind a variety of worthy formulas, and to represent that program as aid to the democracies of Europe.

"The struggle of the progressive elements of European countries which suffered from the war and the struggle for the preservation of the sovereignty and independence of these countries are declared by Truman to be opposition to the rehabilitation of Europe. We must not close our eyes to the fact, says the message, that the Communists are decisively opposed to any attempt to help Europe get back on her feet."

[From the Washington Star of December 30, 1947]

WHAT THE RUSSIANS ARE SAYING OF US

The Moscow radio, broadcasting in French to Europe, said:

"The Voice of America (The United States short-wave broadcast) carries out the orders it gets from Wall Street and does not shirk at any method to carry them out. When King Dollar is in, the moral standards are out.

"The truth is a foreign notion to the Voice of America, in particular, and United States broadcasts in general. The United States wavelengths are almost entirely under the control of monopolist corporations. The class in power allows only reactionary journalists and commentators ready to write and read anything that pleases the 'boss,' to the mike. Progressive journalists hardly ever manage to broadcast."

[From the Washington Star of December 31, 1947]

WHAT THE RUSSIANS ARE SAYING OF US

The Moscow radio, broadcasting to the Soviet Union, said:

"Recently, on board the steamship *Rus-stya*, a group of Armenians arrived from the United States. They had emigrated from Russia 20 to 30 years ago. The stories of these living witnesses on life in the United States are full of tragedy. They speak about awful years during which they lived in Truman's golden America.

"Some of us made a fairly good living at times, but despite that, could never feel like human beings in the United States," said an Armenian doctor, who has just returned from the United States.

"It is only here among the Soviet people that we begin to feel and experience real freedom and human life," said an electrician who lived 46 years overseas."

[From the Washington Star of January 1, 1948]

WHAT THE RUSSIANS ARE SAYING OF US

The Moscow radio, broadcasting in French to Europe, said:

"More than 2 years have elapsed since the end of the war against fascism. Where is peace today? The angels must be particularly saddened when they fly over the very Christian America and when they hear on the waves—so-called free—the choir of the warmongers which rival each other to find the most efficient means to exterminate men.

"But what does it matter? The American leaders have prepared impressive gifts for the European people: Antiworker laws in France, increases in the price of coal and railway fares, projects for a western German state, amnesty for the Fascists, and many things which I do not mention. It is not toward the star of Bethlehem but toward the dollar that certain 'kings' of western Europe turn their glances today, forgetful of national dignity and surrounded by the indignation of their people. It is not before the humble manger that they kneel but before the American association of industrialists."

[From the Washington Star of January 4, 1948]

WHAT THE RUSSIANS ARE SAYING OF US

The Moscow radio, broadcasting in English to the United Kingdom, said:

"The formation of a provisional democratic government of Greece upset the whole reactionary camp from Athens to Washington. The growth and consolidation of the democratic forces of Greece, which is indicated by the failure of all the efforts of the Athens puppets to crush the democratic army in the guerrilla forces, reflects the deep and abiding love of the Greek people for liberty and independence.

"The Anglo-United States patrons of the Greek Fascists are in difficult straits. The actions of the Greek democrats expose the whole imperialist policy pursued by Britain and the United States in Greece."

[From the Washington Star of January 5, 1948]

WHAT THE RUSSIANS ARE SAYING OF US

The Moscow radio, broadcasting in English to North America, said:

"It is known that the American reactionaries label as Communists all who refuse to bow to the almighty dollar, all who refuse to sell their Nation for a mess of pottage. All this further exposes the real aims of the American imperialists, who dream of clearing the road to world domination with the dollar and the atomic bomb.

"But the bosses of the Marshall plan overlook the will of the nations of Europe, who do not want to serve as pawns in the hands of others or sacrifice themselves for plans hatched on the other side of the ocean."

[From the Washington Star of January 6, 1948]

WHAT THE RUSSIANS ARE SAYING OF US

The Moscow radio, broadcasting to the Soviet Union, said:

"Wallace's election campaign undoubtedly leads to the salvation of the democratic forces in the United States, and it is greeted by all who favor democratic development in the United States and are sincere friends of peace * * *"

Moscow radio, broadcasting to the United Kingdom, said:

"Even before the announcement that Wallace was to stand for the Presidency, Government employees were discharged under Truman's loyalty order for sympathizing with Wallace and listening to his speeches, and as the election campaign gets going and the people's movement against the bipartisan policy continues to mount, fresh emergency measures against progressive-minded Americans may be expected."

[From the Washington Star of January 7, 1948]

WHAT THE RUSSIANS ARE SAYING OF US

The Moscow radio, broadcasting in French to Europe, said:

"It is by now ancient history that corruption is rife in the United States administration, as well as in the political parties. Indeed, corruption in the United States has assumed truly American proportions, and this applies to Federal Government organs and private concerns.

"Volumes would have to be written to write even a brief outline of the dishonesty of American officials, many of whom have felt the heavy hand of the law and public opinion. But there are not a few United States statesmen whose nefarious activities are carried on behind the scenes, and of whose exploits little or nothing is known."

[From the Washington Star of January 8, 1948]

WHAT THE RUSSIANS ARE SAYING OF US

The Moscow radio, broadcasting in Russian to the Soviet Union, said:

"The countries treading along the American path are up to their eyes in postwar difficulties. Britain and France are going through a crisis, and even in the United States

the approach of a crisis is becoming clearer. The Marshall plan is designed to delay the approach of a crisis and to convert the European countries into suppliers of raw materials for United States markets. It is designed to strangle the industries of Europe and to cast European countries into the abyss of poverty and unemployment."

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I proceed now to my third point:

I think it was the feeling of our entire group that, while there were shortcomings in the services that our missions had rendered during the last few years in the information field, nevertheless generally speaking, and realizing the limited resources at their command, they had done a distinctly creditable job and the limited personnel engaged in these operations was entitled to real gratitude and praise from us.

Fourth. I think we are agreed also that whatever expenditures have been made up to date for this service were fully justified, and that the necessary work to be done in these informational and educational fields must have far more extensive support than it has had in the past. We compared the amount spent by Great Britain for her information program, including the BBC broadcasts, and we discovered that, as against the meager \$12,000,000 which we are spending this fiscal year, Britain is spending the equivalent in sterling of something like \$40,000,000—between three and four times as much as we are. This is because Britain has discovered during the more than 10 years she has been carrying on this service, the vital importance of it in connection with the development of her foreign policy. We could not get the figures on Russian expenditures, but the evidence was clear on all sides that this kind of ideological warfare was the great big effort that Russia is making today. Estimating from the number of persons apparently employed, from the space occupied, and from the intensity of the radio programs, it probably would not be out of the way to guess that Russia is spending at least two or three times as much as Great Britain, which would mean that she is spending ten to fifteen times as much as the United States.

Fifth. I think we would all agree also that the critical times call for the highest possible type of personnel at all levels, and especially the key men who have to determine these fundamental policies.

Sixth. This brings us to a consideration of the organizational set-up. It was agreed, I think, by all of us that the over-all supervision of this important work must be in the Department of State, with our chiefs of missions in the various countries primarily responsible. But we were also agreed—and this agreement on our part is reflected in the Senate amendments to the bill which I will discuss presently—that there must be a distinct set-up, on the one hand, of the so-called informational service, which may conceivably have certain propaganda implications and may even become involved politically; and, on the other hand, we must set apart by itself the so-called educational exchange service which, if it is to be truly effective, must be objective, nonpolitical, and, above all, have no possible propaganda implications.

Seventh. We were agreed that there were geographical and cultural differences in the countries we visited, which would require variation in dealing with the informational and educational exchange programs in the various countries. This implies that there could not be one pattern set up in New York City, for example, which would be made universal for all of Europe. This would apply, of course, even more when we are dealing with other parts of the world, such as the South American areas and the Middle East and the Far East.

Eighth. We were agreed that the State Department had been wise in using the assistance of other Government agencies in handling certain phases of its work, and especially those phases which had to do with the giving of technical assistance to other countries, as, for example, the setting up of geological surveys, weather bureaus, and so forth.

Ninth. We were particularly agreed with the importance of using private American agencies to the maximum extent possible in everything having to do with the understanding of America abroad. I wish to emphasize especially the importance of using private American agencies to the maximum extent possible in everything having to do with the understanding of America abroad.

By these private American agencies, I mean our press service, our American periodicals, our motion pictures, and our private commercial radio service. We believe that every effort should be made to facilitate these services and to this end we even explored the possibility of ways and means by which it might be possible to enable these activities to expand through relieving them in some way of the embarrassment of foreign currencies which they received for their services, and which were not convertible. We did not find it possible to incorporate in the pending legislation any immediate provision that would take care of this matter, but we earnestly recommend that hearings be held on the subject, and that subsequent legislation be passed to make it possible for this type of private American service to be rendered more extensively.

Whether that should be in the form of introducing a bill, having hearings on it, and determining how this is to be brought about, is a matter for later consideration. I think our committee is agreed that some formula should be developed whereby the foreign currencies might be translated into dollars, so that the publications rendering this very important service can be given relief from their present dollar embarrassment.

Tenth. The committee feels that, while none of us wants to impose any type of censorship on the products of private American industry operating abroad, nevertheless there should be some way by agreement with the producers themselves to maintain the highest possible quality of production. What I mean by this is, for example, if we are sending motion pictures abroad reflecting American life, there should be a pride among the producers in reflecting the highest possible type of American life, and not send over some of the unfortunately cheap type of films which repre-

sent the regrettable, seamy side of the American character. It seems completely fitting that in this field of "who we are and why we are," we should reach a "standard to which the wise and honest can repair."

Eleventh. Every member of our committee is a strong supporter of the United Nations and what the Charter stands for. Consequently, we were particularly careful to consider whether any of the activities we were carrying on, or might carry on, would in any way conflict with the over-all international picture of the United Nations, which we want to keep in the forefront. I think we were agreed that our activities up to date fitted in with the United Nations plans, and, as we expand the work can be made to fit in even more, and that our activities are in entire consonance with UNESCO.

Our over-all conclusion is that this service has the great opportunity to reflect American life to the other peoples of the world, and, above all, American policies, and to these ends we firmly believe that the expansion of the service at this time is imperative.

The problem now before us is whether the pending legislation known in the House as the Mundt bill, with such amendments as the Senate committee has recommended, should be passed. As I stated in my opening remarks, this bill aims to give legislative authority for what have been the unofficial activities of the State Department since the end of the war. Year by year, the State Department has been compelled to ask for appropriations for activities which it felt were imperative, and yet which really had no legislative authorization. We have tried in the pending bill to bring all these activities into the "tent" of the State Department, and, in the interest of conformity, certain existing legislation is repealed, when and if this act takes effect.

Let me run through the bill, hurriedly, indicating its scope:

Title I gives the "short title, objectives, and definitions."

Section 1 gives the short title.

Section 2 declares the objectives and distinguishes clearly between, first, an information service to disseminate abroad information about the United States and its people—that is in one category; second, an educational exchange service to cooperate with other nations in (a) the interchange of persons, knowledge, and skills; (b) the rendering of technical and other services; (c) the interchange of developments in the field of education, the arts and sciences.

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

Mr. SMITH. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. First, I should like to congratulate the Senator on the very clear statement he is making on the pending bill.

Mr. SMITH. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MILLIKIN. There is one feature of the bill upon which he has touched which is of interest to me and to many people in the educational field. While I was home during the late summer, and since then by correspondence, I have had

the benefit of the views of Dr. Cherrington, of the University of Denver. From information which he has given me it seems there is a good deal of opinion among leaders in the educational world that there should be a complete divorce in organization, that the activity should not be taken out of the State Department, but within the State Department there should be a complete divorce, from top to bottom, of the information service as distinguished from the educational exchange service. The Senator has emphasized that his bill takes some account of that point. As I understand, the whole activity will be headed by one person, and thus in both these fields we will present a single face to the world.

I should like to have the benefit of the Senator's observations on the reasons for that particular theory of the bill.

Mr. SMITH. I thank the Senator for particularly calling this matter to our attention, because that is one of the most important changes made by the Senate committee in the bill, as I shall point out later. Not only have we made this distinction between the information service and the educational exchange service in the statement of purposes, but we have also emphasized the point in title VI, establishing two advisory commissions instead of one; one commission to advise in the field of information which might be called propaganda, and the other in the field of educational exchange which might be called the purely cultural side. We have very fully discussed the matter which the distinguished Senator calls to our attention, and we felt that, as the State Department is set up at the present time, the logical composition of the work would be to have an Assistant Secretary of State in charge of public affairs. Under him would be two subassistants, one of whom would be directly charged with the informational side of the work, and the other directly charged with the educational exchange side. In the field of which the distinguished Senator is speaking we had in mind that it should be headed by educational men of outstanding ability who understand the whole educational exchange problem, and particularly the interchange of students, which is, we feel, one of the most important parts of the bill. It was felt that that was the logical set-up from the standpoint of the present State Department organization; and without making any radical change in the set-up, we felt this would be the best way to deal with it. I have had correspondence with Dr. Cherrington. I have discussed the matter with Dr. Conant and Dr. Dodds, of Princeton, who are very much interested in it; and I think I am correct in saying that they feel that the way we have set this up comes as near as anything can at the present moment to meeting their desires for the separation of the two services.

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

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I think the provisions of the bill for the separation of the two agencies beneath the top man are

thoroughly admirable. Dr. Cherrington told me just yesterday that there has been a recent meeting of the presidents—I think of our educational institutions—I think he said 600 of them were present—and that they still hope that the two agencies may be completely separated, each having its own head.

I would not offer any amendment to that effect, because I have confidence that the committee has made the best solution of the problem it could make. But it continues to emphasize the point that by heading both agencies with one man, there will be presented to the world one face, which could readily lend itself to the impression that the educational part and the informational part are really being intermingled and are intended to serve propaganda purposes. What would the Senator say is the answer to that particular criticism?

Mr. SMITH. I would hope that the man who has been suggested to set up the whole organization and to take both of these services under the same general tent in the State Department would be so proficient in his job that when he was dealing in the field of what we have heretofore called cultural relations—educational exchanges—he would be able to promote that part by itself, and would not try to steal the thunder of the other part for his own purposes. I think the man who is recommended and who probably will be appointed is of such caliber that he is capable of making that vital distinction.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Then I take it that the Senator from New Jersey believes that in the operations under the provisions of this bill, the top man will be able to make it clearly evident to the world which is information and which is on the educational side.

Mr. SMITH. I think I am safe in saying that we shall feel that we have failed in our purpose if that is not perfectly clear when the plan becomes operative.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Might there also be a reasonable assurance that if that objective is not met in practice, there would be general support for an amendment which would separate the two services from top to bottom within the State Department?

Mr. SMITH. Speaking for myself, Mr. President, I certainly would take that position if I felt that the situation was abused in the way the Senator from Colorado suggests it might be abused.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SMITH. I thank the Senator from Colorado for bringing this matter to our attention, because it is one of the most important features of the bill.

Mr. President, in this connection I may say that in Great Britain these two services have actually been divided by not having the so-called cultural service under the foreign service at all. They think they may have to go back to giving it a foreign service coverage; but the British consul, so-called, is entirely independent of the whole BEC operation and all the informational program. I understand that they have been somewhat embarrassed because they have had to have parallel organizations in the field, and in certain areas the same per-

son has had to serve both purposes, and so forth.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, if the Senator from New Jersey will further yield, I should like to say something which seems to me to be obvious, and perhaps it should not be said, namely, that the information service must necessarily proceed on a current, day-to-day basis, according to the necessities of the international situation, whereas the other agency is dealing with what might be termed the verities, which have more permanence; and it would be a very bad thing if the world received the impression that we were mixing the two and were using the verities of our cultural life and were twisting them so as to serve temporary, day-by-day, information-service purposes.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, the Senator from Colorado is entirely correct, and I agree completely with the statement he has just made.

Continuing with the brief analysis of the bill, let me say that section 3 of title I relates the activities under this bill to the United Nations. Section 4 contains certain definitions.

Then we come to title II, entitled "Interchange of Persons, Knowledge, and Skills."

Section 201 of this title has to do with the exchange of students, teachers, and so forth. It contains an amendment aimed at protecting the United States from subversive activities. We inserted a provision of our own there, and it will be brought up presently among the amendments. It would change the language in such a way as to protect us against subversive activities by students entering this country.

Section 202 provides for the interchange between the United States and other countries of books, periodicals, and so forth.

Section 203 gives authority to provide for assistance to schools, libraries, and community centers abroad, and so forth.

Then we come to title III, which is headed "Assignment of specialists."

Sections 301, 302, and 303 provide the machinery for assigning specialists to other countries that are desirous of obtaining the services of persons having special scientific or other technical or professional qualifications. Mr. President, I may say that in connection with this part of the bill, Secretary Marshall tells me that today he has applications from all over the world, particularly from South American countries, for the assignment of specialists to help them with some of their jobs, and especially to give them the benefit of American techniques. Secretary Marshall feels unable to comply with such requests unless he has authority of this kind. Therefore I feel that this is a very important part of the bill.

Title IV relates to participation by Government agencies. Sections 401, 402, and 403 authorize the Secretary of State in carrying on the activities under this act to utilize the services, facilities, and personnel of other Government agencies. That means that if there are in the Interior Department, for example, personnel in some specialized fields who are carrying on specialized work, the State

Department could call on that Department—or, for that matter, the Department of Agriculture or any other department—for help in carrying out this part of the purposes of the bill.

Title V has to do with disseminating information about the United States abroad. Sections 501 and 502 of this title cover the information through press, publications, radio, motion pictures, and other information media, and through information centers and instructors abroad. It should be noted especially under this heading that it is the sense of the Congress that the Secretary of State shall reduce Government information activities whenever corresponding private information dissemination is found to be adequate. This was a matter of a great deal of debate last summer, when the matter was up for consideration, and I think the Appropriations Committee considered it. We took great care to provide that the Secretary of State should reduce Government information activities whenever corresponding private information dissemination was found to be adequate. This is the spirit of the whole bill, namely, to incorporate private activities whenever they can be found to fill the need.

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

Mr. SMITH. I am glad to yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. In the committee amendments, I notice it is provided that the information which the Secretary of State will be authorized to provide to other countries may be made available to Members of Congress 15 days after it is released. I should like to ask why it is necessary to withhold such information from Members of Congress for 15 days after it is released to other countries.

Mr. SMITH. Let me say that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] has an amendment which would slightly change this language, and I shall accept that amendment when it is presented. But the purpose was not to make Members of Congress wait 15 days. We said, "within 15 days." In other words, by this provision we would make sure that those who are handling the information cannot dally along with it, but must get it out promptly. This provision was inserted merely as a matter of convenience.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am wondering whether there is any objection to making it possible for Members of Congress to receive the information, if they so desire, at the same time it is broadcast in foreign countries.

Mr. SMITH. I may say that we have discussed that matter at great length. If the Senator from Arkansas is suggesting that every Member of Congress should receive every one of these releases, I point out that he would simply be showered with a mass of material with which he could not possibly deal. But we drew up our ultimate amendment in such a way as to provide that, upon request, this information should be furnished as soon as practicable. Some of the material which goes abroad is disseminated from the embassies abroad, although it originates in the United States; and it would take some time to

get it back. But the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], who has made quite a study of this matter, brought an amendment to me last night. I think it will probably cover the points the Senator from Arkansas is raising. When our committee amendment is presented, if the Senator presents that amendment to our amendment, I think the point will be covered.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Such a provision may serve some useful purpose; but I cannot see why the Congress or Members of Congress, or any American citizen, so far as that is concerned, should not have the information, if it is available, at the same time it is released abroad. I cannot see any reason for withholding it for 15 days.

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

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. If I am correct in my understanding, the 15-day period is really a period of limitation. We recognized that there were certain difficulties in making the information available immediately, such as those involved in transportation from abroad, translation sometimes, and things of that kind, but in no event should it be longer than 15 days.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I appreciate the statement. I wanted to emphasize the point, though. It occurs to me, with respect to information to be disseminated abroad, information which emanates from the State Department here, that there would be no excuse for withholding it from any Member of Congress or from the public for 15 days.

Mr. SMITH. I think that the kind of information of which the Senator speaks would be available here, but as a practical matter we send material abroad constantly, and we send a wireless bulletin which is made the basis of releases over there; sometimes the entire bulletin, sometimes part of it, being released. Sometimes a special article in the bulletin is adapted to local conditions, and I think that it would be difficult if we said literally that every document that goes out abroad, or every broadcast, must be given simultaneously to everybody here. It would be just a practical question of how best to do it. There was no disposition on the part of anyone to conceal the information. The whole spirit of the thing was to do it in the most practical way and without too many complications.

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

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I have just been handed a copy of the amendment which will be proposed by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL].

Mr. SMITH. I may say to the Senator that the printed copy was slightly changed, after I conferred with the Senator from Minnesota last night, but it is substantially the same, I think.

Mr. McCLELLAN. It is the desire of the committee to make information available as quickly as it is practical to do so, is it not?

Mr. SMITH. Absolutely, and to everybody, especially to Members of Congress; absolutely.

To continue, under title VI—and this is a very important title—there is pro-

vision for advisory commissions to formulate policies, sections 601, 602, and 603. This is a completely new title in the bill and takes the place of the former title VI. This title, as I said to the distinguished Senator from Colorado a few minutes ago, recognizes the sharp distinction now drawn in the bill between the Information Service, on the one hand, and the Educational Exchange Service on the other. It provides definitely for two commissions to advise with the Secretary of State as to the policies and programs to be adopted for the carrying out of the act. Now, if the Senators will visualize what I said to the Senator from Colorado a minute ago, they will see a new Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs; under him, as subassistants, one in charge of information, another in charge of educational exchange, and those subassistants have the advisory commissions in their special fields. Those commissions are composed of five persons each, appointed as provided in the bill.

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

Mr. SMITH. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico. He was the author of the amendment, so I am glad to yield to him, that he may explain it.

Mr. HATCH. I merely wish to emphasize the fact that in the amendment we have completely separated the two, having one commission for the Educational Exchange Service, which is entirely independent of the Information Service.

Mr. SMITH. That is correct.

Mr. HATCH. That is in reality quite a step toward what the Senator from Colorado has in mind, and it is vastly superior to the House provision, which combined the functions in one commission.

Mr. SMITH. The Senator is quite right, and I am glad he emphasizes the point. One of the commissions is to be known as the United States Advisory Commission on Information; the other is to be known as the United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange.

I pass to title VII, appropriations, sections 701 and 702. This title covers the general authorization of appropriations to carry out the purposes of the act, and provision for the transfer of funds. I may say that there are no appropriation figures in the bill. There are no ceilings or anything of that kind. Authority is simply given for appropriations to meet the purposes of the act. The Department is required, of course, to bring in its broken-down budget and requests for appropriations each year.

Title VIII covers administrative procedures, sections 801, 802, and 803. This title gives certain specific authorities to the Secretary in carrying out the various titles of the act. I may say that in those sections provision is made for the employment of special committees to study special problems, as for example the moving-picture industry, which would be one; the way the radio can be best handled, and things of that kind. We thought we should provide for the appointment of special committees, with the advice, of course, of the two commissions set up in title VI.

Title IX, funds provided by other sources. This title has two sections, section 901 and section 902. I shall try to point out the difference between them. Section 901 provides for reimbursement to the Government of the United States, by others who have been benefited by the activities of the Department, of the cost of the service rendered. There are cases in which the Government makes its investment in helping other countries, or helping special projects somewhere, and this provides for reimbursement where that is done.

Section 902 provides for payment in advance by other governments for the expenses of any specific part of the program undertaken pursuant to the act. In these two provisions we take care of reimbursement for expenses paid by the governments, and payment in advance, when we require that before we undertake a project. There seems to be ample reasons for those distinctions.

Title X is entitled "Miscellaneous." Section 1001 provides for a loyalty check on personnel by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. That was incorporated by the Senate, modifying in certain respects the House provision on the same subject.

Section 1002 provides for the delegation of authority by the Secretary of State. Obviously he cannot perform all the functions himself.

Section 1003 provides for restricting information in the interest of the security of the United States. That is a provision written into the bill by the House, and the reasons for it are obvious.

Section 1004 provides for the repealing or superseding of certain existing acts, which I mentioned earlier. We are trying to bring in under the tent of the State Department, in one bill like this, all the activities of this nature being carried on under different pieces of legislation.

Section 1005 is a very important section. It provides for the utilization of private agencies. This is one of the most important sections of the whole bill, and provides, among other things, as follows:

It is the intent of Congress that the Secretary shall encourage participation in carrying out the purposes of this act by the maximum number of different private agencies in each field consistent with the present or potential market for their services in each country.

That is a clear-cut statement of policy of the Congress to use private agencies to the maximum extent possible.

Section 1006 is a provision for terminating authority under the act by concurrent resolution of both Houses of Congress. If at any time Congress feels the act is not being properly administered, a concurrent resolution can bring it to an end.

Section 1007 protects veterans' preferences.

Section 1008 provides for reports to the Congress.

Section 1009 makes the act applicable to all international information activities and educational exchanges of the State Department. There again we have to cover two sections in order to bring these activities together, so there cannot be overlaps or conflicts.

Section 1010 covers the separability of provisions.

Finally, the title is amended, from the very cumbersome title which the bill had originally and which appears on the calendar, to the simple title, which will read as follows:

An act to promote the better understanding of the United States among the peoples of the world and to strengthen cooperative international relations.

Summing up the bill as a whole, it should be noted that the amendments which both the House and Senate incorporated in the original bill added certain safeguards in order to prevent the possibility of any abuse of powers granted by the bill and, as far as possible, to make clear the standards of service expected and the scope of authority of those charged with the responsibility. These safeguards are enumerated in the report of the committee accompanying the bill, but I am going to repeat them here, because this is a very important feature of the bill as drawn. There was criticism of some of the activities of the State Department in carrying on these different functions, and both the House and Senate felt that certain safeguards should be incorporated in the bill.

First. In addition to the usual investigation conducted by the Department of State, the FBI is required to investigate all personnel employed under the information program within 6 months. All new employees are also subject to FBI investigation. In other words, a person already employed must be investigated within 6 months, and new employees, before they can be taken on, are subject to report by the FBI.

Second. The Secretary of State will be required to use the services of private agencies for carrying on this program wherever practicable. I have already emphasized that point.

Third. The Secretary of State must also use the existing facilities of the Government to the fullest extent possible before setting up any new facilities.

Fourth. Reports must be sent to Congress twice a year on both activities and expenditures of this program, including appraisals of results of the program in foreign countries.

Fifth. The exchange of persons authorized by the bill must be on a reciprocal basis. This does not mean a literal 50-50 exchange of students, but the program must be a two-way street. The bill also provides for the speedy deportation of any alien who enters this country under this program and then engages in political activities.

Sixth. The legislation may be terminated by concurrent resolution of Congress.

Seventh. The two advisory commissions established by title VI are designed to assist this country in the formulation and recommendation to the Secretary, of policies and programs for the carrying out of this act. In addition, the commissions are to report semi-annually to the Congress on the recommendations made to the Secretary, but the committee wishes to stress also that the two commissions are not to be viewed primarily as policemen—as constituted they can be

of great constructive value to the Secretary of State and the Congress in the best development of public-relations programs in the foreign relations of the United States.

Taking the special amendments made by the Senate, there were three special principal emphases; first, the simplification of the bill by simplifying the title and statement of purpose; and, second, as I have emphasized before two or three times, the definite separation of the Information Service from the Educational Exchange Service. This separation is clearly stated in section 2 of the bill and is clearly emphasized in title VI, which, as I stated before, provides for two separate advisory commissions covering both activities.

In this connection—and this is in answer to the question asked of me by the Senator from Colorado a moment ago—it is contemplated that the organization in the State Department, while it will have an Assistant Secretary of State covering the general field of public affairs, will also have two subassistants, one primarily charged with the Information Service as defined in the bill, and the other primarily charged with the Educational Exchange Service as defined in the bill.

Each of the subassistants, acting with the Assistant Secretary of State and with the Secretary of State himself, will be aided in determining policy and programs by the respective advisory commissions, and by any other special committees that may be set up under the authority of section 801 (6) of the bill. In other words, we have here given the widest range to obtain the advice of the highest caliber from the best people of this country in developing a policy which will represent the Voice of America abroad.

The third point emphasized by the Senate committee's amendments is the emphasis on the use of private agencies. All the way through the bill, as it reads today, the Secretary is charged with the responsibility of utilizing the services and facilities of private agencies through contractual arrangements or otherwise.

Furthermore, section 502 has been amended to read as follows:

In authorizing international information activities under this act, it is the sense of the Congress (1) that the Secretary shall reduce such Government information activities whenever corresponding private information dissemination is found to be adequate; (2) that nothing in this act shall be construed to give the Department a monopoly in the production or sponsorship on the air of short-wave broadcasting programs, or a monopoly in any other medium of information.

We want to emphasize particularly those two points, because the suggestion was made that the Department might lose its head and get into too wide a field and try to cover everything. We want to make it clear that it is the policy of Congress to use private agencies wherever they can be used to serve the purpose.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, let me high-light a few points which I feel are important in connection with this legislation:

First. What do we mean by the Voice of America? From a technical standpoint the Voice of America is the international information program now being conducted on a limited scale by our State Department. It takes in our international short-wave radio programs directed to the countries of the world in some 24 languages. It includes some 59 American libraries, operated in half a hundred foreign countries. It encompasses our exchange-of-persons program with other countries under which American teachers and specialists in the sciences and arts go to these countries at their invitation to assist them, and under which we encourage students, teachers, and others to come to the United States to study and give us the benefit of their cultures. It includes also the daily informational service to our embassies throughout the world to keep them informed of the news from America, and to enable them to pass it on to any persons in foreign countries who wish to publish it or otherwise disseminate it. In short, the Voice of America is our own instrument for projecting a full and fair picture of the United States to the other nations of the world.

Second. This service, in the judgment of your committee, is of special importance now, because of the increasingly serious situation in Europe. Its importance is further enhanced in light of the efforts we have been making to relieve hunger in the war-ridden countries of Europe and the Far East as well. And it becomes of transcendent importance now that we are about to provide additional billions through the European recovery program—the so-called Marshall plan—in aid to these countries in our efforts to forestall chaos and prevent starvation abroad.

Third. It was our sincere hope that Russia and all the satellite countries would participate in this humanitarian effort. Russia has not only refused to do so, but Moscow has applied pressure on the satellite countries to prevent their participation. Russia has not only declined to join in this effort, but she has organized a consolidated propaganda service, with headquarters in Belgrade, in a concerted movement to destroy our European recovery program. This is all part of her plan to impose communism on Europe, for Russia well knows that communism can only thrive on chaos and human misery; that a happy, well-fed population does not turn to her type of dictatorship. The Moscow plan is to divide and then absorb.

Fourth. Our present Voice of America with its limited budget in the light of these new developments, is wholly inadequate to meet the needs of our country. It must be strengthened far beyond our previous conception of its size and scope. At the moment we are losing this war of words, and in order to make up for the ground that we have lost, we definitely need to take two steps:

(a) Pass the pending bill, which will give this program the needed legislative authority;

(b) Present to the respective appropriation committees of the House and Senate a revised emergency budget for the balance of this fiscal year, and a new

over-all budget for enlarged activities for the fiscal year 1948-49.

This legislation and these appropriations must obviously go hand in hand with the European recovery program, in order that the spirit and purpose of America in developing that program may be made clear to the peoples of the world.

Mr. President, before I close, and open the subject to questions, I should like to reflect some personal thoughts which have come to me in trying to reply to the question, "What do we all mean by the Voice of America?" Perhaps if I have criticized the service up to date I would say it was because the Voice had seemed to be too much a current voice. The Voice of America, to me, Mr. President, goes back into history. That is why our cultural-exchange program is so important. I like to think of the Voice of America in terms of the past, of our ancestors—and I am proud to say their blood is in my veins—who came to the tidewater land of Virginia, who came to the shores of New England, who later pioneered to the West and moved across this great country with the spirit of freedom, the spirit of truth, seeking truth, seeking release, people who came from every stock in Europe, in these countries which today are in difficulties. There is not a country in the so-called Marshall plan, I think I am correct in saying, that does not have stock in America. There is not a country to which the Voice of America may not appropriately be directed. America should interpret to these countries the part they played through their own people in making a consolidated whole here in this country where the divisions have been broken down, and where, through devoted effort, we have moved forward to a new and better vision of life as a whole.

Mr. President, I am thinking in terms of voices—not only the voices of today, but the voices of the past. I cannot help thinking of the voices in our colonial days. I cannot help thinking of the voices during the Revolution, those of George Washington, and Thomas Jefferson. The distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] today paid a glowing and splendid tribute to Benjamin Franklin. The voices of those named, and those of others of our distinguished forebears are the voices of America. I want to have those voices heard abroad, because they come from the very stocks we are now trying to help, as some of their forebears came to us in the early days of our history.

Coming to the later stages of our history, we find the name of Abraham Lincoln. We can go further, to the voices of those who are today making America. We can think in terms of the voices of the boys who served in World War I and those who served in World War II, and who gave their lives in those wars. Those were voices of America.

Let me say to my colleagues, whether in the House or the Senate, that all the voices raised on the floor of these two Houses of Congress are voices of America today, and we are challenged to make those voices worthy to represent the America in which we believe.

So it is not a mere mechanical dollars and cents matter, merely the making of

an appropriation, in order to have some machinery set up, it might be said, to advertise America. It is something much more profound than that. It is the giving of the spirit of America to the world, which needs it so profoundly today to raise it up from the despair in which it is now; to have the peoples of the world understand why we are interested in relief, why we are interested in a recovery program, and why we are willing to do what we now propose to do. It is because we feel in our hearts that we are the descendants of the ancestors of the very people who are suffering because they have not had the privileges we have had in America, in this great free country.

So I feel, Mr. President, that we should pass the bill before us, to give legislative authority which will make it possible for us to give this true picture to the world—to give the peoples of the world the truth. We should pass the bill so that whatever money is needed will be generously given in order to carry on the program. But we cannot stop there. The spirit of America is the voice of America, and every one of us has his responsibility to contribute to that voice.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks a number of editorials on this subject which have come to me from various parts of the country.

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

[From the Brooklyn (N. Y.) Star-Eagle of November 14, 1947]

UNITED STATES VOICE NEEDED IN EUROPE TO COMBAT COMMUNIST LIES

The United States is losing a vital battle in Europe, one which is related intimately to the success or failure of the effort to save the Continent from economic collapse and from communism. This country is losing the fight to gain the confidence of the people of Europe, the people whose mood is desperate and whose sentiment is being captured by the adroit propaganda of Moscow.

All who are familiar with conditions in western Europe concede this to be the case. Russia has little to offer the nations in distress except words. Insofar as her own interests are concerned, Russia is making the best possible use of this weapon. They are not necessarily words of promise because Russia can promise virtually nothing that is tangible. Over the air and through the media of newspapers and other publications, Moscow sends a torrent of abuse and ridicule, all designed to impair the prestige of the United States and sow suspicion and distrust.

This technique, like so much that is characteristic of Moscow's methods, is a heritage from Hitler and follows a familiar and fairly sound line of reasoning. If sufficient mud is thrown, some of it is reasonably certain to stick. If a big lie is repeated with tireless insistence, it comes to be accepted eventually by the more credulous as truth.

Returning from two months in Europe, as chairman of a committee which studied the overseas information program, Senator H. ALEXANDER SMITH, of New Jersey declared that "if we are going to make the Marshall plan work we must see to it that the people of Europe know what we are trying to do." He adds that the invective that has been turned against the United States in these countries in the effort to force communism on western Europe "is so vicious as to be almost unbel-

lievable to anyone who hasn't actually heard it."

Senator SMITH charges that Russia has organized a consolidated Communist propaganda service with headquarters in Belgrade in an effort to destroy the United States recovery program. There can be no doubt that this is true and that there is an imperative urgency that this conspiracy be defeated.

Former Under Secretary of State Sumner Welles has repeatedly emphasized the need of a truth campaign if the people of Europe are to have an honest concept of the American effort and the motives by which it is animated. Representative JOHN J. ROONEY, of Brooklyn, who speaks with the authority of first-hand knowledge, has also raised his voice for the need of a more adequate and eloquent Voice of America.

Senator SMITH has indicated that he will sponsor legislation providing for an expansion of this country's information service abroad. His hand will be strengthened materially by the American Federation of Labor's stand for the creation of a Deminform, or democratic information bureau, to combat the influence of the Cominform. Through one means or another the challenge of destructive Soviet propaganda must be met. Defeat in the war of words involves the danger of defeat in the whole war.

[From the Newark (N. J.) Evening News of November 14, 1947]

THE VOICE OF AMERICA

One of the most foolish economies put through in the first session of the Eightieth Congress was the 50-percent cut in an appropriation for the Voice of America broadcasts. These are the American radio broadcasts to Europe and the rest of the world carried out under the auspices of the Office of Information of the Department of State. The program is now operating on an annual budget of \$10,000,000, an amount considered altogether inadequate in the light of the world responsibilities of the United States.

Official radio broadcasting is a new venture for us. Without doubt the programs beamed abroad could be much improved. But in 1946 the Department of State received 150,000 letters from foreigners who heard its broadcasts, and other evidence suggests that the audience is large, continuous, and substantial. The British Broadcasting Corp., which is official, has had much more experience in this field. It is convinced, through various checking devices, such as offering to communicate with relatives of those in eastern Europe, that broadcasting is an important adjunct to the effective conduct of foreign relationships.

That, too, is now the conviction of most Members of the Congress who went abroad during the recess. Senator SMITH of New Jersey, is cochairman of a congressional committee which investigated American broadcasts, as well as Russian propaganda, in Europe. He will ask the regular session of the Congress, meeting in January, to provide \$5,000,000 supplemental appropriation for the Voice of America until June, when the present fiscal year ends, and will urge an appropriation of from \$40,000,000 to \$45,000,000 for the next fiscal year.

But Senator SMITH believed in the Voice of America broadcasts from the first. Other Republicans now are joining him in his effort to get increased support for a program designed to deliver the American message to Europe on the air, both west and east of the iron curtain. The Secretary of State, Mr. Marshall, has stressed the importance of the Voice of America to his long-range project for European relief. The Congress is going to insist that western Europe knows where help is coming from and the reasons for it.

So it looks now as if the Voice of America will be restored to its former strength and even fortified. The task of broadcasting the facts about American aid will, however, be

delicate. Mr. Marshall warns that we must not create resentment among the receiving nations. We should not "poison the gift." Russia will attend to that without assistance from us.

[From the New Brunswick (N. J.) Daily Home News of November 17, 1947]

LET VOICE OF AMERICA BE HEARD EVERYWHERE

Recently returned from Europe where he headed the Senate group of the congressional committee investigating the Nation's overseas information program, New Jersey's Senator H. ALEXANDER SMITH is vigorously supporting complete revision to expand the State Department's Voice of America program.

Senator SMITH describes the Voice of America program carefully, dispelling the popular illusion that it is nothing but a radio broadcast to a few countries. The Voice of America includes international short-wave radio programs sent to the whole world in 24 different languages. It includes 59 American libraries operated in some 50 countries. It includes the exchange of persons program, in which American teachers and scientists go to foreign lands to study, while exchange visitors come here to get to know the United States. It includes news service daily to all American embassies to be passed on to people in the lands where the embassies are located. As described by Senator SMITH, the Voice of America is "our own instrument for projecting a full and fair picture of the United States to the other nations of the world."

In his 2 months in Europe this summer, Senator SMITH found the Soviet Union defeating us decisively in a war of words. Too little and too late for us again. Senator SMITH says the United States must expand the Voice of America to disprove Russian propaganda and to let the people of the world know the truth about our own democracy and about our hopes and aspirations for world peace.

We concur with Senator SMITH in this. The success of our aid to Europe will be seriously jeopardized if we do not export the truth with the food, if we permit Russia to misrepresent us and our democracy to European peoples without being answered. Let the Voice of America ring out strong and brave and true to give new hope to freedom-loving peoples everywhere.

[From the Camden (N. J.) Evening Courier of November 18, 1947]

THE VOICE OF AMERICA TO BE TUNED UP AGAIN

Opinions and attitudes change frequently in this changing world.

A few months back there was vigorous opposition in Congress to the Voice of America—our short-wave radio information service to Europe. Its appropriation was cut in half and only by the skin of its teeth did it escape being abolished altogether.

Since that time a Senate-House committee, with Senator SMITH, of New Jersey, as co-chairman, visited 22 European countries in a study of economic and political conditions. Much of its attention was devoted to the propaganda and information services of America, England, France, and Russia.

The committee found that not only our radio voice but all our other information services were markedly inferior to Russia's and Britain's, and even below the French in some places. Fortunately, only Russia at present is spreading propaganda hostile to the United States.

At a time when we are about to spend many billions in aid to Europe, it is essential that Europe know from where and why the aid is coming. The committee has drawn up a report to that end, recommending that the activities of the Voice be greatly expanded and other information services extended.

Senator SMITH says he will ask an appropriation of forty to fifty million dollars for the Voice when the regular session of Con-

gress convenes in January. Representative KARL E. MUNDT, of South Dakota, his co-chairman, will press for a \$50,000,000 bill in the House.

"If we are going to make the Marshall plan work," SMITH says, "we must see to it that the people of Europe know what we are trying to do.

"The invective that has been turned loose against us—by Russia and her satellites—in their effort to force communism on western Europe is so vicious as to be almost unbelievable to anyone who has not actually heard it."

Secretary of State Marshall will be asked to present a detailed program to Congress for use of the Voice, of which he has been a consistent backer. This may include a personnel shake-up and a restriction of broadcasts to factual news and editorial comment from individual newspapers, to silence critics who claimed the Voice sometimes expressed unattributed opinions which were those of its own staff.

Indications are that America's voice soon will be heard again at full force.

Most Members of Congress have come to recognize they were wrong in turning down the volume control at the last session.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Post of November 19, 1947]

STRONGER VOICE

Almost without exception, Members of Congress who toured Europe this summer have come back convinced of the necessity for expanding our international information program. As Senator H. ALEXANDER SMITH, chairman of the Senate group investigating the program in operation, said in a radio broadcast last week: "We found in every country we visited that we are losing this war of words. Our own Voice of America is pitifully weak compared not only with the efforts of Russia and her Communist satellites but also with the efforts in the same field that are being made by friendly countries such as Great Britain and France."

In other words, if we are to overcome the deadly effects which endless repetition of slander and lies by the Moscow propagandists is bound to have, we must strengthen our facilities for making the truth known and strengthen them immediately with all the tools at our command. We hope that in light of these reports, Senator TAFT and others who have opposed a broadened information program will be persuaded to change their minds. Three steps are essential, in our view, to make American efforts more effective. The first is a deficiency appropriation to restore the cuts which limited the program for this fiscal year to \$12,000,000. The second is to pass the Mundt bill, which will place our information activities on a permanent, businesslike basis. In this context we need to expand not only our radio broadcasts but also our libraries abroad, our daily overseas press bulletins, and our student exchange program. The third step is for the administration to appoint a man to direct our information program who is both an evangelist and an administrator who can command the confidence of Congress.

There is one danger which we hope Congress will avoid in augmenting the Voice of America. In their zeal to meet the attacks the Communists are making on us, some Members may be tempted to insist that we fight fire with fire. Nothing could do our cause more harm than to have our information program perverted into a mere anti-Communist crusade or a vehicle devoted solely to extolling our virtues as benefactors. Either of these courses would convince the people for whose minds we are contending that we too were merely engaged in propaganda. What our information program needs is facts, not invective or self-adulation. The objective truth can be just as devastating as Moscow's name calling, and far more effective.

[From Foreign Policy Bulletin of November 28, 1947]

HOW SHOULD UNITED STATES ANSWER SOVIET PROPAGANDA ABROAD?

In his Chicago speech of November 18, on the eve of his departure for the sixth session of the Council of Foreign Ministers which opened in London on November 25, Secretary of State Marshall raised an important question concerning American-Russian relations. This question is whether the United States should attempt to answer the "calculated campaign of vilification and distortion of American motives in foreign affairs" waged with increasing venom by Soviet officials and Communist groups elsewhere; and if so, in what form American answers should be couched. Should American spokesmen seek to match the vituperation of Mr. Vishinsky—or should they disregard words of abuse and limit themselves to pointing out the positive aspects of our way of life? Is it wise or not for this country to embark on a national Operation Backtalk like that launched against the Russians on October 28 by General Clay in the American zone of Germany—a program which, according to first-hand reports, shows signs of petering out?

WHAT IS GOOD UNITED STATES PROPAGANDA?

These questions reveal the need for determining the scope and content of American propaganda abroad. Many of the Congressmen who visited Europe during the past few months have returned convinced that this country must be more generous in its appropriations for the Office of Information in the State Department, now operating on the shoe-string budget of \$12,800,000 a year. But even should Congress heed the proposal of Representative KARL MUNDT, Republican, of South Dakota, that this sum be raised to \$300,000,000 for 6 years (or \$50,000,000 a year), administrators of the information program will still face many questions as to what constitutes an effective reply to the propaganda conducted by the Soviet Government and by Communist parties outside Russia. In seeking answers to these questions the following points might be considered:

1. Need to convince non-Russians

The object of American information services is not so much to convince the Soviet leaders, or even the Russian people (although any such byproduct of American propaganda would obviously be welcome), but to convince peoples outside Russia who for one reason or another find some appeal in Soviet arguments. Little is gained, in this respect, by mere denunciation of Soviet ideas and practices—especially since it is doubtful that American spokesmen can match the virulence of Mr. Vishinsky. What can be done is to demonstrate by our actions that the United States, within the limits of its capacity, is determined to help other peoples improve their lot.

2. One world—but many peoples

In addressing itself to peoples outside its borders the United States should bear in mind that, while technological progress in transportation and communications has truly led to the emergence of one world, vast differences persist in the traditions, historical backgrounds, and political, social, and economic development of the various peoples inhabiting this one world. American information services should be sufficiently flexible and differentiated to meet the special needs and interests of the particular nations to which they are addressed—and should not be limited to a few blanket formulas about the advantages of the free-enterprise system. To countries which, to begin with, do not possess the resources of the United States, and have been shattered by two world wars and a great depression, constant American emphasis on this concept sounds unrealistic, or patronizing, or both.

3. *United States must not be identified with reaction*

The success of Soviet propaganda is due primarily to the existence throughout the world of genuine political, social, and economic maladjustments which Communist propagandists skillfully exploit to denigrate democracy. It is therefore essential that American information services stress the need to correct these maladjustments by whatever methods seem most appropriate in a given country, provided political liberty, basic attribute of democracy, is preserved. An attitude of deprecation toward other systems simply because they are not like ours gives ammunition to Communist propagandists who claim that the United States intends to use its resources to stifle internal reforms in nations receiving American aid. It is of paramount importance that other peoples should have no cause to identify Washington's resistance to Russia and communism with support of reaction and resistance to all change abroad.

4. *Facts are our greatest strength*

All peoples, especially in Europe, have grown unutterably weary of propaganda and counterpropaganda. Our greatest strength lies in presenting factual information, as both the EBC and the OWI did during the war, when they won the confidence of listeners who defied Nazi terrorism to hear British and American broadcasts. In presenting information, it is wise to mention not only facts favorable to the United States, but also facts that are not so favorable. Other peoples have learned by hard experience that life is a mixture of good and evil, and that one cannot always expect a happy ending. When our propaganda attempts to give the impression that we are mercifully free of all the flaws we find in others, our admonitions are regarded as either naive or hypocritical. It would be much more effective to admit such faults and shortcomings as we may have, while pointing out our unremitting efforts to remedy them—as the President's Committee on Civil Rights has successfully done in its report. Wide circulation abroad of the findings and recommendations of this committee, which epitomizes some of the qualities the rest of the world particularly admires about Americans, would do far more to enhance the prestige of the United States than any amount of back talk at Russia.

Nor should the United States pretend that it alone among nations is above power politics. In one form or another power is always used in politics, whether national or international. Power is not of itself evil; what can be evil is the use one makes of power. What the world criticizes most about the United States is not that it uses its power too much, but that it has not yet developed a constructive foreign policy commensurate with the power at its command.

5. *Faith—not fear—must be motive*

American propaganda should be motivated not by fear of Russia, which is purely negative, but by positive faith in American ideas, and by concrete measures to carry them out in practice abroad such as the program of farsighted aid urged by Secretary of State Marshall. Every time we reveal fear of Russia we thereby weaken our own position in the eyes of the rest of the world. Nor should we, through fear, force on other peoples a choice between Russia and the United States, which for many of them would be suicidal.

6. *Europe must have means for its own propaganda*

The most effective propaganda, as the Russians have discovered, is directed not from outside, but from inside. For example, commendation of our aid to Europe sounds more gracious if offered by writers and radio commentators in countries receiving aid than if presented by ourselves. Europe, however, is greatly handicapped by the shortage of news-

print, which has reduced most European newspapers to four, and often only two pages. One of the most useful contributions the United States could make to the dissemination of information would be to make newsprint available to the countries of western Europe. Here, too, we might learn from the Russians, who have helped their neighbors in eastern Europe and the Balkans to obtain newsprint. More good words would be heard about the United States if Europeans who support the Marshall plan had a better opportunity to express their views directly to their own countrymen.

But, no matter how technically efficacious our propaganda may prove to be, we must always remember that words, written or spoken, have become devalued through overuse and overemphasis. Only actions can serve to revalue them. No matter how much money we spend on propaganda, the money will be wasted unless our actions abroad match our words. This means that we must do some hard thinking here about the basic concepts of our foreign policy, and develop greater understanding both of the world outside our borders and of our new role in world affairs.

VERA MICHELES DEAN.

[From the Des Moines Register-Tribune of December 3, 1947]

HOW ABOUT TELLING EUROPE THE PLAIN, UNVARNISHED FACTS?

One of the happy results of European visits by so many of our Representatives and Senators this fall was the almost universal discovery that the story of our kind of democracy and of our foreign policy was not being told adequately, probably not even well.

The first reaction to this has been a fairly common conviction that the Voice of America type of program under the auspices of the State Department needs great expanding. And this in turn raises the natural question what kind of job the international broadcasts have been doing with limited resources, and what kind of job they ought to do with substantially augmented resources.

Whenever some people talk about this part of our role as the world's greatest power, they use such phrases as "countering Communist propaganda" or "replying to Russia" or "defending ourselves against Soviet accusations." There is even an assumption in some quarters that, in order to get a fair hearing before the European world, we must conjure up some marvelously shrewd propaganda scheme. The inference of this is that we must somehow twist our story into an even more Machiavellian design than the Russians and other Communists have succeeded in doing, in putting the case for their philosophy.

The Register, frankly, is pretty doubtful about this approach. It is simply making the job hard. It is taking risks of outsmarting ourselves in the process. It implies the use of politically calculated and perhaps even faintly dishonest techniques.

We think there is a better way.

That way is simply to tell the world the truth—the whole truth, the unadulterated truth.

We have not seen in any detail the content of the Operation Backtalk which General Clay inaugurated in our zone of Germany a month or two ago. But our impression is that it was conceived partly in anger against Russian propaganda, and the latest reports are that it has already begun to fizzle. If it was largely propaganda, that is no wonder. Germans and Europeans generally are pretty well fed up on mere propaganda. They have been fed so much of it that they can smell it a half mile away.

During the war the British Information Service around the world took a different tack. It provided all the facts it could accumulate about everything imaginable affecting the British war effort—historical

facts, political facts, economic facts. Some of these accumulations were not very complimentary to British history; some of them were not even very complimentary to the existing British Governments. But the result was that the British people and the British Governments sounded to observers as if they were human beings rather than incredible brass gods.

If we want the people of Europe to believe in us, to judge us fairly and dispassionately, we first have got to seem human to them. We have got to have our story told in such a way that we appear to be what we are, with many faults and many virtues. And the way to seem what we are is to tell our story straight, to tell it truthfully, but to tell it as completely as possible.

Certainly this takes money. The job needs to be adequately financed. It will be only a drop in the bucket relatively, anyway. We presume that Congress will shortly take care of that part of it.

Once the resources exist, we need to see that the whole project is affirmative and constructive—not defensive and incriminating. We would lose in a war of incrimination against communism; the Communists have far fewer scruples about undignified accusation and distortion than we. Why should we even stoop to this level, when it is not an effective technique anyway?

Why should we not, instead, tell Europe and the world precisely the reasons why our sudden acquisition of enormous economic power worries us? Why should we not confess frankly that we are feeling our way, that we don't have all the answers, and that we are doing our human best to live up to our responsibilities?

Why should we not say candidly that we haven't yet found the perfect economic system for every imaginable society, that unquestionably our system still has some weaknesses, that we are all too aware of them, that we are trying conscientiously to correct them?

Why should we not take the wind out of the Communists' sails by pointing out frankly the ways in which our democracy has not yet achieved the ideal, the ways in which we have improved its functioning so strikingly in the last generation or two, and the ways in which we hope to carry it ahead still further in the years ahead? Need we be ashamed of that?

This, and more, is a story that Europe could believe. It is a story that any reasonable human could have faith in. It is a story that would inspire confidence and hope.

Then, if our actions meanwhile give credence to our words, we will have measured up. If our actions do not, of course, then telling our story at all would be a waste of time.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle of December 13, 1947]

VOICE OF AMERICA'S AUDIENCE

There is an excellent chance that the United States, despite the Marshall plan, will lose its strategic fight in Europe unless it steps into the propaganda duel with enough intelligence and vigor to outwit the Russians at a game they play surpassingly well.

That we are running a poor second has been widely conceded—just how poor is startlingly illustrated in a pair of reports from the Continent.

The New York Herald Tribune, describing a typical American information organization in a European country, cites "a couple of mimeograph machines, a 2,000-volume library, and a few reels of documentary films," plus the beamed broadcasts of the Voice of America. The budget is \$40,000 a year. The typical Soviet set-up consists of an elaborate network of personnel operating hundreds of libraries (to our one), and costing millions of rubles. Even the British, impoverished as they are, lay out \$240,000 in

Czechoslovakia—just over 10 times what the American information budget cost.

The New York Times, in an interview with Senator LONGE, shows the comparative fruits of these ventures.

A wealthy, conservative French physician told LONGE: "Of course, we realize that medical science is way ahead in America of what it is in France, but then we also know that you have all those underprivileged people over there on whom your doctors constantly experiment."

A conservative French deputy told LONGE: "We know that you Americans are trying to build up Germany industrially faster than you want to build up France. The reason you do this is because you intend to have a war with Russia, and you want to get Germany into shape as your ally." Why would we fight the Russians? "Because Russia has taken away so much of your export trade."

So much for the Communist success in swaying some of the most stalwart people of France. So much for our dismal failure.

There is every indication that Congress will multiply by several times last year's pitifully inadequate information budget. But the words of the two conservative Frenchmen make admirably manifest the fact that dollars alone won't get us where we need to go. We can prate "Look how rich we are," a million times and it won't undo what's been done to the French mind, or the Polish mind, or the Italian mind, during these past 10 years. The task calls for a consummate amount of thought, skill, and understanding.

Consider your typical French physician, and what was happening to him between 1940 and 1945. Battered by ponderous forces that drove him to the brink of financial and physical ruin, his intellectual and psychological make-up could hardly survive unscarred. The mass cynicism that resulted from the war finds no parallel in the American experience, except possibly for the psychological ruin that lay strewn through the South at the close of the Civil War.

This is the culture most receptive to communism, and the Russians know it and have capitalized upon it. A measure of their success is the fact that the physician and the deputy, while no friends of Russia and certainly not in Soviet employ, are unconsciously playing the Russian game.

How do we win these people?

Not alone by the Marshall plan, as long as the gifts are accepted with grave suspicions of our motives.

Not by the broadcast of canned descriptions of Thanksgiving dinners in the United States, nor by mail-order catalogs reflecting the extent and variety of our luxuries, nor by querulous demands that the Europeans be more like us.

We have to talk their language, and the language they best understand is the assurance of security—freedom, to a drowning man, is less important than a rope.

The details of the task may well occupy the constant attention of a battery of earnest, intelligent information specialists for years to come, but the important thing now is for Congress to grasp the dimensions and the broad nature of the problem. That understanding must be applied to the terms of the Marshall plan, but further than that, to the creation of an information service that will, by slow degrees, transform a sea of cynicism into a reservoir of friendly understanding. That is the size of the job.

[From the Princeton (N. J.) Herald of December 17, 1947]

THE VOICE OF AMERICA

Americans who are worrying about what Russians are thinking of us for retaining our bases in the North Pacific must have experienced quite a shock if they listened to the recent radio broadcast which Senator SMITH made from Washington. The New Jersey Senator did not mince words in his

forceful plea for recognition of the vital importance of the Voice of America in the new war that is going on in Europe.

"Russia has turned loose against us a propaganda machine of incalculable size and effectiveness," he declared. "No one can even estimate the resources that are being poured into it. It employs every kind of device of mass communication to din into the ears of the populations of every country of the world, the lies and distortions by which she hopes to keep the world in chaos and ultimately to control it. The grist for this gigantic propaganda machine comes direct from Moscow with almost every act of her government, and every speech by her representatives at the United Nations designed for propaganda value in the war of the ideologies."

Senator SMITH was cochairman of the Smith-Mundt committee which spent 2 months this past summer in Europe visiting all its countries except Russia, Yugoslavia, Albania, and Ireland, in an exhaustive investigation of the need for the expansion of our international information service. Reporting to the country on the results of that trip the Senator said that the invective "that has been turned loose against us by Russia and her satellite countries in their effort to force communism on western Europe is so vicious as to be almost unbelievable to anyone who hasn't actually heard it. We are accused of virtually every political and moral crime under the sun."

The Voice of America is the international program conducted by the State Department for which \$12,000,000 has been appropriated for the current fiscal year. Even Great Britain, as the Senator points out, with governmental expenditures reduced to the barest minimum, spends \$40,000,000 on a similar, but expanded program. Our information program consists of short-wave radio programs in approximately 24 languages, about 50 American libraries operated in as many foreign countries and its exchange of persons with other countries under which American teachers and specialists in the sciences and arts go to those countries at their invitation to assist them, while their students and teachers come to the United States. The program at present is wholly inadequate to meet the needs of our country in the face of existing conditions.

"My experiences and my observations on this investigating trip," said the Senator, "impel me to use every means at my disposal to try to let the American people know what is happening to us in Europe."

The Marshall plan which provides for an appropriation by the Congress of billions of dollars for the rehabilitation of European countries will fall tragically short of its objectives unless we organize an information program capable of combating the consolidated Communist propaganda service which aims to destroy our European recovery program.

Senator SMITH gained his information at first hand. Given ample opportunity to learn what is going on in Europe, he took full advantage of it and has reported his observations in language which leaves no room for doubt. It is inconceivable that Congress should fail to appropriate the necessary funds for America with its seeming wealth of resources, to tell her story to the world, that all nations may know what we are striving to do for the stricken peoples of Europe. It will be impossible to attain our objectives unless we can offset the Communist program of misrepresentation of which Senator SMITH has testified.

[From the Christian Science Monitor of December 19, 1947]

WORD AND DEED

Nothing is to be gained by exchanging cold war for hot words. But that is not the announced purpose of the new State Depart-

ment policy to meet Russian propaganda with direct replies. If the policy is wisely carried out, it will aim at light, not heat. It will counter lies with facts, not Russian rhetoric with American declamation.

The Voice of America will be only one of the avenues of appeal to the peoples of the world—and especially, we must admit reluctantly, of Germany. But the congressionally snubbed Voice will be of key importance in the new program. Greatly increased appropriations will be necessary to make it a match for the strident blare from Moscow.

Most important of all are the actions with which the United States backs its words. Inflated speech, like an inflated economy, promises more than it delivers. But a people that means business in its support of world democracy can afford to advertise its motives as well as its acts.

[From the Watertown (N. Y.) Times of December 5, 1947]

WHERE OUR VOICE IS HEARD

Fighters for democracy lead a lonely life behind the iron curtain of communism. Yet they are not discouraged, for they know that powerful forces in the west are working with them. They know because of the Voice of America radio broadcasts. Stanislaw Mikolajczyk, the Polish peasant leader who recently fled from his country, has testified to this.

Mikolajczyk reports: "Poles hear that the Americans have not forgotten the people behind the iron curtain and still believe in the principle that freedom and democracy cannot be divided into spheres of influence. Freedom and democracy must be shared by all if peace is to reign over the world and mankind is not to be drowned by chaos."

Unfortunately these words, that mean so much to believers in democracy abroad, carry little weight with Congressmen here at home. The cost of the Voice of America broadcasts is a small price to pay for the lives men are risking to fight Communist oppression. Such services toward freedom cannot be bought on the open market. Congress should forget politics and throw full aid behind this Voice, bringing hope to freedom from a friendly people.

[From the Watertown (N. Y.) Times of December 22, 1947]

GETTING THE TRUTH TO EUROPE

Every American who has visited Europe of late has returned convinced that there must be a vast increase in America's information service. The most recent is John G. Cowles, the Minneapolis publisher. "We need a competent, hard-boiled organization in Europe to get the people the facts about the United States and about Russia," he says.

The inflation in Russia and the devaluation of the Russian ruble presented a rare opportunity to show the people of Europe what they could expect under Communist domination. Yet we fell down flat owing to the inadequacy of both our information service and broadcasting facilities.

We did the same thing when the Big Four Conference broke up in London. The Russians broadcast all over Europe that the western democracies opposed the union of Germany into a single nation. Newspapers in the Soviet zone in Russia were filled with extracts from Molotov's speeches. Apparently there was no real effort on the part of our authorities to have the truth presented in newspapers in western Germany.

We are about to embark on the Marshall plan. The Russians have twisted and distorted the purpose of that plan and may now be depended upon to take up the task with renewed zeal. We must counteract this but we cannot do it unless our information service is greatly expanded.

It is one of the most important matters facing the regular session of Congress.

[From Collier's magazine of December 27, 1947]

GIVE AMERICA A REAL VOICE

The United States State Department's propaganda service, first called the Voice of America, then formally christened the Office of Information and Educational Exchange, had tough sledding during the year or so in which it was under the supervision of William Benton, Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs, who recently resigned that post.

For all the tough sledding, the Voice of America idea is a good one. The idea is that, since Russia is flooding much of the world with the falsest kind of anti-United States propaganda, we should crack back with fair, factual, and vigorous propaganda of our own. The Voice attempts to do that, but is pretty seriously handicapped at present because Congress last summer granted it only \$12,400,000 for a year's work instead of the \$31,000,000 the State Department requested.

All of which impels us to urge that the Senate pass H. R. 3342 at its earliest convenience.

H. R. 3342 is a bill, passed by the House last July, to make the Office of Information and Educational Exchange permanent, and to put it in charge of a wide variety of United States propaganda services—radio programs beamed in strategic directions, library and information offices in many countries outside the iron curtain, documentary films on various aspects of American life, and so on.

Representative KARL E. MUNDT, Republican, South Dakota, who led the initial congressional attack on some of the Voice's misplays, is a strong backer of this plan to tune up, tone up, and generally strengthen the Voice. MUNDT urges that we spend some \$50,000,000 a year on these efforts to funnel into other people's minds our side of the argument between democracy and communism.

Such an expenditure seems to be a reasonable one, only provided the agency is run by realists and businesslike executives, with dreamers, phonies, and tinhorn tub thumpers ruled out.

We have a mighty story to tell about this country, to a world which knows only fragments of that story. Let's get busy and tell it.

[From the Louisville Courier-Journal of January 4, 1948]

ONLY WAY TO OFFSET RUSSIAN PROPAGANDA IS TO ANSWER IT—INDICATIONS ARE NOW THAT PLANS ARE AFOOT TO DEVELOP MACHINERY TO DRILL THE TRUTH INTO EUROPE

(By Leland Stowe)

The answer to Soviet propaganda is simple. The answer is really to answer it. But we can't possibly hope to counteract the most highly developed propaganda organization in today's world merely with occasional statements by Secretary Marshall, the President, and a few others.

Even when Molotov and Vishinsky have spells of silence, the Soviet-Communist propaganda mills grind steadily onward with great effectiveness, day in and day out. Yet the same nation which perfected advertising into a near science and invented the almighty public-relations man has left the world field, politically speaking, almost completely free for the last 2½ years to Moscow's experts.

One cheering item for the new year is that Uncle Sam gives promise of finding his voice at last—and of using it consistently, with some boldness and imagination. Under Secretary of State Robert A. Lovett revealed this when he announced a decision "to meet Russian misstatements and distortions with direct replies." This decision appears to be a constructive byproduct of the otherwise dismal Big Four failure in London. Top American policy makers evidently got tired

of watching Molotov and his colleagues run away with the propaganda ball.

BUSINESSES DO IT

So the year 1948 should see the United States begin to act something like a \$200,000,000 concern.

Can any organization with an annual income of approximately \$200,000,000 afford to spend less than \$50,000,000 to present its case and its goods to hundreds of millions of potential customers? You wouldn't think there could be the slightest question about this. After all, scores of America's biggest corporations spend proportionately far more than this each year—just to get the facts about their products and what they are doing before the public, here and abroad.

To the richest and most powerful nation in the world, \$50,000,000 a year, both to make available all pertinent facts about its activities and to prevent the spread of false conceptions about its policies, ought to be an indispensable investment.

CONGRESSMEN "EXPOSED"

But until very recently, a majority in our Congress insisted that the United States of America had no need of a respectable and strong public-relations instrument. Last June Congress refused to appropriate some \$33,000,000 a year (out of a budget of as many billions of dollars) for the United States Information Service and the Voice of America overseas broadcasts. Congress cut the requested funds down to a niggardly \$12,800,000 for this fiscal year. On the world's fiercely competing ideological markets, Congress rated the facts and truth about America as being worth no more than a ragged shoestring.

Since then, nearly 200 Congressmen have visited Europe and been personally exposed to the high-pressured anti-American propaganda war being waged by the Soviets and Communist Party machines throughout the Continent. They discovered that the outside world is a lot different from Washington and Kalamazoo. They learned that a lot of things which Congressmen and most Americans take for granted can be made to look alarmingly different when served to foreign publics with a neat Communist twist or with calculated omissions.

Suddenly a good many of these traveling Congressmen became angry and alarmed at the distortions and libels of Uncle Sam which they encountered. Representative KARL MUNDT, of South Dakota, had fought all along for an Uncle Sam-sized information service in and to foreign lands. Today, prospects for his bill are greatly strengthened. In the coming session, he will seek an appropriation of \$50,000,000 a year for the next 6 years. Thanks to the tremendous activities and the tactics of Soviet-Communist propaganda, there seems a fair chance that America's voice, both by radio and printed material, will be raised to something more than an adolescent's shrill squeak.

This explains Lovett's announcement about direct replies to Soviet propaganda. It could be made only because a fair number of American politicians are beginning to catch up with some of the harsh facts of our postwar era. But there can be no adequate, persistent answer to Moscow's vast propaganda offensive unless the bulk of American voters became equally aware of the extremely vigorous competition which confronts us and western democratic principles in Europe and Asia. In the realm of governmental information and international public relations, the American people must grow up fast. In these respects, and as of today, Uncle Sam's team is far behind Uncle Joe's.

A WASTE OF BREATH

If it isn't worth \$50,000,000 a year for America's case to be heard accurately and read accurately by hundreds of millions of people overseas, then the United States might

as well crawl into its shell like a turtle—and leave the world field to uncontested Soviet propaganda. For Americans to denounce communism, yet refuse to provide the means to repudiate a constant barrage of Communist assertions and misstatements, has been both a waste of breath and lack of elemental common sense. When you are assaulted by mud-splashes the first thing to do is turn on a good garden hose. In these times, the Office of Information in the State Department can and should function as a powerful garden hose; not a trickle, but a pounding, unceasing stream of clear water.

What could a \$50,000,000 information hose do? Molotov's London speech, which broke up the Conference, offers an enlightening example. When Lovett spoke of misstatements, distortions, and falsehoods, he undoubtedly had this speech in mind. But although Marshall and Bevin replied to it and spiked many an assertion, they did not begin to answer Molotov as he could be answered. Restudying this speech, you can see what opportunities Washington has missed until now for lack of detailed direct replies. Here are samples:

1. Molotov accused the western Allies of "hidden reparations and economic privileges" in western Germany. To brand the accusation as false is only a half measure. What about the enormous hidden reparations and economic privileges amassed by the Soviets in the eastern European countries? Washington possesses thousands of columns of hard facts on this. An adequate United States Information Service could deluge Europe with such facts.

2. Molotov charged Anglo-Americans with buying up whole concerns in Germany. Marshall and Bevin declared this absolutely false. But why stop there? Every informed person knows that the Soviets have been steadily buying controls of quantities of enterprises in Hungary, Rumania, and other satellite countries for more than 2 years. An alert information service, sufficiently expanded, would present Europeans with a long and confirmed list of such actions.

3. Molotov claimed that western Germany's whole economy was in a state of dependency on other countries, especially the United States of America. What about the economic dependency of every Soviet satellite nation? The facts are all available—but millions of Europeans will never know them unless Washington leads in presenting them, alongside Molotov's charges.

MOLOTOV WIDE OPEN

In his denunciation of the western Allies Molotov left himself wide open to direct replies, well documented, on most of the sweeping accusations he made. The General Marshall-Bevin retort was "We're not doing that." It would have been far more effective, in public-relations terms, if they had added, "But this is precisely what you are doing."

Foreign ministers can't talk forever. They cannot answer the Niagara of Soviet propaganda with a host of unanswerable facts in a half-hour speech.

The only way to reply crushingly and tellingly to a vast propaganda machine is through a large and well-organized mechanism for information. The Soviets will continue to win the propaganda war until America refuses to let its voice be smothered by the opposition's sheer weight, plus its own indifference and lack of political awareness.

[From World Report of January 6, 1948]

REPORT ON THE VOICE OF MOSCOW—RUSSIA'S WAR OF WORDS AGAINST AMERICA

The "cold war" is entering a new phase. Soviet propagandists are trying—in some cases successfully—to convince the world that America is expansionist, aggressive, a warmonger out to dominate the world.

United States officials think the time has come to tell the world that Russia is the

guilty party. The Voice of America, if Congress approved, is to reply vigorously to the Voice of Moscow.

In the following survey, World Report analyzes the problem the American Government is up against in combating Russian propaganda.

In the "cold war" between Russia and the United States, Radio Moscow is a major weapon. It assumed the offensive early and has hammered away at America's conduct and intentions early and late.

Until recently, Radio Moscow has had things pretty much its own way. Soviet diplomats, like V. M. Molotov and Andrei Vishinsky, have provided it with scorching ammunition against America. Russian newspapers, under direct control of Soviet officials, daily provide additional ammunition.

Lately, however, Radio Moscow has begun to notice international competition. A smaller, less experienced instrument, the Voice of America, has demanded attention in Moscow. Apparently the Voice of America finally has got under the skin of Soviet propagandists.

The episode began with the Voice of America broadcast reports that Russian consumers were doing some panic buying in Moscow. Stores were closing to avoid having their shelves stripped of goods. There were rumors of changes in prices and in the value of the ruble.

A few days later the Soviet Government announced its drastic devaluation of the currency. Ruble devaluation of 90 percent was an official admission that inflation in Russia had reached critical heights.

What annoyed Moscow was that the press in America and in western Europe generally interpreted the currency devaluation as evidence of economic crisis inside Russia. The Voice of Moscow says it is nothing of the kind. The capitalist press, according to Moscow, is reacting with "fury and lies" to conceal the economic crisis that grips the United States.

Finally, said Radio Moscow, "This anti-Soviet chorus was joined by the New York radio station of the State Department's Voice of America, whose lying broadcasts have on more than one occasion incensed the working people of our country."

To American officials, the significant point in this statement is the admission that the Voice of America reaches Russian workers.

In the past, the Voice of America has had difficulty reaching Russian listeners. First broadcasts, a few months ago, were feeble. They were criticized by the American Embassy in Moscow as inadequate. Attempts by the State Department to improve the programs were handicapped by congressional opposition and a cut in appropriations.

Other efforts to inform Europeans of American aid and of America's side of the argument with Russia did not seem to be getting very far. Congressmen who visited Europe last summer complained that Europeans heard much of an occasional shipment of Russian grain, but heard little or nothing of continuous shipments of American wheat and coal. Some Europeans, usually friendly to America, seemed to be impressed by Moscow's repeated statements that the United States was imperialistic.

There is no evidence that Soviet propaganda has won many in western Europe to Russia's cause. There is evidence, however, that the Voice of Moscow has helped to make Europeans suspicious of America.

Success of the Voice of America in annoying Soviet propagandists is thus significant. Internal difficulties in Russia, combined with Communist set-backs in France, may now handicap Radio Moscow in influencing western Europe.

TO REPLY TO RUSSIA

Exactly how the Voice of America will seize this opportunity remains to be determined. Thus far, the Voice of America has ignored repeated attacks by Moscow on American intentions. Now, however, high officials

in the State Department say the time has come to correct misinformation, distortions, and outright lies broadcast by the Voice of Moscow.

Answering Soviet attacks on the United States can be a full-time job. A limited sample of Moscow broadcasts for one recent week gives an idea of what is involved.

To British listeners, the Voice of Moscow attacks the Marshall plan, blames the failure of the London Conference of Foreign Ministers on the western powers, says American prosperity is at an end, explains what is back of anticommunism in the United States and warns the British that the dollar is growing strong at the expense of the pound sterling.

The Marshall plan, according to Moscow, is "an instrument for swelling the profits of United States and European monopolies by still further tightening the screws on the laboring population of western Europe." In other words, if the Labor government in Britain supports the Marshall plan, it does so at the expense of its principal supporters, the British workers.

Western diplomats at London wanted the recent Conference to fail, Radio Moscow explains, because they "wanted to pursue a policy for dismembering Germany to the bitter end, and transform the western zones into colonies for German imperialists." Thus, Moscow ignores Anglo-American statements urging a united Germany, warns British labor to beware of imperialism.

"The color has gone out of United States prosperity," Moscow broadcasts to England. "Indeed, the sinister signs of an approaching crisis have become so evident that they can no longer be concealed." To left-wing members of the Labor Party in Britain, this view may reinforce their earlier fears that the Labor government ought to get closer to Russia, divorce itself from America.

Lovers of liberty in England are advised by Moscow that the United States is engaged in "a police onslaught on the elementary democratic rights of the United States people." Anticommunism in America, it is explained, is a "campaign undertaken to justify a policy of external expansion."

To Britons worried about the stability of the pound sterling, Moscow says that the British-American deal on western Germany puts financial policy in American hands, and "the pound follows the wake of the dollar."

Germans come in for special attention by the Voice of Moscow. They are told that America wishes to dismember Germany permanently. They are also advised that American charges about Russia taking reparations out of Germany are designed to conceal huge American takings. Thus, according to Moscow, "almost the entire German production" of textiles is seized by the United States. Exports of German coal are made "at such low profit for the Germans that they depend on loans which only the United States can make. Thus, western Germany is coming under United States capitalism."

Soviet propagandists, however, do not say one thing to Russian audiences and the opposite to listeners abroad. The propaganda line is substantially the same both at home and abroad.

RADIO MOSCOW'S LINE

Russians, day after day, learn from the Voice of Moscow that the United States "has embarked on a new, openly expansionist policy directed at establishing world domination," that "United States monopolistic capital . . . is endeavoring under the guise of aid to enslave European countries," that Wall Street looks upon Greece as an appetizer and now wants "to gobble up France," that oil is the only reason for American concern with the Middle East and that America's own economic crisis has now reached the point where "millions of men, including war veterans, are unable to find any occupation."

Many members of the United States Congress now think that Russian statements of this sort ought to be answered. The likelihood is that the current Congress will encourage the Voice of America to speak up.

A major problem, however, is how the United States can offset Russian propaganda without getting the United States Government deep into the propaganda business.

In America, if not in Russia, Government statements are not always accepted by the public at face value. Only the other day, a Voice of America broadcast to China drew criticism because it played down the view of Lt. Gen. A. C. Wedemeyer that Washington ought to go to the aid of Nationalist China.

Some Europeans, furthermore, are weary of propaganda. Austrians, for example, say they want neither Russian nor American propaganda.

Methods that a reinforced Voice of America will use in answering Moscow are still to be determined. They probably will be the subject of controversy in and out of Congress.

So long as the cold war between Russia and America continues, however, it is generally agreed that there is a job for the Voice of America to do. Its busiest time may come during the next few months, while the United States Congress debates—and the Voice of Moscow attacks—the \$17,000,000,000 program for helping western Europe.

[From the Washington Star of January 9, 1948]

INFORMATION PROGRAM BOOST

The varying fortunes of the State Department's Voice of America radio program have taken a decided turn for the better as a result of two new developments. The first was the unanimous approval by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee of a bill to provide basic legal authority for the broadcasts. The second was the appointment of George V. Allen, now Ambassador to Iran, as Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs.

The bill reported by the Senate committee is a substitute for the Mundt bill which passed the House last year. The proposed legislation reflects the views of the joint committee which toured Europe the past summer and found urgent need of a well-considered and well-rounded foreign-information program. It will provide the statutory authority which the existing program lacks and which Representative TABER, of New York, insists on as a prerequisite to further appropriations. The measure would set up two advisory commissions, appointed by the President, to recommend general policies governing broadcasting and exchange of students between this country and other nations. Passage of this authorization would pave the way for consideration of appropriations to effect the program. Opposition to the information plan has dwindled noticeably as a result of first-hand observations by the congressional travelers.

Mr. Allen is a good choice as successor to William Benton, who had a number of congressional critics. The youthful diplomat (he is only 44) is a career man in the State Department with a background of newspaper experience after graduation from Harvard. He proved to be an intelligent and resourceful Foreign Service officer in difficult wartime assignments. There is good reason to believe that his appointment will meet with approval at the Capitol and elsewhere and that the lagging foreign-information program will derive a real lift from his leadership.

[From the New York Times of January 9, 1948]

TO TELL THE AMERICAN STORY

The quick and unanimous action of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in reporting out a bill to authorize an information program overseas, and predictions that

money will be appropriated for an expanded service, are welcome indications that Congress at last is aware of the necessity of telling abroad the American story.

Words are an important weapon in the cold war into which the United States has been forced. No more short-sighted action was taken in the first session of the Eightieth Congress than that which halved the requested \$20,000,000 for an already curtailed program. There are predictions now that \$5,000,000 is to be voted immediately to expand the radio service—the Voice of America programs—and that the full program of information and student exchange may be granted as much as \$50,000,000 for the fiscal year beginning July 1.

The change of attitude in Congress can be traced directly to the gathering by many of its Members during the summer recess of some first-hand information for themselves. All, or nearly all, of those who went to Europe and saw for themselves how this country's acts and motives were being distorted came back convinced that action must be taken to give people of other lands facts and explanations. It is not enough to hold good intentions. Others must be convinced that the intent is good.

The revitalized program, as envisioned in the Senate bill drawn by the subcommittee headed by Senator SMITH of New Jersey, seems to us to be an improvement not only over the old program but also over the Mundt bill that was passed by the House at the first session. It divorces the information program and the student-exchange program—to free the latter from any propaganda taint—and sets up separate five-member committees to advise the new Assistant Secretary of State in charge of the program. The nomination of George V. Allen, a career diplomat with a newspaper background, for that post gives promise of an able administration. The sooner the expanded program can be put into effect the better. Too much time already has been lost through delay and misunderstanding of the need.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of January 9, 1948]

THE INFORMATION PROGRAM

With the White House announcement that George V. Allen will be appointed Assistant Secretary of State in charge of our information and cultural program, this troubled area of our policy bids fair to take on new force and direction. Mr. Allen, who is not to be confused with George Allen, of Missouri, former jester at the White House court, is a career diplomat, looking back at 44 upon a record which includes early newspaper work, service in the State Department at Washington, and participation in some of the major wartime conferences. His latest position, as Ambassador to Iran, has given him first-hand experience in a region where the conflict of propagandas and the war of ideas is crucial.

Mr. Allen's appointment coincides with a disposition on the part of Congress to face realistically the need for a foreign-information program. The Congressmen who visited Europe last summer returned with a heightened appreciation of how necessary it is to counter the anti-American propaganda of the Soviets, as well as to spread understanding of our own life and ideals. Even JOHN TABER, who in other respects seems to have learned little, may possibly have regretted his earlier lead in reducing appropriations for this purpose to a bare minimum.

At the close of the last regular session, the House approved a bill authorizing the Office of International Information and Educational Exchange, and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee gave its sanction Wednesday to a similar bill. Though neither of these carries appropriations, the prospects for a supplemental grant, and an adequate budget for the next fiscal year, have been

considered favorable. Mr. Allen's nomination should greatly help the cause.

[From the Camden (N. J.) Courier-Post of January 12, 1948]

UNITED STATES INFORMATION SERVICE

Expansion of America's information service abroad is indicated by two actions of the past week—unanimous approval by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee of Senator SMITH's bill for a revitalized program, and appointment of George V. Allen as Assistant Secretary of State to supervise the service.

Allen, who has been Ambassador to Iran and is thoroughly familiar with a part of the world where our information service is vitally important, is a brilliant young career diplomat and a former newspaperman. His nomination gives promise of an abler administration than the service has had in the past.

Senator SMITH's measure corrects several flaws in the Mundt bill, which passed the House at the last session, and is supported by numerous former critics of the information service whose views were changed during their summer visits to Europe. The radio Voice of America now appears likely to get an added \$5,000,000 appropriation almost immediately, with perhaps as much as \$50,000,000 to be granted for the whole information and student-exchange program for the next fiscal year.

Congress is right in realizing how essential our information service is to combat foreign propaganda, and Senator SMITH is to be commended for having been a leader in bringing many of his colleagues around to that realization.

[From the Washington Post of January 12, 1948]

TELLING THE WORLD

One of the most hopeful auguries of the new session of Congress is the manner in which action has been expedited to put the foreign information program on a sound basis for the future. Last week the Senate Republican Policy Committee gave the green light to the Senate version of the Mundt bill as one of three pieces of "must" legislation for January. Later, at the instigation of Senator SMITH, the Foreign Relations Committee reported the bill out with only a minor change over what already had been passed by the House last session. There is every indication that with the support of newly won converts in the Senate the bill shortly will become law.

In addition to providing the basis for expansion of Voice of America broadcasts, libraries and other facets of the information program, the Mundt bill also goes into another significant aspect of our cultural relations—the interchange of students, teachers, and technical materials and the assignment of specialists to other countries on request. These activities must be considered a complement to the program of advertising America. In a concession to educators, the Senate committee included an amendment establishing two separate advisory committees of private citizens, one for informational and the other for educational activities. Providing that the separation is not carried to the point of handicapping operations at field levels, the establishment of these committees should make for more public understanding and support.

The crucial importance of an immediate effort to broaden the various parts of the information program is illustrated by the noticeable increase in Russian propaganda since the advent of interim aid and the Marshall plan. This propaganda has become more and more vicious. If the world is to have a fair and accurate picture of what we are doing, if our motives are not to be misconstrued and turned against us in the minds of the very people we are trying to help,

then we shall have to use every means at our command for propagating the truth. Passage of the Mundt bill itself, of course, does not assure the funds necessary to do the job. But it is the first step in what many Members of Congress have rightly come to regard as an inescapable choice. The second equally essential step will be to vote the money for an adequate program, both in a deficiency appropriation and in next year's budget.

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

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I should like very much to congratulate and commend the Senator from New Jersey upon his very excellent address, and particularly his last remarks, with regard to the real purpose and significance of the legislation.

I should like to ask the Senator from New Jersey if he would be willing to consider an amendment which I believe would carry out specifically what I believe is stated to be the intention of the committee in its comment on page 10 of the report, in which it says:

It is not intended that these two Commissions have authority over the Board of Foreign Scholarships or the United States National Commission for UNESCO.

The reason why it seems to me the amendment may be appropriate is because of the very broad provision in section 1009. Therefore the amendment, I believe, would be appropriate on page 17, line 21, to add, after the word "Act," the words "Provided, however, That the Commission created by this section shall have no authority over the Board of Foreign Scholarships or the program created by Public Law 584 of the Seventy-ninth Congress enacted August 1, 1946, or the United States National Commission for UNESCO."

In other words, I believe that amendment simply carries out what the committee states is its intention, and makes it clear. The reason, I believe, arises not from the section on page 17, that is, section 601, but from the very broad terms of section 1009, which states that—

All provisions in this act regulating the administration of international information activities and educational exchanges provided herein, shall apply to all such international activities under jurisdiction of the Department of State.

I think that certainly would leave room for doubt. I may say that in the long run I think it is very likely that all these programs may be merged. But in the short term I think it may be very confusing, because, as the Senator well knows, even when we pass this act, there will still be a major obstacle in procuring the money. I should not like to see the program now started under Public Law 584 held up or interfered with for any reason, because that board has been appointed and has started to function. I am worried about the possible interpretation of section 1009, and I suggest the amendment for the consideration of the Senate.

Mr. SMITH. The Senator has reference, I believe, to the so-called surplus property realizations abroad, to be used for educational purposes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. SMITH. Under the law known as the Fulbright Act.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. SMITH. In answer to the Senator, I will say that it is clearly the intention, as stated in our report, not to give any authority over these boards. Unless some of my colleagues see some objection to the amendment suggested by the Senator from Arkansas, I should be glad to accept his amendment interpreting what we mean by this section.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I offer the amendment with that understanding.

Mr. SMITH. I do not know whether it is now in order.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I will offer it at the appropriate time.

Mr. SMITH. The Senator from Arkansas has submitted his amendment, which I take it will lie on the table until the appropriate time arrives for its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment submitted by the Senator from Arkansas will lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, as one member of the subcommittee, I should like to pay my tribute to the work which was done by the chairman, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], who worked so hard and so faithfully on this bill. The other members of the subcommittee, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] all made valuable contributions.

Certainly the bill as it is now is in much better form than it was when it came over from the other branch. It meets the needs of the situation in a more practical and complete way.

However, I think the Senator from New Jersey will agree with me when I say that the bill is only a beginning, insofar as United States public relations abroad are concerned. There has been a good deal of talk to the effect that if Congress would only pass this bill all our troubles would be over. To my mind, Mr. President, there could be no more false doctrine than that. We can pass all the bills we want to, and we can vote hundreds of thousands of dollars in appropriations; but unless there is energetic, intelligent, and imaginative administration we shall not really hold up our end in the great debate which is going on over the world and in which we, whether we like it or not, are one of the two principal participants.

That means, of course, that there must be an intelligent administration of the Office of Public Information. I understand that Mr. Allen, the new appointee, is a very able man, from whom we can expect great things. But as the Senator from New Jersey has said, the Voice of America is not limited to one little bureau in the State Department. The Voice of America is the President of the United States. The Voice of America is the Secretary of State. The Voice of America is the United States ambassador in every country. They are the ones who are going to be listened to and noted by people the world over. It is up to those who administer this act and who carry out the expenditure of

funds always to bear in mind that the conduct of public relations is not a little incidental clerical activity. In the days in which we are now living, it is the armor in which strategy and economics are clothed. If the European recovery program known as the Marshall program is not conducted with due and intelligent regard to the matter of public relations, it will not do a great deal of good.

Let me repeat what I said at the outset. I congratulate the Senator from New Jersey for the fine and useful work which he has done in connection with this bill.

Mr. SMITH. I thank the Senator.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with this bill. For a long time I have been in favor of what it provides for. In fact, I had something to do with bringing out previous bills on this subject.

Psychological warfare is very, very old. It is almost as old as war itself. Even in an organized sense, it is almost as old. We know something about the use of the Voice of America in warfare, because it is spectacular, and because it has brought great results. Propaganda has always been an arm of the State, especially in despotic countries, where the one who has the power must always maintain it by keeping himself before the populace, whether it be a mob or whether it be a thoughtful group.

Mr. President, there are many things in this bill. The reaffirmation of the exchange of students is one. The fact that America is not ashamed to talk about herself is another. The fact that we may be made conscious, as we should always be in a democracy, that the voice of that democracy is in reality the voice of all the people, is another factor. I am sure that those who become spokesmen for our people will reflect that voice as time goes on.

Today I wish to do what I think ought to be done in relation to the Voice of America. We have been talking a great deal about the Marshall plan and about relief and aid for Europe. In spite of what anyone says, I am still a believer in the fact of one world. I have been such a believer for a long time. It makes no difference whether the world is divided in two politically. The economic entity, the geographical entity, and the fact of unity is always there, and we come back to it. I therefore wish today, if I can, to attempt to bring a spirit of universality into what we are talking about, and especially in regard to these plans.

I believe that in presenting the voice of America we shall have to present it to the whole world, because there has been a realignment of the world. World conditions and the relationships between nations make it impossible to spend all our time in our discussions on any one country or any one group of countries, or any one part of the world when we discuss world policies.

First of all, few have noticed that the Truman doctrine and the Marshall plan, in reality, have their origin in what we have done in the Far East. China was told to put her own house in order before she could depend upon future aid, and Japan is now looked upon as the very

center of American activity and policy of that phase of the Truman doctrine, which stands for the support of peoples attempting to remain free of economic controls and political dominations.

With Congress having before it resolutions which call for the admission of Hawaii and Alaska as States, Japan becomes more of a neighbor than ever. Our administration, as trustee of the former Japanese islands of the Pacific, makes us an actual administrator of territory which was formerly controlled by Japan and a close neighbor to nations and peoples who, until the immediate present, have been considered far off.

Our first treaty with Korea, which was completely forgotten when the Japanese annexed that land, seems now, as far as our responsibility there is concerned, to have again come to life, and Korea looms large and we stand today as we always have, in theory, for the independence and territorial integrity of China.

Our tasks will not be easy. They will be many times harder than they have ever been unless we properly orient ourselves to the basic values of our various friendships and responsibilities in Asia, and without prejudice and without hate, evaluate honestly who are and who must be our friends if even a semblance of peace is maintained in the Eastern Hemisphere.

Our new relations with the Philippines, the recasting of controls in Indonesia, in Indochina, and Siam; the continued development, in their individual national responsibility, of the commonwealth states in the Pacific, are all contributing factors in our policy and our plans. In a way, Australia and New Zealand are now as close to us as is Canada.

I call to the attention of the Senate today the fact that we talk about the "iron curtain," and the fact that the eastern part of Europe is far from us, and we speak of the need of uniting western Europe against what might be trouble from the east. Those who point out and emphasize the two-worlds idea have completely forgotten that if Alaska should be made a State, or even with Alaska a Territory, we are separated from Russia on the west by merely a few miles. The way to the heart of the United States, from a strategic standpoint, by many enemies situated in the middle of Europe or in Asia, is, of course, by way of the Pacific. Geography has made it that way, and by reason of travel by air we are so close to Russia that she is one of our very nearest neighbors.

The new India, whether united or divided into parts, has given us an entirely new relationship, one which will test the ability of our diplomatists to evaluate new conditions and work in accordance with them, and test executive understanding and leadership in carrying on our new responsibilities in that part of the world. To the thoughtless, they seem to be few, but they seem great in number to those who know the strivings of the people of all Asia to meet the challenge given them by a mere reading of the political concepts of the west and the free intercourse with our missionaries.

A reminder of a single event will make my point. When William J. Bryan was

In India he left this thought, and it never died. No matter, he said in effect, how much you may dislike Britain, never forget that you should be forever grateful to her, for she gave you the English language, in which the concepts of liberty have been expressed.

Mr. President, I wonder if those few words Bryan said back in 1907 or 1908, are not in complete harmony with the words of the Senator from New Jersey in closing his statement on the pending bill. If the words of liberty were essential to the Indian people, and if what has taken place in India since that time does not prove that the words of liberty are essential to a people, then, of course, we may lose sight entirely of all that the Senator from New Jersey has said, and that which we have stood for as a nation may become merely a doctrine having no effect around the world. We know it has an effect, and we have such implicit faith in the democratic processes, coupled with the educational processes, that once these ideas gain root in the hearts and minds of men they never come out, because they are related to the eternal strivings of man himself and of man's soul for lasting and eternal liberty.

Great as these factors are, however, the responsibility for seventy-odd-million Japanese, functioning under a new constitution sponsored by us, and, when the time for peace actually comes, introduced to the world as an American-directed product, our biggest and greatest task is, of course, Japan herself.

Almost a century has passed since Commodore Matthew Perry anchored his tiny squadron of small vessels in Tokyo Bay. Faced with this impressive display of power the Japanese were forced to accept their first modern treaty. This treaty served to "open" Japan to the west and exposed her to western idealism, western realism, European and American ways. In almost a decade from the time of the first treaty students from Japan had arrived in America and the teacher-student relationship was begun. In the late summer of 1945, again an American, this time a soldier, led the spearhead of the greatest concentration of armed strength the world has ever know into Tokyo Bay. From a turret of the flagship *Missouri* flew an American flag of 31 stars—Commodore Perry's flag of an earlier day. On the deck below, Gen. Douglas MacArthur received the imperial surrender. Japan had been "opened" for a second time and exposed again to western idealism, realism, and practices. It is hoped that this second opening will renew an even firmer student-teacher relationship.

We now know only too well what dire consequences sprang from the earlier contact between our country and Japan. Japan followed with zeal all she thought represented best the strength of the West, our military and naval habits. Two or three centuries of Shogunate and military single-willism, plus the fact that her constitution was set up by a revolutionary government, proved to be factors so strong that even the new constitution and the new leadership could not overcome the habits and the thought of the past. Perry's visit was conceived in a mixture of American self-interest and

American good will, but it was the first link in a chain of events that led to the acme of the world's use of force to combat force at Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

I emphasize that point of self-interest, because it has come back into the vocabulary of those who are constantly talking and asking questions about the Marshall plan.

Having emerged from the long slumber of centuries of hermit-like seclusion, the Japanese grasped eagerly at the new material techniques of the west. It is inevitable that the learner should attempt to imitate his teacher and, like so many students, the imitation was accepted and indulged in without, of course, attempting to interpret completely that which was imitated. The Japanese learned the west's techniques, learned them well and applied them ruthlessly, testing their new-found strength in a series of wars spaced almost regularly at 10-year intervals—the Chinese-Japanese War of 1895, the Russian-Japanese War of 1905, the World War of 1915, the Manchurian incident of 1931, and finally in 1941 the Second World War. The peoples of the west followed this strange spectacle of growing power in the Orient, first with amusement, then with surprise, then awe, and finally, after the rape of Nanking, with either indignation or terror and horror. It was a hideously fascinating spectacle. From an island base, rich in natural beauty, but wretchedly poor in the substance of power and scarcely larger than New Mexico, the Japanese reddened the map of Asia in ever-widening arcs until at the pinnacle of their military success their empire encompassed an area equal to that of continental United States.

This, then, was the end result of a seemingly insignificant naval visit more than 90 years ago. What can we expect from the "second" opening of Japan, carried out under such strikingly different circumstances? As you know, it required almost 4 years of devastating war, appalling sacrifices of American lives, and an immense united effort to pry loose the Japanese from their conquests, and to force them once again back into the confines of their homeland. But now the arrogant alien boot no longer echoes in war-torn China. The Japanese Fleet is at the bottom of the sea. Flattened beyond recognition are many of the great cities of Japan where the abundance of Asia and what she could secure from the west had been fashioned into deadly instruments of aggression.

We have won at tremendous cost this second opportunity to "open" Japan. We had to pool our courage, our skill, our intelligence, and our imagination in a common undertaking of unbelievable magnitude. Our responsibility is not merely to make the victory that finally came a vindication of our technology, but even more a triumph of a way of life based upon decent ideals, a fulfillment of American democracy, and its dream of human freedom.

But are we equal to this new task? Can we meet the challenge of the second opening of Japan, and in a larger sense the challenge of the peace, with a trust in the strength of the atomic bomb? No; we need something more. Will we retain

the war-forged spiritual unity and the determined will to achieve, now that the objective is to construct, rather than to destroy? Can we supply the needed leadership to the world, when the basic requirement is no longer guns but mechanisms of peace and ideals?

Mr. President, I cannot help but pause for a moment to point out that the problems of peace are so much more difficult than the problems of war, and to point out that, throughout the ages, man had been perfectly happy to unite at all times for war, but has refused to unite for peace. Way back in the days of the Greek dramatists and poets, Sophocles, I believe it was, had one of his heroines wail the lines:

When, oh when, will men cease to unite for destruction and unite for the building and the bringing of peace?

That question is still unanswered, Mr. President. That question may be answered by the Voice of America moving out into the whole world, because we will not, we dare not, we cannot move into the world's sphere and talk about America and not also talk about peace, good will, educational relationships with one another and, above all things, governments built upon understanding.

Our capacities to wage the war were admittedly unsurpassed. Our capacities to lead the peace are presently undergoing careful scrutiny in many parts of the world. Japan must have no cause for losing faith in her teacher.

Although we share the control of Japan with our Allies, the circumstances of the war have projected America into a position of primary responsibility. Our task bids fair to challenge all of our capabilities, which can become successful only on a cooperative basis, and cooperation never succeeds unless there is a fusion of common ideals and common characteristics. Have I thereby set the stage for an impossible contingency? Is there anything in the way of ideals common between us and our former enemy? If our answer is to be generated by hate, it will be definitely "No." However, through a study of history and what has actually taken place, without our being against Japan just because we are for some other country, we can discover many common ideals and aspirations. If it had not been for these common ideals and aspirations, the peace, as it did come in Japan, would never have occurred. The atomic bomb, despite the Emperor's reference to it, and again admitting that it was a contributing factor, was not the basic factor which brought about the surrender and, with it, the complete trust on the part of our former enemy that America would honor every promise she made.

How did it happen that a country and a people who have been credited with being individually and collectively self-sacrificing, and still having an army of 4,000,000 men trained and equipped, who had never shot a bullet at an enemy, surrendered unconditionally, and still realized that what they were doing could be done with honor? It could not have been from a fear of a call for more sacrifice. It must have been from trust. And how was it, despite the fact that many leaders

of our Government justified the use of the bomb on the score of military necessity, and knew little about what had gone on since the very days of Pearl Harbor in attempting to bring about a complete surrender where guerrilla warfare could be avoided, that armies scattered over almost half a globe could be returned without piecemeal fighting and disorder? Something must have been going on, because a people of over 70,000,000 could not be converted overnight by the destruction of a comparatively small city, after larger cities had been destroyed without affecting their spirit.

It is because I believe that a future successful building of Japan depends upon an appreciation of the ideals which will go into that building that I am going to attempt to point out what can be accomplished by reference to what has already been accomplished. If the same spirit can control the future in the same way that it got control of the hearts and minds of the Japanese people in the past, we can build hopefully, and under our tutelage Japan can become a leader of Asia in developing national solidarities and peaceful international activities to such an extent that the rebirth of the new Japan will affect the lives of the millions and millions of other peoples in Asia.

When I say that, I do not in any sense condone a single act of the Japanese Government in bringing about war with America. Time and time again in talking to the Japanese I have repeated one theme, namely, that the government led by Matsuoka and Tojo had actually become apostate, that these leaders turned their backs upon the fundamentals of their greatest leaders, and that the acceptance of their theories would lead to Japan's utter destruction.

We remember that after Pearl Harbor the Japanese Government instituted a monthly celebration in honor of the Pearl Harbor victory. The idea of apostate leadership struck me so forcibly that I wrote one or two magazine articles and developed the first of what became my messages to the Japanese people. I pointed out in December 1941 that never in the world's history had a nation of 70,000,000 people deliberately moved to its own destruction to the extent that I called it national suicide. I was, of course, an American; and Pearl Harbor outraged me even more, I think, than anyone else, because it seemed proof positive that wicked forces in Japan had completely gotten control of the finer thinking of the great men I used to know. I was so convinced that the destruction of Japan was certain that I started my appeals directly to the Japanese people. The OWI institutionalized my messages, and they were sent regularly up until January 1, 1946. All the time I stressed one theme, namely, an appeal to the Japanese people to overthrow their false leaders and to return to the teachings of Meiji Tenno and his associates.

I make that point at this time, Mr. President, because I do not know of any other case in history when people have given up in the way that the Japanese people gave up; and I make this point particularly in view of their constitution and the controls which existed among

them and the fact that a Japanese general in the field was completely autonomous and completely independent from the government at home, and could do whatever he wished to do. Mr. President, do you think that a Japanese general in charge of troops, who had learned year after year to live on the land in China, could have been made to surrender unless he had been convinced that surrender was the proper thing for his people? Of course, he could not.

People do not understand, they do not realize, how the Japanese mind worked and how the Japanese institutions worked. Let me give one incident. I was appointed chairman of a Senate committee to try to do something for our own men who had been captured in foreign countries. We had an extremely interesting little request that came to us. The Japanese had allowed their prisoners to send home to their parents postal cards saying, for the most part, that the prisoners were well. But those postal cards were undated. Some of the parents said they had received word of the death of one of their boys, and then later on had received one of the postal cards from the boy himself saying that he was well and happy. The parents wanted to know if we could not bring it about so that the boys could date the postal cards they sent. I made that request on the part of our people through generals.

It is realized that the request had to go through Spain and through Russia at that time, in order to reach Japan. The Japanese people replied immediately saying they had no objection to the boys dating their postal cards, but that we should know they could not control the generals in the field, and if the generals who were responsible for the prisoners said that no dates should be allowed on the postal cards, the Japanese Government could do nothing about it. I mention that to emphasize the fact that the universal surrender came even among armed forces that knew they were completely autonomous and could act for themselves. I mention it also to show the type of thinking that goes on in another great country. Japan replied to our request immediately, but it took months for us to get the answer. Why? The answer was held up in one of the countries through which we had to communicate. Why was it held up? It was held up because it was deemed unimportant. "Why should any parent be interested in his son after he has once entered the Army?" There are nations in the world who still do not have what we call a dog tag, that is, an identification tag, for their soldiers. They do not keep track of the soldiers. They bid the boys good-by when they leave, and if they come back they welcome them, but there is no communication, for the most part, especially in time of war. The boys are expendable, to use an expression which we developed, and they remain expendable all the time. Therefore, it should be emphasized over and over again that the surrender came as a result of a reasoned appeal; it came as the result of a conviction.

In war, therefore, we have an illustration of the strength of the very thing we are trying to do now in peace. As time

moved on we were thus in a strong position to be able to explain what was meant by unconditional surrender, and ultimately we were able to unite the Japanese people in the thought that it was not necessarily the aim of America to destroy their basic institutions. We repeated that surrender with honor was obtainable, if it were lived up to in honor, and thus came the unheard of surrender, with almost universal respect for what the Emperor had done.

The convincing of our own people of the necessity of avoiding anarchy in Japan was not an easy task. I call to mind now one radio program I was on, in which the great man with whom I carried on a discussion maintained that anarchy in Japan would be welcomed. Think of it, Mr. President. But in the midst of the war we were so full of hate that we were going to exterminate peoples. That is what was said. In war, if you want to take enemies, you had better tell the enemies you are going to treat them right when you take them, or you will not take them; because if any soldier boy knows he is going to be exterminated when he surrenders, of course he will fight to the last ditch, regardless of anything.

It seems to me that when we realize what we did by psychological warfare in World War I, in bringing about a continued reasoned appeal to the people of the old Austro-Hungarian Empire, and broke it up, not by guns or bullets or bombs but by reasoned appeal, we should never have lost sight of our chance. Incidentally, we did not lose sight of it, for never once did the psychological warfare of our Army and Navy cease throughout the war, and it brought tremendously great results.

Calculate if you can the loss of life to our boys, and the millions of dollars of destruction that we would have had to fight through, if we had not secured the type of surrender we did. Get out the map of China. It is unnecessary to go to the South Sea islands, but just get out the map of China and figure out how far the Japanese troops were scattered over that country. Consider that they were turned into guerrillas, and think how many American boys would have lost their lives chasing down those guerrillas, if we had not brought about the type of surrender we did. My point is that the surrender had to be organized, and was not an impulsive thing resulting from the destruction of Hiroshima and part of Nagasaki.

I go back to Germany, and I go back now to our discussions in the State Department. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and I, with five or six others, took part every Saturday morning in those discussions. Time after time it was pointed out, and I could not help pointing it out, because I knew, that when Hitler fell there would then be nothing to pin to. As early as 1934 Hitler destroyed both the German Constitution and the German Government by breaking the first rule of politics and government, by taking unto himself not only the Constitution but also the Government; so that when Hitler came to an end there was nothing at all with which one could negotiate. We had a little

chance, because an admiral claimed to be a successor of Hitler, but we did not embrace that opportunity of giving unity to the German people. We let the opportunity go; probably we had to. But the answer of the experts was always the same, "We will have the German people, and we can deal with them."

Mr. President, it is impossible to deal with a people, utterly impossible. We may be able through the Voice of America to appeal to the people, to appeal to individuals, teaching them better habits, a better outlook, a better history, but there is no technique that has ever been devised in the history of government or in the history of politics which makes it possible for forty or fifty or sixty million people to carry on negotiations with anybody. It just cannot be done. We knew that. We knew that was going to happen in Germany, and now we know the result of letting it happen the way it did because we are spending, as every one who thought about it knew that we would spend. The minute an enemy is defeated, then his conqueror must feed him. That is not a rule of life, that is not a rule of war, that is not a rule of law; it is a fact that has followed. The victor must either kill or starve his vanquished foes, or feed them; and to kill or starve them is not the American way.

We are paying now for the fact that Hitler did not know his political science in 1934, or he would never have done what he did. At that time, when Hitler assumed complete control and autonomy, I was at the University of Berlin. I was talking with the various professors there about what he might do. No one who was trained in government could conceive that Hitler would possibly do what he did; but he did it, and much of our trouble comes from the fact that there was no continuity in authority, no way for those people to speak for themselves. Had there been, we probably could have brought about the type of surrender that was brought about in Japan.

The American people should be grateful beyond words not only because of the number of boys whose lives were saved, not only because of the property that was saved, but because we have a chance to make a real beginning in building constructively upon a foundation that is already established. The Japanese Nation has been a unit for generations, so much of a unit that probably that made our task tough. Literacy in Japan is very high. When the war started, there were more electric-light bulbs per capita in Japan than there were in the United States. She has not been a backward country. I am frequently asked whether my messages got to the Japanese people. "How could they?" I have been asked. Radio sets are very cheap; the Japanese people had as many as we had, and they knew how to work them.

One thing about a newly awakened people getting new devices, and one thing which is extremely interesting, is that they work such devices to death once they begin to understand them. I have gone into Japanese hut after Japanese hut and have seen two, three, and four clocks, not one of them going. Those who live in the huts found what the time was in other ways. But it was

the style for everyone to have one or more clocks, so the people obtained as many as they could.

With respect to radio messages which we sent to the Japanese, those messages were heard. We received replies sometimes so quickly as to startle us. We received one reply from the Japanese Government to the messages we sent near the end of hostilities, in the form of an action which took place within a week after the first message from us went out. The replies were picked up as far west as Portugal in Europe. We can get to the people of the world by radio, and I am glad we are headed toward an attempt to do so now.

If the Japanese leaders had succeeded in convincing their people that Japan should fight as the last machine gunner fought at Iwo Jima or Okinawa to utter destruction, who can figure how long it would have taken our soldier boys to have burned and blasted out of China and other places of Asia all of the Japanese who were there.

All during the war, both in our own country and in Japan, not much was publicly said and not much was quoted that went out in our psychological warfare. But if what was said had not been very effective, why was so much attention paid in replying? If the Japanese people did not hear what the OWI sent out under the name of Senator THOMAS, why did the Japanese radio go to the trouble to try to belittle and abuse all that Senator THOMAS stood for? At any rate, the results did come out as I maintained from the very beginning were possible. My and the OWI's 5 years' work may be completely marked off as having been useless, but the results remain. I have stressed this point because I believe that the future success of American and Japanese cooperation in bringing stability to Asia depends entirely upon our being able to appreciate common viewpoints from which we can operate and through which there will be joint agreement. The surrender is proof that it can be done.

In the messages to Japan I took the stand that modern Japan was at her very best in thought and in action during the days of the Meiji era, when such men as Admiral Togo and General Nogi were the instructors of the present Emperor. I knew both Togo and Nogi. I knew their lives and I knew their ideals, and I knew what the present Emperor had been taught as a boy. I knew also Admiral Nomura. He, too, had become an instructor of the princes in the peers school. I knew his philosophy about the world and what the result would be if Japan and America should fight. I knew that the present Emperor and his little brother, Prince Chichibu, had both been taught that friendship with America was of prime importance for the success of Japan, and that if Japan went to war it would end with the destruction of the Japanese prestige in the world. It was because of this knowledge that I had such faith in the effectiveness of the two messages which some of us urged President Roosevelt to send directly to the Emperor before Pearl Harbor. I knew these boys could never forget these teachings. To an extent, therefore, I

knew that my appeal to the Japanese people would also bear fruit if any of my words got to the Emperor. I know now that they did. Have we not in the basic teachings of the necessity of friendship with America, which was drilled into the mind of the present Emperor as a child, a key to the position of the future Japan in the world? Is there throughout all of Asia another nation with the educational system which, when properly cleansed of propaganda, can unite a people as Japan was united for evil? Can this not be turned to good purposes with lasting effect if the good purposes are based upon truth?

That Japan can achieve national solidarity we all know and admit. That she has been a good and constructive member of the community of nations in the past we also know. To anyone who wishes to understand the schemes of national planning which Russia, Germany and Italy later followed, he should study the antecedents of those schemes tried in the development of Japanese nationalism from 1868 down to 1900. Thus we have a people who have been schooled and who can be united to deal with; a people, too, who have been united at times for good quite as much as they have been for ill. When one realizes the whole history of the development of nationalism all over the world, one is not surprised that a people such as the Japanese, who consciously were imitating others, did at times take more seriously the written word and what was being done in the world than a people who were not conscious of imitating. Give the Japanese people and Japanese nationalism an honest psychoanalysis and that which has occurred in their land can be explained on the basis of what had occurred in other lands. Japan's acceptance of the Axis theory of Mussolini and Hitler makes the strutting of Matsuo today seem the comic-opera stuff it was. But Japan's leaders, like Matsuoka, were not the only people in the world, although they acted the part more ridiculously, who fell for the strutting.

Look at the Japanese soldiers' record in the Boxer War. Note the respect which Nogi and Togo both had for noncombatants in the Russo-Japanese war, where General Nogi, during the battle of Port Arthur, sacrificed brigade after brigade rather than let his fire reach defenseless persons, women and children and non-combatants. Then read an Italian writer's thesis written after the First World War in defense of horrible warfare and translate that into Japanese and have it accepted literally by a people who were admittedly following, what we know today, were false leaders and you have an explanation of the Japanese change of character and what took place at Nanking and other atrocity centers. The philosophy of warfare took a terrific change after the last war. Writers began putting forth the ideas of horrible warfare and the more horrible the more quickly it was to be over. The sad part about that attitude is that when people get an idea from someone else and not from their own experience and translate that idea into their own language and into their own way of behaving, horrible warfare becomes beastly warfare, and there

is much of the last war that has to be characterized as low-down, beastly warfare. Thus we see that the seeds which matured in the destruction of Pearl Harbor had their beginnings in the Western Hemisphere.

Japan is a nation that definitely wants to be led in world affairs. She needs the association of an honest mind and teacher. The Japanese people have never once lost the student attitude. I do not mean by that that the nation and culture of Japan is devoid of much that is their own, because they are not. But I do want to leave with the Senate the thought that every act of Japan since the arrival of Admiral Perry and the decision of the Japanese leaders to take upon themselves western ways has been an act of following and not of leadership. As long as Japan had the leadership of Great Britain under the Anglo-Japanese alliance, she had a constructive leadership. I am not advocating an American-Japanese alliance, but the war has put us in a position of either being good neighbors, of assuming the teacher-student attitude, or of completely withdrawing and allowing friendships to be sought in less helpful centers, as they were when Japan looked to Italy and Germany as friends and broke with their former allies, the British, and her association with us.

Now if there is to be the student-teacher position plus good neighborliness, because the good-neighbor policy must work east and west as well as north and south, we have an obligation to perform. If we will do our part there is no doubt in my mind but that Japan will do hers.

It is important that we have clearly in mind what it is that the United States proposes to accomplish in Japan. Our objectives are not secret. They have been stated clearly and firmly many times. They are objectives that are entirely in harmony with the purposes of the United Nations. They were endorsed by all the major allies at Potsdam. What we desire is the full demilitarization of Japan and the removal of obstacles which thwart democratic activities in Japanese society. At the same time we will allow the Japanese people every opportunity to resume a peaceful and respectable place in the world.

I said before that the primary responsibility for the success or failure of the Allied objectives rested with the United States—that the future of Japan would be determined largely by our actions. There is, however, also a clear limitation on our responsibility. We cannot create democracy in Japan, for democracy, as General MacArthur has said, and as we all know, "is a thing largely of the spirit." General Marshall, echoing the ideals of Lee, which he undoubtedly planted in his heart as a youth at the Virginia Military Academy, has defined it in a way that Jefferson would applaud, and at the same time realize that his teachings were as much a part of American leadership today as he hoped they would be when he wrote that he and Adams would yet look down from heaven with joy at the fulfillment of this great dream. Marshall's words should be taught to every school boy and girl in America, should

be translated and made part of the education of each youth in Japan. These are his words:

I realize that the word "democracy" is given many interpretations. To the American Government and citizens it has a basic meaning. We believe that human beings have certain inalienable rights—that is, rights which may not be given or taken away.

They include the right of every individual to develop his mind and his soul in the ways of his own choice, free of fear and coercion—provided only that he does not interfere with the rights of others. To us a society is not democratic if men who respect the rights of their fellow men are not free to express their own beliefs and convictions without fear that they may be snatched away from their home and family. To us a society is not free if law-abiding citizens live in fear of being denied the right to work or deprived of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Surely I will be excused for a moment's diversion to say what I have said so many times, that the outstanding characteristic in our world leadership in the world war is that our great generals and admirals are statesmen first and military geniuses second. If this is not a complete proof of the American ideal of citizen soldiery, I do not know what else it may be. An almost day-to-day association with our Secretaries of War and the Navy during the war period gave me a renewed appreciation of the basic idealism which underlay their acts.

Democracy is a way of life a long time in the building. Our legitimate objective, and the most we can hope to accomplish, is to establish and permit to grow in Japan those conditions under which democracy can flourish. At the same time, we must remain on guard against a revival of forces which, just a short time ago, were calling for a hundred years war against us and crashing planes in mad suicidal dives on our naval vessels. Let us make no mistake; militarism in Japan is not a mere surface phenomenon involving a few generals and admirals. It is more a manifestation of imitation of evils found in the West and the tragedy which befalls a people who cast off decent ideals to follow apostate leadership.

The work of the occupation has fallen into three main categories: Demilitarization, political and social reorientation, and economic reconstruction. In considering each of these it is important to remember that the actual task of administering the policies has rested largely with the Japanese Government, operating under the authority and supervision of the supreme commander for the Allied Powers.

The most tangible result is seen in the demobilization of Japanese military power. Within a very short time after the surrender, forces in the homeland were completely disbanded and armaments production was brought to a halt. When the Japanese had completed these assignments, they were ordered to dissolve their war and naval ministries. Then came the return of the pioneers of Japanese expansion—the 6,000,000 civilians and soldiers scattered in outposts throughout the Pacific and in Asia. This tremendous job of repatriation was completed by the end of 1946 except for large numbers of Japanese prisoners still held by the Russians. Still another phase of demilitarization has been the war-crimes

trials. These have been conducted with justice. In addition to the major criminals still undergoing trial in Tokyo, scores of other Japanese have been made to answer for the flagrant atrocities they committed against the helpless during the war. These trials received full publicity in Japan so that the ordinary people may know to what depths of wickedness their military descended.

Of course, the complete destruction of Japan's current ability to wage war is not in itself perpetual insurance against a revival of military power. In the long run the prevention of militarism must depend upon the further growth of the democratic idea among the Japanese people. It is at this point in allied policy that the problem of demilitarization merges with the larger questions of political and social reorientation and economic reconstruction.

What we should attempt in these fields is the establishment of an environment in Japan which will predispose the people of that country to a peaceful revolution of tremendous consequence. We should introduce in a few years the nonmaterial aspects of hundreds of years of western culture—the fruits of the renaissance, political liberalism, Christian humanism—in short, all those ideals and spiritual values which have tempered the material advance of the west. But in addition to that, the oldest of all Chinese learned culture, based as it was upon a deep and appreciative study of the Chinese classics, should be revitalized and brought to life under the auspices of teachers who have accepted the theory of the dignity of the individual and the notion of the processes of government which spring from an acceptance of the principle of inherent right in the individual and above all the great principle that governments are instituted not for their own perpetuation nor their own good, but for the people they represent.

Mr. President, time after time in the hearings on the European relief bill questions were asked by various Senators, as to why we cannot bring this about, or bring that about. The answer is easy. No other government on earth fully accepts the notion that a government is merely the agent of the people. Political parties in every government I know of where the democratic processes have been working incidentally, are professional affairs, and those political parties succeed, and the men in them derive their livelihood, only when they control government. One could not convince an Italian, a Frenchman, or a citizen of any other country that when government speaks it speaks for the benefit of the people. They know that it speaks for the benefit of the party in power, and the self-perpetuating will of those people. In America, where political parties are sentimental, and where we continually have accidents in politics in every State in the Union, it is difficult for us to see that there is a difference. It was extremely interesting to attend the Oxford debate the other night and find one of the young debaters, a boy who was probably only a sophomore in college, being introduced as a man who will be put forth by his party as a candidate for a seat in Parliament. Already

he had adhered to a given party in Great Britain, and that is where he will stay as long as he lives. His success in his political life will not depend upon that which he does for the Government of Great Britain, but it will depend upon that which he can do for the party which he joins. If he becomes a great leader he will be moved from one constituency to another in order to preserve himself in his party position. If that practice were followed in America, being allied with the Democratic Party, if the Democratic Party could persist I could have a life job. But it does not work that way in America. All the alinement in the world will not keep the independent voter from jumping fences and sidewalks and voting as he pleases.

That is the fundamental difference. Even when we make comparisons with the mother of parliaments, the country which gave us most of our institutions, we find that the difference is so great that it is exceedingly difficult even for United States Senators to understand. They ask an ambassador on the stand the question, "Why can you not bring it so that in France, Italy, Holland, or Denmark, the people will react in a certain way?"

It will take a long time, Mr. President. The Voice of America may bring about such changes. That is one of the tasks which we have to do if our type of life is to persist in the world.

To bring about the desired reorientation of Japanese society, every phase of Japanese life must be affected. The initial targets already aimed at are the feudal components of the social structure and elements in public life which had championed totalitarianism. These impediments to freedom had to be uprooted and swept into obscurity before any constructive measures could be undertaken. Therefore, thousands of persons in government, business, education, and public information were screened. Scores of Japanese with militaristic leaning have already been excluded from public life. Furthermore, the thought-control police—the dreaded Kempeitai—have been abolished and the fanatic patriotic societies, such as the Black Dragon, have been dissolved.

State Shintoism, chief perpetrator of the imperial divinity concept, has been abolished. This is not the great revolution which many writers have stressed. The Shinto religion, even in my day, was a religion without a theology, without a hierarchy, and even without a system of morals, excepting for the influence which those priests who did read and who understood the Chinese classics might have accepted. Ancestor worship alone had little state significance until it was pointed out to the Japanese by westerners that it was not necessary for the whole nation to become Christian, as was the plan, in order that nationalism might properly be accepted, since thoughtlessly, it had been pointed out that nationalism, as a state ideal, had developed only in Christian countries. The scheme was for the crown-prince to become a Christian and that when he succeeded to the emperorship the transition would be easy. At this time it was pointed out that, if Shinto were made to

stand for the concept of the divine right of kings, as evolved in the west, Shintoism could become a state religion and be made into a political concept to develop the theory of national patriotism. The Mikado cult has ceased to operate in the realm of mysticism. The emperor, Hirohito, has been humanized and placed both constitutionally and in practice on a level comparable with that of King George of England. In my day the Mikado cult, as a political necessity, had not become so universally accepted that those few teachers, who talked about the development of the Japanese Constitution and compared the Emperor's political position with that of the King of England, were interfered with. I remember one debate in Parliament where this was openly done and, while the member of Parliament was chided because he was reminded of the fact that the constitution carried the provision of the inviolability of the Emperor, it did not seem then archtreason to discuss the point.

While the effect of these preliminaries were spreading through Japan the Japanese Government was pushed into a series of actions designed to establish a basis for genuine democracy. Restrictions on political, civil, and religious liberty came to an end and thousands of political prisoners—potential leaders of a new Japan—were released. The notoriously brutal Japanese police received a reschooling in practices of common decency and courtesy. New textbooks in geography, history, and morals cast Japan in an entirely different light for the pupils of the elementary and secondary schools.

The press, the radio, and the screen all experienced a new freedom. They ceased to be the mouthpiece of officialdom and their liberty was limited only for the interest of Allied objectives.

One of the most far-reaching changes concerned the women of Japan whose position in society had long been backward. They were granted legal equality. This change cannot be marked off as a purely theoretical one as some critics have sought to do. That the women will exercise their new rights is indicated by the first election after the establishment of the occupation. They constituted 67 percent of all voters. They elected 38 of their sex to the House of Representatives. One of my own students, who wrote his master's thesis in the middle twenties on the subject, *The Introduction of Women's Suffrage in Japan*, became one of the leaders in this movement. My point in mentioning this is to show that there are thousands in great movements in Japan who are prepared to assume leadership in many fields in bringing about Japan's great social and political changes. The universities of our country are all represented in these fields.

The trends toward political, economic, and social democracy set in motion by General MacArthur's directives culminated in the new constitution promulgated on November 3, 1946. Much ill-informed criticism has been directed at this constitution. There are those who say that the document is alien to the Japanese character, that in allowing it to be promulgated General MacArthur

has provided the shell of democracy without the substance. The fact remains, however, that the document is one of the most democratic fundamental laws ever devised. It conforms in every respect to the most advanced concepts of the political, economic, and social responsibilities of government. That it is un-Japanese does not destroy its basic purpose. Almost everything that we attempt in Japan at this time might be labeled un-Japanese, since we are attempting to reform and redirect Japanism, not to preserve it intact. MacArthur himself has clearly stated that the constitution, however liberal, does not of itself create democracy. However, what it does do is to provide the legal structure within which democracy can develop. That is all that any constitution could do. That is all that we intend to do. The process of giving substance to a fundamental social concept is something which can be undertaken only by the people who live under it. The task is a timeless one, and we shall not know soon with what degree of success the Japanese will discharge it. Knowing the Japanese and knowing that the seeds of democratic thought are already there, I am convinced that democracy has taken genuine root in Japan and that it will endure. All are impressed by the recent Japanese elections. A preponderance of moderate candidates was elected, and the national Government is now headed by a Socialist, who is a Christian, Tetsu Katayama, whose views follow those of the British Labor Party. His cabinet is of a coalition type and it contains a considerable conservative element.

The political and social progress of Japan during the 2 years of the occupation has been very impressive. In the long run, however, it is likely that the final test of our policies will take place in the economic field. If we fail there, democracy will not stand in Japan. Let us not forget that the advance of totalitarianism in Europe was built largely on the promise to end the economic chaos into which the various nations had fallen.

The great family trusts—the so-called *Zaibatsu*—have been dissolved and large land holdings have been divided. Responsible trade-unions have been encouraged. The motive behind these measures is to break up excessive concentration of wealth in impoverished Japan and to diversify economic power and responsibility.

There are some problems of the Japanese economy that are beyond the control of the Japanese themselves. Consider for a moment that the arable land in Japan now available to feed a population of between seventy and eighty million people is equal to slightly more than one-half the farm acreage of the State of Illinois. We must face the fact that Japan does not and cannot produce sufficient food. The prospects for any significant increase in agricultural production in the foreseeable future are exceedingly remote. As a matter of fact, in the absence of large imports of fertilizers there is more likely to be a drop in output. Then remember that Japan's major cities

were destroyed. Familiar as the Japanese are with overnight destruction, such as the Tokyo earthquake and the fire of '23, the Osaka and Aomori fires, and the volcanic eruptions, yet the destruction of her cities on a scale greater and more extensive than the destruction in any country in Europe makes it too much for us to expect them not to have greater economic consequences.

It is clear that Japan's sole hope of maintaining even a tolerable standard of living depends upon the redevelopment of peaceful foreign trade. Until this can be done, the United States must advance essential food supplies. It is hardly necessary to stress that if widespread starvation takes place in Japan, not only would our democratic objectives be defeated, but the security of the occupation itself would be placed in costly jeopardy. The Japanese authorities have been prodded into developing the most equitable distribution of food supplies. Beyond this the responsibility rests with the people of the United States and with their Congress to make available basic assistance until economic recovery reaches the point where Japan is once again self-sustaining.

At present three factors hamper Japan's recovery: The economic breakdown and exhaustion within Japan; the failure of the Allies to settle finally the reparations problem; and the barriers to free Japanese trade in the world markets. In each of these instances only initial corrective measures have been taken.

Regardless of what the Japanese themselves do, however, we must recognize that ultimately the tempo of Japanese recovery is intricately related to allied policy on the questions of reparations and foreign trade. The principle of compensating the victims of Japanese aggression with a part of Japan's productive capacity is recognized by all the Allied Powers. But it is imperative that the Japanese be advised as quickly as possible on the precise terms of the reparations settlement. Until this is done they cannot go forward with their recovery plans. In the case of foreign trade, the Japanese have been permitted some private trading. But this is only a partial solution. Japan must be able to purchase essential nonstrategic raw materials freely abroad and to sell finished products in the world markets. This may run counter to the views of some selfish interest in the Allied Nations, but the alternatives are a continuous drain upon the taxpayers of the United States or mass starvation in Japan. These are the inescapable realities of the situation.

But, regardless of the distress caused by bad economic conditions, Japan must be guided from that most fatal of all premises, that feeding the people must come first, social, and political reforms after. That is the fallacy to which Italy has sunk with such fatal results to the good and well-being of that great people. My plea is that political, social, and economic upbuilding go hand in hand, for they are related.

The destruction of Japan was so complete, her defeat so colossal, and her governmental changes so revolutionary, that there is no other way out for Japan,

except to attempt to be a good student and a good neighbor. Common sense, therefore, is the only guide Japan need follow. But pure common sense will not see us through in our end of what must be a bargain. We must appreciate our student. No teacher is successful if he has no sympathy for or appreciation and comprehension of his student. To know Japan, therefore, to understand her basic ideals, to appreciate both the good and the bad of her characteristics, becomes our prime essential. We must cease to be satisfied with following the policy of rather ill-trained unsympathetic experts either in Asia or Europe.

Economically, Japan has always been dependent upon our trade. In the future that will be the case more than ever. The invention of nylon and its universal acceptance by the ladies of the world may bring upon the Japanese silk industry an economic repercussion from which it cannot recover. Both nylon and war must be overcome. But Japan's success economically is more certain than it has ever been if she can remain free from the destructive burdens of a terrible taxation which was necessary to maintain her unnatural armaments. Thus Japan economically faces the new world with skill, abundance of labor, organizational ability, a knowledge of knowing how to work together, and a craftsmanship unexcelled. Given these factors, plus a halfway decent market, she will succeed. Whether she will have that market depends upon us. We shall have to do some adjusting there. Japan's skill in meeting the demands of consumers in almost any line was, we remember, so much a factor before the war that those who judged war entirely on the basis of economic competition felt that she and her selling abilities must be destroyed. Thus, if we become her sponsor and her economic ally in raising her own standard of living and helping her to get her goods into the markets of the world, she will become a profitable ally, not only to us but to the whole world.

Socially, Japan must of necessity work for the raising of standards in the rest of Asia, or else she will be overcome by lower standards, if the thesis that poverty anywhere affects the living standards everywhere is true. If we have really learned that war anywhere is the concern of all everywhere, then Japan can join enthusiastically with us in attempting to arrange her economy so that her standards will contribute to the betterment of the standards throughout the world.

The Japanese money system is, of course, completely destroyed. But the Japanese people have been used to a stable currency, and that can be assured them again by association with us. Her yen should be pinned to our dollar.

Politically, we need not fear a return to any philosophy at all which is distasteful to our American democratic ideals, if we will but give the Japanese people a chance again to read and study about Washington and Lincoln and the other American leaders that every Japanese schoolboy studied during the development of the Japanese school system. The war was carried on by Japanese

leaders who were utterly false to world thought and to the Japanese traditions that were accepted by the majority of the Japanese people a generation and a half ago.

So Japan can again be brought into the sisterhood of nations, with the Rising Sun as a token of a restoration of an old aspiring, an old striving, which was crushed by the rise in the world of a false doctrine based on the notion of a single will in a state under the leadership of dishonest, ill-trained, overambitious Hitlers, Mussolinis, Matsuokas, and Tojos.

Under the old theory, the Emperor of Japan owned all the land and all the people, and was father of all. Those concepts were taken from the theories put into the Chinese characters. The people in a paternal sense were never forgotten. They had no rights, but they needed no rights because the Emperor was all-benevolent. That was theory. Today Japan has a constitution based upon our own American notion that governments exist for the benefit of the people; that governments themselves have no rights, but that the rights belong to the people; that the property is the property of the people; and that the governments use the property only for the people's benefit and for public use. In this picture the Emperor is a guardian, therefore, of the people's property and the people's well-being. That, too, is theory. It is the key to American-Japanese cooperation. Leadership in Japan will, no doubt, come from the people inspired by these ideals, and the Emperor will be an interpreter of the people's aspirations. We should think that through as we consider the whole of Asia, and we should consider whether it is an exaggeration to say that the making of the new Asia will undoubtedly occur under Japanese leadership. The culmination of the American revolution is not yet complete, but it is surely on the way.

This is what I said in 1943:

The after-war world will be a world with the center of interest shifted away from the Western Hemisphere to the East. Asia, like Europe, is allied with distant powers and is divided within. Yet the preponderance of Asiatic populations will throw the center of gravity to the Eastern Hemisphere. Since the beginning of time, Asia has been a world problem. Now it is the world problem. The conflicts in which the four major allies—Russia, China, the United States, and Great Britain—are fighting are Asiatic conflicts. But long after Asia will have ceased to be a theater of military operations it will be predominant; for the three greatest social, political, and economic revolutions—the Chinese, the Indian, and the Russian—are essentially Asiatic.

Our fundamental concept of democracy and our religious and political recognition of the dignity of the individual and his inherent rights are necessary to the solving not only of Europe's problems but also of Asia's. Our belief in the rights of revolution gives us confidence in the face of change. With faith, then, in our idealism, the world will go forward as it follows American leadership.

If my prediction is true, the place for Japan in the fulfillment of that prophecy is plainly seen when we catch the spirit

of her new constitution. Our whole success depends upon our being able to keep the thought of the leadership in Japan in harmony with what we said in our psychological warfare, and to build the future Japan upon what we told the Japanese were their own ideals, as taught to them during the best part of the Meiji era, their greatest period.

Mr. President, I have felt justified in doing the two things I have done in my rather long consideration of this bill. First of all, the theories behind the bill are as essential to our success and as much in keeping with our own self-interest in the expansion of American ideals in the rest of the world as is any other thing we may suggest. In the second place, no matter what we think, no matter what we do, no matter how we act, we have with us all the time the problems of Asia, which to a certain extent we have forgotten because Asia has not been in the headlines lately. That is a very good sign, Mr. President, because things are moving fairly well so far as concerns Japan and the part of Korea for which we are presently responsible. Comparatively speaking, things in those parts of the world are moving along fairly well. But never can any American fail to realize, Mr. President, that a peaceful Europe will bring to us no peace at all unless we have a peaceful Pacific and a peaceful Asia. Our real neighbors, our real responsibilities, are to be found in the lands to the west of us, across the Pacific rather than in the lands across the Atlantic. The answer to the question of to what extent our Army and Navy must be expanded is to be found in the lands lying to the west of us, across the Pacific. However, the average person in the United States does not realize that that is the case.

Therefore, Mr. President, I add this final thought to the fine sentiment presented by the Senator from New Jersey at the close of his speech, when he stated that American stock had its roots in and stemmed from practically every one of the 16 countries for which we are trying to do something under the Marshall plan. Of course, more of our American stock has come from Europe than from Asia; nevertheless, a considerable part of it has come from Asia. It is obvious that we are responsible for the new birth, the new life, and many of the revolutions which have occurred in that part of the world, because those developments have occurred under the leadership of our thought. So it is that we must see to it that those great revolutions succeed properly, if we are to have peace and contentment for ourselves and for the world.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the first committee amendment, which is, in section 1, on page 2, line 5, to strike out "1947" and insert "1948."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] for the great leadership he has given to the course of the measure pending before the Senate of the United States, and, because I understand a record vote will not be

taken on the bill, I desire to make myself of record in support of it.

I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that in the Seventy-ninth Congress we had a similar controversy before the Senate over similar legislation, except the way was much more difficult than the Senator from New Jersey has found it to be in this instance. But it is rather interesting, Mr. President, to go back to that debate in the Seventy-ninth Congress, when it was my task to lead on this side of the aisle the fight for the retention of what was then the foreign branch of our OWI, then being conducted under the very able leadership of Elmer Davis, and note the course of the argument, and the pleas which were made at that time in support of the proposition that if we were really going to accomplish the great objectives which we have in Europe as far as winning the peace is concerned, the then Voice of America, known as the Foreign Branch of OWI, should not be hamstrung by the Congress of the United States. By a very close vote, it will be recalled, we won that battle in the Seventy-ninth Congress.

It is interesting to note, however, the great change that has come over the thinking of the Congress since that year, with the result that now we have this very sound piece of legislation, so well handled by the Senator from New Jersey, bearing out, I think, some of the very points that were made in the debate in the Seventy-ninth Congress, when we pleaded with the Congress not to make the mistake of closing off or shutting down the appropriations for a public relations program in Europe, because, as we predicted, if we do not maintain that program, then movements in Europe contrary to the best interest of America are bound to take root.

In closing these remarks, I again wish to thank the Senator from New Jersey, and point out in the Record that what we are doing today seems to me to be taking a step that ought to have been taken with much greater vigor and greater spirit back in the Seventy-ninth Congress.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, the kind words of the Senator from Oregon are very much appreciated by the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield to me?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I rise to say a few words in connection with the remarks made by the Senator from Massachusetts, who paid a high and well-deserved tribute to the chairman of our subcommittee, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH]. It happens that originally there were just two members of that subcommittee, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and myself. Later there were added to the subcommittee the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. Our work was not all performed at home, but it took us into nearly all the European countries and then back home again. I want to say, Mr. President, that, under the leader-

ship of the Senator from New Jersey, I never saw any group of men work with greater singleness of purpose or with a stronger desire to bring out the best bill possible in the light of everything we had to consider. I am glad to pay this tribute to the Senator from New Jersey.

I may say, Mr. President, I was tremendously impressed by the remarks of the Senator from New Jersey as he concluded his eloquent address by referring to the voice of America as a voice of all the great Americans of the past and of all the great Americans of the future, and saying that the voice of America must include all that has been said of our ideals and purposes and way of life, by those who are dead and gone, and by those who live today. Mr. President, I know that he agrees with me that to that voice of America should also be added not only the voices of the present and the voices of the past, but also the voice of the future; for the voice of America as she looks down the years in the future is the hope of all the downtrodden and oppressed peoples of the world. The voice of the future in America must remain the voice of the past and the voice of the present, a strong voice declaring the rights of freemen, the freedom of the individual, the rule of law and order, things for which the countries of the Old World are so desperately praying and yearning. So we must project to that part of the world our best hopes for the future, that the other countries of the world may remain strong, free, and independent nations. All the rights, freedoms, and high principles combined, of the past, the present, and the future, constitute the strong and mighty voice of America.

In working on the pending bill we have tried to lay the foundation upon which adequate appropriations may be made, so that the voice of America hereafter, as it speaks to the world, shall be as strong and as mighty as is America herself.

I shall not take further time except to say that in the light of all the things we had to consider, including the probable attitude of the House of Representatives, we have brought forth the best bill we were able to present, and with the amendments which will be agreed upon today, I think for the present at least the bill will answer its purposes.

Mr. President, I wish to say that I was very much interested in noting yesterday an editorial in the Washington Post on the subject of a suggestion made by our colleague the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]. The suggestion had to do with the air-mailing of copies of American newspapers overseas as a vital part of our foreign-information program. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the editorial be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

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

READING MATTER

Senator WILEY expressed a commendable thought in calling for greater numbers of

American newspapers and magazines to be flown abroad, and we hope that the Nation's publishers, not the State Department, will act upon it. Our foreign-information program, and, indeed, the Marshall plan itself, can have no more important adjunct than the spread of American reading matter. The situation now is that, aside from the limited American publishing operations in foreign cities and the relatively few copies sent by air from this country, American periodicals are a month or 6 weeks old when they reach libraries and reading rooms abroad. Our disadvantage in the ideological struggle is thus obvious; Moscow papers can be had in almost any European capital the next morning.

The ideal solution for this problem would be for American newspapers and magazines either to set up editions published in Europe and Asia or to band together and promote a commentary service for distribution abroad. Perhaps, also, the idea might be considered of encouraging the kind of overseas editions which were put out during the war by several of our newspapers and magazines. Under this arrangement all copy would be written, edited, and set in type in this country, but the actual printing would be carried on abroad by means of lightweight printing plates flown from the United States.

But one or the other of these ideas would take time, and Senator WILEY's suggestion could be carried out immediately. There is a place in his picture, moreover, for book publishers, for American books are desired almost universally. Universities in Germany and Japan, for example, have received practically no American textbooks and technical material since before the war. To place such material in their hands now could be to acquire an inestimable asset in cementing friendship and spreading American ideas.

Every man in these perilous days must be his own Marshall plan according to his ability, as Mr. Drew Pearson has demonstrated so well and so admirably with his Friendship Train project. In the battle we are waging, food for men's minds is no less imperative than food for their stomachs. What must be guarded against, however, is the suggestion of Government subsidization; this would be a double-edged weapon, for it would give the Kremlin a weapon in their ideological war on America by demonstrating the same tie-in between press and state that Russia has.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I should like to express my deep appreciation of the kind words of the Senator from New Mexico, and to thank him for having added the voice of the future to the voices of the past and of the present. I should like further to pay tribute to him for the wonderful assistance he has given us all in the consideration of the bill, and the special point that he emphasized, not only every time we met together, but which he also emphasized the other day when, to my regret, I was not present on the floor of the Senate, that in dealing with foreign relations, politics is forgotten. The reason why our committee was successful this summer, in my judgment, was because we never even thought of politics. We were Americans working together, trying to find an American policy to accomplish an American purpose, and I thank God I have been able to be associated with men who had that view in approaching this subject.

Mr. President, I shall be glad to continue with the consideration of the committee amendments to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment of the committee.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 7, to strike out section 2, as follows:

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby declares that the objectives of this act are to enable the Government of the United States to promote mutual understanding between the people of the United States and of other countries, which is one of the essential foundations of peace, and to correct misunderstandings about the United States in other countries. The means to be used in achieving these objectives are—

- (1) the interchange of persons, knowledge, and skills;
- (2) the rendering of technical and other services to other countries on the basis of mutual cooperation;
- (3) the dissemination abroad of public information about the United States, its people, and the principles and objectives of its Government; and
- (4) the dissemination abroad of public information about the United Nations, its organization and functions, and the participation of the United States as a member thereof.

And in lieu thereof to insert the following:

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby declares that the objectives of this act are to enable the Government of the United States to promote a better understanding of the United States in other countries, and to increase mutual understanding between the people of the United States and the people of other countries. Among the means to be used in achieving these objectives are—

- (1) an information service to disseminate abroad information about the United States, its people, and policies promulgated by the Congress, the President, the Secretary of State and other responsible officials of Government having to do with matters affecting foreign affairs;
- (2) an educational exchange service to cooperate with other nations in—
 - (a) the interchange of persons, knowledge, and skills;
 - (b) the rendering of technical and other services;
 - (c) the interchange of developments in the field of education, the arts, and sciences.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, after line 20, to insert a new section, as follows:

UNITED NATIONS

SEC. 3. In carrying out the objectives of this act, information concerning the participation of the United States in the United Nations, its organizations and functions, shall be emphasized.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 2, to change the section number from 3 to 4, and in line 6, after the word "agency", to strike out "in the executive branch."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, in section 201, line 18, after the word "skill" to insert "and shall wherever possible provide these interchanges by using the services of existing reputable agencies which are successfully engaged in such activity", and on page 5, line 4, after the name "United States" to strike out "If the Secretary finds that any per-

son from another country, while in the United States pursuant to this section, is engaged in activities of a political nature or in activities not consistent with the security of the United States, the Secretary shall promptly report such finding to the Attorney General, and such person shall, upon the warrant of the Attorney General, be taken into custody, and promptly deported." and insert "The persons specified in this section shall be admitted as nonimmigrant visitors for business under clause 2 of section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended (43 Stat. 154; 8 U. S. C. 203), for such time and under such conditions as may be prescribed by regulations promulgated by the Secretary of State and the Attorney General. A person admitted under this section who fails to maintain the status under which he was admitted or who fails to depart from the United States at the expiration of the time for which he was admitted, or who engages in activities of a political nature detrimental to the interests of the United States, or in activities not consistent with the security of the United States, shall, upon the warrant of the Attorney General, be taken into custody and promptly deported pursuant to section 14 of the Immigration Act of 1924 (43 Stat. 162, 8 U. S. C. 214). Deportation proceedings under this section shall be summary and the findings of the Attorney General as to matters of fact shall be conclusive. Such persons shall not be eligible for suspension of deportation under clause 2 of subdivision (c) of section 19 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (54 Stat. 671, 56 Stat. 1044; 8 U. S. C. 155)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, in section 301, line 8, after the word "any", to strike out "person" and insert "citizen of the United States."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, in section 302, line 18, after the word "Any", to strike out "person" and insert "citizen of the United States."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, in section 303, line 9, after the word "Any", to strike out "person" and insert "citizen of the United States."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, in section 401, line 6, after the word "with", to strike out "their" and insert "the"; in the same line, after the word "approval", to insert "of the President."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, line 7, after the word "agencies", to strike out "whenever the Secretary shall use the services, facilities, or personnel of any government agency for activities under authority of this act, the Secretary shall pay for such performance out of funds available to the Secretary under this act, either in advance, by reimbursement, or direct transfer. In utilizing the Government agencies, it is the sense of the Congress (1) that the best available and qualified Government services, facilities, and personnel shall be sought, in order to insure professional

competence and avoid duplication; and (2) that the Secretary shall consult the appropriate technical agencies of the Government concerning any activity authorized by titles II, III, and IV of this act which comes within the competence of such agencies."

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated. My amendment is in lieu of the committee amendment on page 9, line 7.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 9, in lieu of the matter proposed to be stricken out by the committee amendment in lines 7 to 20, inclusive, it is proposed to insert the following:

Whenever the Secretary shall use the services, facilities, or personnel of any Government agency for activities under authority of this act, the Secretary shall pay for such performance out of funds available to the Secretary under this act, either in advance, by reimbursement, or direct transfer. The Secretary shall include in each report submitted to the Congress under section 1008 a statement of the services, facilities, and personnel of other Government agencies utilized in carrying on activities under the authority of this act, showing the names and salaries of the personnel utilized, or performing services utilized, during the period covered by such report, and the amounts paid to such other agencies under this section as payment for such performance.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the amendment is self-explanatory. I ask that my amendment be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska to the committee amendment on page 9, line 7.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, may I ask whether the amendment suggested by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] has been agreed to?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No; it has not been agreed to.

Mr. SMITH. I will say to the Senator from Utah that the amendment has not yet been reached.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 10, in section 403, line 14, after the word "through", to strike out "the" and insert "any appropriate"; in the same line, after the word "agency", to strike out "with appropriate legislative authority"; in line 17, after the word "agencies", to insert a comma and "and shall not enter into the performance of such services to any foreign government where such services may be performed adequately by qualified private American individuals and agencies and such qualified individuals and agencies are available for the performance of such services"; and on page 11, line 12, after the word "assignments", to strike out the semicolon and "(4) that such services shall not be undertaken for a foreign government if, in

the opinion of the head of the Government agency, such services will impair the fulfillment of domestic responsibilities of that agency; and (5) that the Department shall invite outstanding leaders in the United States, both within and outside the Federal Government, in the various fields of activity covered by this title, to review and extend advice on the Secretary's policies in rendering technical and other services to another government pursuant to this title."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, after line 21, to strike out:

TRAINING

SEC. 404. Any Government agency, at the request of the Secretary, is authorized to provide to citizens of other countries, and to citizens of the United States going to other countries in connection with the carrying out of this act, technical and other training within the fields in which such agency has competence, or to provide for such training through State and local governmental agencies or private institutions and organizations.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, after line 5, to strike out:

INTERCHANGE OF SPECIALIZED KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS

SEC. 405. A Government agency, at the request of the Secretary, is authorized to promote the interchange with other countries of scientific and specialized knowledge and skills, within the fields in which such agency has competence, through publications and other scientific and educational materials.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, after line 12, to strike out:

INTERDEPARTMENTAL COORDINATION

SEC. 406. In order that the activities of Government agencies authorized by titles II, III, and IV of this act may be effectively coordinated and interdepartmental relationships as authorized by this act may be clearly defined, the Secretary may establish upon direction of the President an interdepartmental committee to advise the Secretary on the development and administration of these activities.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, in section 501, line 4, after the word "abroad", to strike out "all such press releases and radio scripts shall, in the English language, be made available to press associations, newspapermen, radio systems and stations in the United States, and to Members of the Congress of the United States, upon request, within 15 days after release as information abroad." and insert "On request, representative samples or specific individual press releases and radio scripts shall be made available in the English language for examination at the Department of State by representatives of press associations, newspapers, magazines, radio systems and stations, and be made available to Members of Congress, within 15 days after release as information abroad."

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I offer the amendment to the committee amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment offered

by the Senator from Minnesota will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 13, in the committee amendment, beginning with the word "on" in line 9, it is proposed to strike out through and including line 16, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

Any such press release or radio script, on request, shall be available in the English language, at the Department of State, at all reasonable times following its release as information abroad, for examination by representatives of United States press associations, newspapers, magazines, radio systems and stations, and, on request, shall be made available to Members of Congress.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I have discussed the amendment with the Senator in charge of the bill, and I think it is agreeable to him.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I accept the amendment.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, what is the limitation proposed in the Senator's amendment?

Mr. BALL. We simply say, "at all reasonable times." I could not figure out what the 15-day limitation meant.

Mr. HATCH. I did not understand the Senator's amendment. As I now understand, the amendment provides that such releases shall be made available at all reasonable times.

Mr. BALL. Yes.

Mr. HATCH. That is satisfactory.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] to the committee amendment on page 13, beginning in line 9.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, in section 502, line 20, after the word "Secretary", to strike out "shall encourage and facilitate by appropriate means the dissemination abroad of information about the United States by private American individuals and agencies, shall supplement such private information dissemination where necessary, and," and on page 14, line 5, after the word "information", to strike out the semicolon and "(3) that the Department shall invite outstanding private leaders of the United States in cultural and informational fields to review and extend advice on the Government's international information activities; and (4) that all printed matter, films, broadcasts, and other materials in the fields of mass media shall, when disseminated by the Government, be identified as to Government or private source."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, after line 12, to strike out:

TITLE VI. ADVISORY COMMISSION TO FORMULATE POLICIES FORMULATION OF POLICIES

SEC. 601. There is hereby created a United States Information and Educational Exchange Advisory Commission (hereinafter in this title referred to as the "Commission") to be constituted as provided in section 602. The Commission shall formulate and present to the Secretary of State the policies to be

followed and adhered to in connection with the interchange of persons, knowledge and skills, the assignment of specialists, the preparation and dissemination of information about the United States, its people and its policies, and the carrying out of the other provisions of this act.

MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMISSION, GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 602. (a) The Commission shall consist of 11 members, not more than 6 of whom shall be from any one political party, as follows: (1) Nine members to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and (2) the Secretary of State or such officer in the State Department as may be designated by such Secretary.

(b) The members of the Commission shall represent the public interest, but of the persons appointed under clause (1) of subsection (a) of this section, one shall be selected from among educators, one from among individuals formerly in active service in the armed forces of the United States, one from representatives of labor, one farmer, one from the newspaper business, one from the motion-picture industry, one from the radio industry, and three from persons having general business experience. All persons so appointed shall be persons of national reputations in their respective fields. No person holding any compensated Federal or State office shall be eligible for appointment under clause (1) of subsection (a) of this section.

(c) The term of each member appointed under clause (1) of subsection (a) of this section shall be 3 years except that the terms of office of such members first taking office on the Commission shall expire, as designated by the President at the time of appointment, three at the end of 1 year, three at the end of 2 years, and three at the end of 3 years from the date of the enactment of this act. Any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor is appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term. Upon the expiration of his term of office any member may continue to serve until his successor is appointed and has qualified.

(d) The President shall designate a chairman and a vice chairman from among members of the Commission.

(e) The members of the Commission shall receive no compensation for their services as such members but shall be entitled to reimbursement for travel and subsistence in connection with attendance of meetings of the Commission away from their places of residences.

(f) The Commission is authorized to adopt such rules and regulations as it may deem necessary to carry out the authority conferred upon it by this title.

(g) The Commission is authorized, without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, to appoint and fix the compensation of such clerical assistants as may be necessary in carrying out the provisions of this title.

RECOMMENDATIONS AND REPORTS

SEC. 603. The Commission shall meet not less frequently than once each month and shall from time to time prepare and transmit to the Secretary and to the Congress its recommendations for carrying out the various activities authorized by this act, and shall submit to the Congress a quarterly report of all programs and activities recommended by it under this act and the action taken to carry out such recommendations.

And to insert:

TITLE VI—ADVISORY COMMISSIONS TO FORMULATE POLICIES

SEC. 601. There are hereby created two advisory commissions, (1) United States Advisory Commission on Information (herein-

after in this title referred to as the Commission on Information) and (2) United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange (hereinafter in this title referred to as the Commission on Educational Exchange) to be constituted as provided in section 602. The Commissions shall formulate and recommend to the Secretary policies and programs for the carrying out of this act.

MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMISSIONS; GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 602. (a) Each Commission shall consist of five members, not more than three of whom shall be from any one political party. Members shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. No person holding any compensated Federal or State office shall be eligible for appointment.

(b) The members of the Commission on Information shall represent the public interest, and shall be selected from a cross section of professional, business, and public service backgrounds.

(c) The members of the Commission on Educational Exchange shall represent the public interest and shall be selected from a cross section of educational, cultural, scientific, technical, and public-service backgrounds.

(d) The term of each member appointed under subsection (a) of this section shall be 3 years, except that the terms of office of such members first taking office on each Commission shall expire, as designated by the President at the time of appointment, two at the end of 1 year, two at the end of 2 years, and one at the end of 3 years from the date of the enactment of this act. Any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor is appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term. Upon the expiration of his term of office any member may continue to serve until his successor is appointed and has qualified.

(e) The President shall designate a chairman for each Commission from among members of the Commission.

(f) The members of the Commissions shall receive no compensation for their services as such members but shall be entitled to reimbursement for travel and subsistence in connection with attendance of meetings of the Commissions away from their places of residence, as provided in subsection (6) of section 801 of this act.

(g) The Commissions are authorized to adopt such rules and regulations as they may deem necessary to carry out the authority conferred upon them by this title.

(h) The Department is authorized to provide the necessary secretarial and clerical assistance for the Commissions.

RECOMMENDATIONS AND REPORTS

SEC. 603. The Commissions shall meet not less frequently than once each month during the first 6 months after their establishment, and thereafter at such intervals as the Commissions find advisable, and shall transmit to the Secretary a quarterly report, and to the Congress a semiannual report of all programs and activities carried on under the authority of this act, including appraisals, where feasible, as to the effectiveness of the several programs, and such recommendations as shall have been made by the Commissions to the Secretary for effectuating the purposes and objectives of this act and the action taken to carry out such recommendations.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment in section 601.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the committee amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 17, at the end of line 21, in the committee amendment, it is proposed to insert the following proviso:

Provided, however, That the commissions created by this section shall have no authority over the Board of Foreign Scholarships or the program created by Public Law 584 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, enacted August 1, 1946, or the United States National Commission for UNESCO.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I have discussed this amendment with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I have discussed the amendment with the Senator from Arkansas. We feel that it is appropriate, because it is distinctly the purpose of the bill to exclude the other activities to which the Senator has referred. There is no objection to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas to the committee amendment on page 17, line 21.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to section 702, on page 20, beginning in line 8. After the word "Secretary", I move to strike out the word "may" and insert in lieu thereof "shall", to comply with the amendment adopted earlier on page 9.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 20, after line 19, to insert the following sub-head:

THE SECRETARY

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, line 5, after the word "create", to insert "with the approval of the Commission on Information and the Commission on Educational Exchange."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, in section 901, after line 6, to insert:

ADVANCE OF FUNDS

SEC. 902. If any other government shall express the desire to provide funds, property, or services to be used by this Government, in whole or in part, for the expenses of any specific part of the program undertaken pursuant to this act, the Secretary is authorized, when he finds it in the public interest, to accept such funds, property, or services. Funds so received may be established as a special deposit account in the Treasury of the United States, to be available for the specified purpose, and to be used for reimbursement of appropriations or direct expenditure, subject to the provisions of this act. Any unexpended balance of the special deposit account and other property received under this section and no longer required for the purposes for which provided shall be returned to the government providing the funds or property.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, line 3, after "Sec. 1001", to strike out "No citizen or resident of the United States, whether or not now in the employ of the Government, may be employed or assigned to duties under this act unless the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, after such investigation as he deems necessary, certifies that in his opinion such individual is loyal to the United States and that such employment or assignment to duties is consistent with the security of the United States: *Provided, however,* That any present employee of the Government, unless an unfavorable report as to such employee is rendered sooner by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, may, without such certification, be employed or assigned to duties under this act for the period of 6 months from the date of its enactment. This section shall not apply in the case of any officer appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate." and in lieu thereof to insert "No citizen or resident of the United States, whether or not now in the employ of the Government, may be employed or assigned to duties by the Government under this act until such individual has been investigated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and a report thereon has been made to the Secretary of State: *Provided, however,* That any present employee of the Government, pending the report as to such employee by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, may be employed or assigned to duties under this act for the period of 6 months from the date of its enactment. This section shall not apply in the case of any officer appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, after line 7, to strike out:

SEPARABILITY OF PROVISIONS

SEC. 1002. If any provision of this act or the application of any such provision to any person or circumstance shall be held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the act and the applicability of such provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, line 15, to change the section number from 1003 to 1002.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, line 23, to change the section number from 1004 to 1003.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 27, line 4, to change the section number from 1005 to 1004.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 27, line 20, to change the section number from 1006 to 1005, and in line 23, after the word "agencies", to insert "including existing American private publications."

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I offer the amendment to the committee amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 27, line 21, after the word "utilize", it is proposed to strike out down to and including the word "publications" in line 23, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "to the maximum extent practicable, the services and facilities of private agencies, including existing American press, publishing, radio, motion picture, and other agencies."

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment is to make it very clear that in conducting these activities, particularly the informational activities, the State Department is to utilize, to the maximum extent practicable, by contract or otherwise, the facilities and services of private agencies in the field. One reason why I am offering the amendment is that since this bill was scheduled for consideration in the Senate I have received word that the State Department is considering going back to its old practice of itself programing all its short-wave broadcasts. During our hearings on the State Department appropriation bill last year it was brought out very clearly that such a plan costs several times what it would cost if the services were contracted for. Somehow when the Government attempts to do that kind of news writing and broadcasting, it means three or four employees for every one employed by private agencies in the field. I know that the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations which handles the State Department appropriation would not want to go back to the old system, under which the State Department had a huge staff of people in New York doing all the programing, or nearly all the programing, for short-wave broadcasts. I wish to make very clear in this bill the intention of Congress, namely, that the Department shall utilize to the maximum extent practicable the facilities of private agencies. I realize that there are some broadcasts to critical areas which the State Department itself may have to program. However, to the maximum extent practicable, it should utilize the facilities of private agencies in this field.

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

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I have a memorandum given to me by the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] who, I am satisfied, has seen the amendment of the Senator. He wished to have me ask the Senator whether, in carrying out the provisions of the act under the terms of the Senator's amendment, the Secretary will give consideration to using the facilities and services of all regularly licensed international short-wave stations on an equal basis.

Mr. BALL. I will say to the Senator that I believe that in that field we must leave discretion with the State Department to contract with whatever private agencies in the field it feels can do the best job for the program. I would not attempt to say, either in the legislation or here on the floor, that the Department should contract in one way or another, or should or should not contract with a certain agency.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator's amendment provides that such use of private facilities shall be made to the greatest extent practicable. In reality that probably covers what the Senator from Wyoming had in mind.

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

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I find myself in complete agreement with the Senator's amendment. However, for purposes of clarification, am I correct in my understanding that in making use of private facilities—and I think they should be used—the State Department will retain necessary discretion to protect public funds in case any private agency should seek to make a charge for its facilities which the State Department might find to be unreasonable in comparison with what the State Department itself could do in sending the program across the air waves?

Mr. BALL. Of course the State Department always has such authority. However, I may say that all the testimony we took last year indicated that if the Department can find a private agency to do the job, it is always much cheaper than to have the Department itself do the job.

Mr. MORSE. I think that is true. I simply did not want to leave in the RECORD the impression that the congressional intent was that no matter how much the private agency sought to charge the Government, the Government would have to use such agency rather than the State Department.

Mr. BALL. I am very glad that the Senator has made that point, because there is certainly no such intention. The price will be subject to negotiation. The State Department does not have to sign a contract with anyone.

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

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. As I understand the Senator's amendment, I believe that what it does is to make it perfectly clear that the Secretary shall use private agencies to the maximum extent practicable. Is that the language?

Mr. BALL. That is the language.

Mr. HATCH. I think the Senator from New Jersey will agree that that is the purpose of the bill itself, and that there is no particular objection to that language.

Mr. SMITH. That is correct. I talked it over last night with the Senator from Minnesota, and he has just spelled out in the amendment what we had in mind in the amendment to this section we had previously recommended. I have no objection to the amendment. I hope it will pass.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] to the committee amendment on page 27, line 21.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that the amendment which I offered as a substitute for the committee amendment was agreed to?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct. The clerk will state the next amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 28, after line 4, to strike out:

OFFICE OF INFORMATION AND EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE

SEC. 1007. Nothing in this act shall be construed to authorize the establishment of any new Government agency; except that for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act the Secretary is hereby authorized to establish in the Department of State an office to be known as the Office of Information and Educational Exchange.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, line 14, to change the section number from 1008 to 1006, and in the same line, after the word "Act," to strike out the comma and "or under any provision thereof."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, after line 17, to insert a new subhead as follows:

VETERANS' PREFERENCE ACT

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, line 19, to change the section number from 1009 to 1007.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, line 23, to change the section number from 1010 to 1008.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 29, line 6, to change the section number from 1011 to 1009.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 29, after line 10, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEPARABILITY OF PROVISIONS

SEC. 1010. If any provision of this act or the application of any such provision to any person or circumstance shall be held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the act and the applicability of such provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, that completes the committee amendments, does it not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. BALL. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 6, line 18, to strike out the word "or" and insert in lieu thereof the word "and."

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed, on page 7, line 12, after the word "serving"

and the period, to insert "No person shall be assigned for service to or in cooperation with the government of any country, unless (1) the Secretary finds that such assignment is necessary in the national interest of the United States, or (2) such government agrees to reimburse the United States in an amount equal to the compensation, travel expenses, and allowances payable to such person during the period of such assignment in accordance with the provisions of section 302, or (3) such government shall have made an advance of funds, property, or service as provided in section 902."

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I wonder if we might have an explanation of the amendment.

Mr. BALL. I should like to explain both this amendment and the one just agreed to substituting the word "and" for the word "or" in line 18 on page 6. That is an amendment to section 203, which authorizes the Secretary "to assist schools, libraries, and community centers abroad, founded or sponsored by citizens of the United States." Then it goes on to say "or serving as demonstration centers for methods and practices employed in the United States."

There is no restriction whatever on who founds them or sponsors them. I think the word "and" should have been used instead of the word "or" in the original draft of the bill. I think the Senator from New Jersey agrees with me.

The whole title, as it now stands, would permit the Secretary to assign technical experts from our Government to foreign governments to an almost unlimited extent, with our Government bearing the whole cost. It seemed to me that in the great majority of cases—and I think the Senator from New Jersey, after consulting the State Department, found that was true—the foreign government does reimburse our Government. I wanted some restriction on the Secretary's right to assign personnel to other governments and to have us bear the total cost only when he finds it is in the national interest to do so. It will give the Appropriations Subcommittee some check on this particular section of the bill.

Mr. SMITH. I am glad to accept that amendment, and the other amendments offered by the Senator from Minnesota, and I wish to thank him for what I think is a great contribution to the improvement of the bill.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, before the bill is passed, I should like to make one or two remarks.

We went through quite a controversy on the floor last year and in our committee when we authorized continuance of this activity in the State Department, even though it was not authorized by law. In reading Time magazine for January 12, 1948, I was struck by an article on page 13, which reads as follows:

Though no one said so openly, the sponsors of "journals-for-export"—

They were referring to proposals that American publications be exported di-

rectly to some of these countries as part of the national program—

were moved by the American's abiding distrust of Government-controlled news. If they needed grounds for their distrust, they now had a good example.

Three weeks ago the United States press headlined the testimony of Lt. Gen. Albert Wedemeyer before the Senate Appropriations Committee. Wedemeyer, whose report on China had been suppressed by Secretary George Marshall, roundly endorsed immediate economic and military aid to the Nationalist Government of Chiang Kai-shek.

But the United States Information Service's bulletins to China (framed by the State Department) sounded quite different. In its account of the China hearings, USIS gave a giggling 17 lines to Wedemeyer, a fat 68 to Willard Thorp and William Walton Butterworth, Jr., State Department apologists for the United States indecisive China policy. USIS painstakingly reported that Wedemeyer had called Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek "a benevolent despot"; it did not add that Wedemeyer also declared that Chiang was "a fine character" and "the logical leader of China today," who needed United States help and should get it. Nothing was said to China, either, about Wedemeyer's recommendation of military aid.

Few United States correspondents in China were surprised at USIS's slanting of the news. USIS headquarters in Shanghai, run by big, beefy Bradley Connors, had consistently trimmed its sails to the State Department's anti-Chiang clique. From Nanking, Time correspondent Fred Gruin reported:

"Since July there have appeared in the United States press many powerful opinions favoring aid, including speeches by Thomas E. Dewey, statements by Representative WALTER JUDD, former Secretary of State James Byrnes, and former Ambassador to France William C. Bullitt.

"So far as USIS is concerned, these do not make news fit to print. Of 66 United States editorials on China which were distributed by USIS, 59 were anti-Chiang and anti-United States aid. The hostile New York Herald Tribune was quoted 11 times, the New York Times, guardedly sympathetic, only 3 times."

Mr. President, I will admit that I have not had time to check with the State Department as to the authenticity of that story, but since there has been no denial from the State Department I assume it is reasonably accurate. I think that kind of deliberate slanting of the news to reflect, not the voice and policy of America, or even the Government of the United States, but the voice of a little clique in the Information Service in the State Department, is a danger which has disturbed a great many members of this service in connection with the whole information program. It was taken over, as we all know, from the OWI. There were far too many Communists and fellow-travelers in that agency from the beginning. I am afraid that some are still there, and that probably the gentlemen responsible for this kind of vicious slanting of news of the developments in the United States regarding China are some holdovers from that fellow-traveler group in OWI, or else some other fellow-travelers who have been brought in by that group.

I say to the Senator from New Jersey that when the Committee on Foreign Relations considers the nomination of the Assistant Secretary to head up this program he will be asked about it and what

his policy will be. In my opinion, the supervisors who are responsible for this kind of distortion and complete slanting of news in contradiction to the policy adopted by the Congress and by the Government of this country should be dismissed from this activity. They have no place in it.

I do not believe, Mr. President, that a democratic country can possibly compete in lies with a dictatorship. We have freedom of speech, and the lies always catch up with us. We cannot control what our people or any other people in the world believe in the way of information. The only kind of propaganda with which a democratic country can possibly get anywhere is the truth. The policy of the State Department, in my opinion, should be constantly to put the emphasis on telling peoples all over the world the truth, even when it may hurt the feelings of some persons in the State Department who do not seem to agree with what the people of America think.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, in connection with what the distinguished Senator from Minnesota has just said, as far as I am concerned, as chairman of the subcommittee, it will be my purpose to request the Committee on Foreign Relations to ask the appointee who is to have charge of this work to confer with us regarding the policies to be carried on in conducting this important office.

So many things have been brought to our attention that it would not be fair to a new incumbent not to confer with him regarding the information service, the educational exchange service, and many other matters which have been brought to the attention of the committee and which should be considered in connection with the policy in conducting those offices in the future. So far as I am concerned, it will be my recommendation that we confer personally with the appointee before his appointment is confirmed.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, since the Senator has raised the question with reference to consulting with the new head of the agency, I should also like to recommend to the members of the Committee on Foreign Relations that they consider and perhaps advise with him on the question of how to make more efficient the organization he will head, because a bill designed to achieve a purpose similar to that of the part of this bill relating to the exchange of persons, was passed in the Congress over a year and a half ago, but the Department has been exceedingly slow in implementing it. I have particular reference to the Office of Financial Policy and Development, which seems to be bogged down and quite unable to take action.

So, with the passage of this bill, with which, as the Senator knows, I am thoroughly in accord, I hope the committee will try to do something to improve the administration of these matters within the State Department. Of course, I do not need tell the Senator that the State Department has been one of the most difficult departments of the Government to reorganize. The present Secretary of State is the third Secretary of State who has promised to reorganize it and streamline it, but nothing of that sort has been done thus far.

In view of the magnificent effort which I consider this bill to represent, I hope the Senator from New Jersey will now give some attention to seeing to it that after the bill is passed, something will happen in the State Department.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Arkansas for his comments. Personally, I feel that they are very much in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I do not wish to delay a vote on the bill, and I shall not do so; but I do not care to have the vote come without my saying just a word or two in its support.

I happen to be one of the Members of the Senate who were appointed as a subcommittee and who traveled all over Europe in an effort to learn what our information service was doing there, what it had been doing, what it needed, and what was the result of the reduction made necessary by the reduction of the appropriation. I concur in the statement which has been made by the Senator from New Jersey, namely, that not only in the consideration of the proposed legislation but in all the investigations which occurred abroad, never a shadow of politics entered the picture in any form. I was, as were all of us, impressed by the pitiful inadequacy of our present service in some of the countries. It is an anomaly that any country has to engage in propaganda or in the dissemination of information in order to counteract misinformation constantly fed to people by any other country supposed to be friendly. That is a new development in international relationships, and it is a very disturbing development.

Nevertheless it is a fact—and we have to deal with facts—that in various parts of Europe and other parts of the world an organized, concentrated effort is indulged in on the part of government, at great expense and great display, to misrepresent the motives of the United States Government as a government, to distort everything that is said in and by the United States Government, to utilize every episode which occurs in this country, as an evidence of our alleged depravity, of our alleged selfishness, of our alleged imperialistic desires, and also to misrepresent the kind of life the American people lead.

In those countries we found a yearning for the truth. Their people hunger for information about the way the people of the United States live—about our school system, about our agricultural system, about our social system, about our cities, about our country generally, and all the things that make up what we have come to call the American way of life. They are anxious for it; and notwithstanding the inadequacy of our service in many of those countries especially, which I need not mention by name, it has been difficult to persuade the people there that the things said about us are true; and whenever there has been an opportunity for the people themselves to learn at first-hand and on the ground, by any sort of demonstration, that they are not true, they have leaped at the opportunity to obtain that information.

So it would be most unfortunate if we did not accept the responsibility of edu-

cating them and informing them about our Nation, about our people, about the way we do things, and about our democracy and our political and social institutions. This bill authorizes the appropriations necessary to do that. I hope that when the appropriations come along, after the bill is passed, after the authority has been granted, they will be adequate to do the job which is so essential at this period of our great world leadership, which we have not sought so much as it has been thrust upon us.

So, Mr. President, I am happy to join in the passage of the bill, and to have added my feeble efforts in its construction and in the obtaining of the information upon which it is based.

I wish to compliment the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] for his untiring and diligent and intelligent efforts directed toward bringing about the enactment of a bill which would be workable and at the same time would not trespass too much upon any theories we have heretofore entertained in regard to the functioning of a government in the matter of giving the world information about ourselves and our people.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KNOWLAND in the chair). The bill is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (H. R. 3342) was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to promote the better understanding of the United States among the peoples of the world and to strengthen cooperative international relations."

The bill as passed is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.,

TITLE I—SHORT TITLE, OBJECTIVES, AND DEFINITIONS
SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948".

OBJECTIVES

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby declares that the objectives of this Act are to enable the Government of the United States to promote a better understanding of the United States in other countries, and to increase mutual understanding between the people of the United States and the people of other countries. Among the means to be used in achieving these objectives are—

(1) an information service to disseminate abroad information about the United States, its people, and policies promulgated by the Congress, the President, the Secretary of State and other responsible officials of Government having to do with matters affecting foreign affairs;

(2) an educational exchange service to cooperate with other nations in—

(a) the interchange of persons, knowledge, and skills;

(b) the rendering of technical and other services;

(c) the interchange of developments in the field of education, the arts, and sciences.

UNITED NATIONS

SEC. 3. In carrying out the objectives of this Act, information concerning the participation of the United States in the United Nations, its organizations and functions, shall be emphasized.

SEC. 4. When used in this Act, the term—

(1) "Secretary" means the Secretary of State.

(2) "Department" means the Department of State.

(3) "Government agency" means any executive department, board, bureau, commission, or other agency of the Federal Government, or independent establishment, or any corporation wholly owned (either directly or through one or more corporations) by the United States.

TITLE II—INTERCHANGE OF PERSONS, KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS

PERSONS

SEC. 201. The Secretary is authorized to provide for interchanges on a reciprocal basis between the United States and other countries of students, trainees, teachers, guest instructors, professors, and leaders in fields of specialized knowledge or skill and shall wherever possible provide these interchanges by using the services of existing reputable agencies which are successfully engaged in such activity. The Secretary may provide for orientation courses and other appropriate services for such persons from other countries upon their arrival in the United States, and for such persons going to other countries from the United States. When any country fails or refuses to cooperate in such program on a basis of reciprocity the Secretary shall terminate or limit such program, with respect to such country, to the extent he deems to be advisable in the interests of the United States. The persons specified in this section shall be admitted as nonimmigrant visitors for business under clause 2 of section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended (43 Stat. 154; 8 U. S. C. 203), for such time and under such conditions as may be prescribed by regulations promulgated by the Secretary of State and the Attorney General. A person admitted under this section who fails to maintain the status under which he was admitted or who fails to depart from the United States at the expiration of the time for which he was admitted, or who engages in activities of a political nature detrimental to the interests of the United States, or in activities not consistent with the security of the United States, shall, upon the warrant of the Attorney General, be taken into custody and promptly deported pursuant to section 14 of the Immigration Act of 1924 (43 Stat. 162, 8 U. S. C. 214). Deportation proceedings under this section shall be summary and the findings of the Attorney General as to matters of fact shall be conclusive. Such persons shall not be eligible for suspension of deportation under clause 2 of subdivision (c) of section 19 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (54 Stat. 671, 56 Stat. 1044; 8 U. S. C. 155).

BOOKS AND MATERIALS

SEC. 202. The Secretary is authorized to provide for interchanges between the United States and other countries of books and periodicals, including government publications, for the translation of such writings, and for the preparation, distribution, and interchange of other educational materials.

INSTITUTIONS

SEC. 203. The Secretary is authorized to provide for assistance to schools, libraries, and community centers abroad, founded or sponsored by citizens of the United States, and serving as demonstration centers for methods and practices employed in the United States. In assisting any such schools, however, the Secretary shall exercise no control over their educational policies and shall in no case furnish assistance of any character

which is not in keeping with the free democratic principles and the established foreign policy of the United States.

TITLE III—ASSIGNMENT OF SPECIALISTS

PERSONS TO BE ASSIGNED

SEC. 301. The Secretary is authorized, when the government of another country is desirous of obtaining the services of a person having special scientific or other technical or professional qualifications, from time to time to assign or authorize the assignment for service, to or in cooperation with such government, any citizen of the United States in the employ or service of the Government of the United States who has such qualifications, with the approval of the Government agency in which such person is employed or serving. No person shall be assigned for service to or in cooperation with the government of any country unless (1) the Secretary finds that such assignment is necessary in the national interest of the United States, or (2) such government agrees to reimburse the United States in an amount equal to the compensation, travel expenses, and allowances payable to such person during the period of such assignment in accordance with the provisions of section 302, or (3) such government shall have made an advance of funds, property, or services as provided in section 902. Nothing in this Act, however, shall authorize the assignment of such personnel for service relating to the organization, training, operation, development, or combat equipment of the armed forces of a foreign government.

STATUS AND ALLOWANCES

SEC. 302. Any citizen of the United States, while assigned for service to or in cooperation with another government under the authority of this Act, shall be considered, for the purpose of preserving his rights, allowances, and privileges as such, an officer or employee of the Government of the United States and of the Government agency from which assigned and he shall continue to receive compensation from that agency. He may also receive, under such regulations as the President may prescribe, representation allowances similar to those allowed under section 901 (3) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 999). The authorization of such allowances and other benefits and the payment thereof out of any appropriations available therefor shall be considered as meeting all the requirements of section 1765 of the Revised Statutes.

ACCEPTANCE OF OFFICE UNDER ANOTHER GOVERNMENT

SEC. 303. Any citizen of the United States while assigned for service to or in cooperation with another government under authority of this Act may, at the discretion of his Government agency, with the concurrence of the Secretary, and without additional compensation therefor, accept an office under the government to which he is assigned, if the acceptance of such an office in the opinion of such agency is necessary to permit the effective performance of duties for which he is assigned, including the making or approving on behalf of such foreign government the disbursement of funds provided by such government or of receiving from such foreign government funds for deposit and disbursement on behalf of such government, in carrying out programs undertaken pursuant to this Act: *Provided, however,* That such acceptance of office shall in no case involve the taking of an oath of allegiance to another government.

TITLE IV—PARTICIPATION BY GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

GENERAL AUTHORITY

SEC. 401. The Secretary is authorized, in carrying on any activity under the authority of this Act, to utilize, with the approval of the President, the services, facilities, and per-

sonnel of the other Government agencies. Whenever the Secretary shall use the services, facilities, or personnel of any Government agency for activities under authority of this Act, the Secretary shall pay for such performance out of funds available to the Secretary under this Act, either in advance, by reimbursement, or direct transfer. The Secretary shall include in each report submitted to the Congress under section 1008 a statement of the services, facilities, and personnel of other Government agencies utilized in carrying on activities under the authority of this Act, showing the names and salaries of the personnel utilized, or performing services utilized, during the period covered by such report, and the amounts paid to such other agencies under this section as payment for such performance.

TECHNICAL AND OTHER SERVICES

SEC. 402. A Government agency, at the request of the Secretary, may perform such technical or other services as such agency may be competent to render for the government of another country desirous of obtaining such services, upon terms and conditions which are satisfactory to the Secretary and to the head of the Government agency, when it is determined by the Secretary that such services will contribute to the purposes of this Act. However, nothing in this Act shall authorize the performance of services relating to the organization, training, operation, development, or combat equipment of the armed forces of a foreign government.

POLICY GOVERNING SERVICES

SEC. 403. In authorizing the performance of technical and other services under this title, it is the sense of the Congress (1) that the Secretary shall encourage through any appropriate Government agency the performance of such services to foreign governments by qualified private American individuals and agencies, and shall not enter into the performance of such services to any foreign government where such services may be performed adequately by qualified private American individuals and agencies and such qualified individuals and agencies are available for the performance of such services; (2) that if such services are rendered by a Government agency, they shall demonstrate the technical accomplishments of the United States, such services being of an advisory, investigative, or instructional nature, or a demonstration of a technical process; (3) that such services shall not include the construction of public works or the supervision of the construction of public works, and that, under authority of this Act, a Government agency shall render engineering services related to public works only when the Secretary shall determine that the national interest demands the rendering of such services by a Government agency, but this policy shall not be interpreted to preclude the assignment of individual specialists as advisers to other governments as provided under title III of this Act, together with such incidental assistance as may be necessary for the accomplishment of their individual assignments.

TITLE V—DISSEMINATING INFORMATION ABOUT THE UNITED STATES ABROAD

GENERAL AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 501. The Secretary is authorized, when he finds it appropriate, to provide for the preparation, and dissemination abroad, of information about the United States, its people, and its policies, through press, publications, radio, motion pictures, and other information media, and through information centers and instructors abroad. Any such press release or radio script, on request, shall be available in the English language at the Department of State, at all reasonable times following its release as information abroad, for examination by representatives of United States press associations, newspapers, magazines, radio systems, and stations, and, on

request, shall be made available to Members of Congress.

POLICIES GOVERNING INFORMATION ACTIVITIES

SEC. 502. In authorizing international information activities under this Act, it is the sense of the Congress (1) that the Secretary shall reduce such Government information activities whenever corresponding private information dissemination is found to be adequate; (2) that nothing in this Act shall be construed to give the Department a monopoly in the production or sponsorship on the air of short-wave broadcasting programs, or a monopoly in any other medium of information.

TITLE VI—ADVISORY COMMISSIONS TO FORMULATE POLICIES

SEC. 601. There are hereby created two advisory commissions (1) United States Advisory Commission on Information (hereinafter in this title referred to as the Commission on Information) and (2) United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange (hereinafter in this title referred to as the Commission on Educational Exchange) to be constituted as provided in section 602. The Commissions shall formulate and recommend to the Secretary policies and programs for the carrying out of this Act: *Provided, however,* That the commissions created by this section shall have no authority over the Board of Foreign Scholarships or the program created by Public Law 584 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, enacted August 1, 1946, or the United States National Commission for UNESCO.

MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMISSIONS; GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 602 (a) Each Commission shall consist of five members, not more than three of whom shall be from any one political party. Members shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. No person holding any compensated Federal or State office shall be eligible for appointment.

(b) The members of the Commission on Information shall represent the public interest, and shall be selected from a cross section of professional, business, and public service backgrounds.

(c) The members of the Commission on Educational Exchange shall represent the public interest and shall be selected from a cross section of educational, cultural, scientific, technical, and public service backgrounds.

(d) The term of each member appointed under subsection (a) of this section shall be three years, except that the terms of office of such members first taking office on each Commission shall expire, as designated by the President at the time of appointment, two at the end of one year, two at the end of two years, and one at the end of three years from the date of the enactment of this Act. Any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor is appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term. Upon the expiration of his term of office any member may continue to serve until his successor is appointed and has qualified.

(e) The President shall designate a chairman for each Commission from among members of the Commission.

(f) The members of the Commissions shall receive no compensation for their services as such members but shall be entitled to reimbursement for travel and subsistence in connection with attendance at meetings of the Commissions away from their places of residences, as provided in subsection (6) of section 801 of this Act.

(g) The Commissions are authorized to adopt such rules and regulations as they may deem necessary to carry out the authority conferred upon them by this title.

(h) The Department is authorized to provide the necessary secretarial and clerical assistance for the Commissions.

RECOMMENDATIONS AND REPORTS

SEC. 603. The Commissions shall meet not less frequently than once each month during the first six months after their establishment, and thereafter at such intervals as the Commissions find advisable, and shall transmit to the Secretary a quarterly report, and to the Congress a semiannual report of all programs and activities carried on under the authority of this Act, including appraisals, where feasible, as to the effectiveness of the several programs, and such recommendations as shall have been made by the Commissions to the Secretary for effectuating the purposes and objectives of this Act and the action taken to carry out such recommendations.

TITLE VII—APPROPRIATIONS

GENERAL AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 701. Appropriations to carry out the purposes of this Act are hereby authorized.

TRANSFER OF FUNDS

SEC. 702. The Secretary shall authorize the transfer to other Government agencies for expenditure in the United States and in other countries, in order to carry out the purposes of this Act, any part of any appropriations available to the Department for carrying out the purposes of this Act, for direct expenditure or as a working fund, and any such expenditures may be made under the specific authority contained in this Act or under the authority governing the activities of the Government agency to which a part of any such appropriation is transferred, provided the activities come within the scope of this Act.

TITLE VIII—ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES

THE SECRETARY

SEC. 801. In carrying out the purposes of this Act, the Secretary is authorized, in addition to and not in limitation of the authority otherwise vested in him—

(1) In carrying out title II of this Act, within the limitation of such appropriations as the Congress may provide, to make grants of money, services, or materials to State and local governmental institutions in the United States, to governmental institutions in other countries, and to individuals and public or private nonprofit organizations both in the United States and in other countries;

(2) to furnish, sell, or rent, by contract or otherwise, educational and information materials and equipment for dissemination to, or use by, peoples of foreign countries;

(3) whenever necessary in carrying out title V of this Act, to purchase, rent, construct, improve, maintain, and operate facilities for radio transmission and reception, including the leasing of real property both within and without the continental limits of the United States for periods not to exceed ten years, or for longer periods if provided for by the appropriation Act;

(4) to provide for printing and binding outside the continental limits of the United States, without regard to section 11 of the Act of March 1, 1919 (44 U. S. C. 111);

(5) to employ, without regard to the civil-service and classification laws, when such employment is provided for by the appropriation Act (i) persons on a temporary basis, and (ii) aliens within the United States, but such employment of aliens shall be limited to services related to the translation or narration of colloquial speech in foreign languages when suitably qualified United States citizens are not available; and

(6) to create, with the approval of the Commission on Information and the Commission on Educational Exchange, such advisory committees as the Secretary may decide to be of assistance in formulating his policies for carrying out the purposes of this Act. No committee member shall be allowed any

salary or other compensation for services; but he may be paid his actual transportation expenses, and not to exceed \$10 per diem in lieu of subsistence and other expenses, while away from his home in attendance upon meetings within the United States or in consultation with the Department under instructions.

GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

SEC. 802. In carrying on activities which further the purposes of this Act, subject to approval of such activities by the Secretary, the Department and the other Government agencies are authorized—

(1) to place orders and make purchases and rentals of materials and equipment;

(2) to make contracts, including contracts with governmental agencies, foreign or domestic, including subdivisions thereof, and intergovernmental organizations of which the United States is a member, and, with respect to contracts entered into in foreign countries, without regard to section 3741 of the Revised Statutes (41 U. S. C. 22);

(3) under such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, to pay the transportation expenses, and not to exceed \$10 per diem in lieu of subsistence and other expenses, of citizens or subjects of other countries, without regard to the Standardized Government Travel Regulations and the Subsistence Act of 1926, as amended; and

(4) to make grants for, and to pay expenses incident to, training and study.

MAXIMUM USE OF EXISTING GOVERNMENT PROPERTY AND FACILITIES

SEC. 803. In carrying on activities under this Act which require the utilization of Government property and facilities, maximum use shall be made of existing Government property and facilities.

TITLE IX—FUNDS PROVIDED BY OTHER SOURCES

REIMBURSEMENT

SEC. 901. The Secretary shall, when he finds it in the public interest, request and accept reimbursement from any cooperating governmental or private source in a foreign country, or from State or local governmental institutions or private sources in the United States, for all or part of the expenses of any portion of the program undertaken hereunder. The amounts so received shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

ADVANCE OF FUNDS

SEC. 902. If any other government shall express the desire to provide funds, property, or services to be used by this Government, in whole or in part, for the expenses of any specific part of the program undertaken pursuant to this Act, the Secretary is authorized, when he finds it in the public interest, to accept such funds, property, or services. Funds so received may be established as a special deposit account in the Treasury of the United States, to be available for the specified purpose, and to be used for reimbursement of appropriations or direct expenditure, subject to the provisions of this Act. Any unexpended balance of the special deposit account and other property received under this section and no longer required for the purposes for which provided shall be returned to the government providing the funds or property.

TITLE X—MISCELLANEOUS

LOYALTY CHECK ON PERSONNEL

SEC. 1001. No citizen or resident of the United States, whether or not now in the employ of the Government, may be employed or assigned to duties by the Government under this Act until such individual has been investigated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and a report thereon has been made to the Secretary of State: *Provided, however,* That any present employee of the Government, pending the report as to such

employee by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, may be employed or assigned to duties under this Act for the period of six months from the date of its enactment. This section shall not apply in the case of any officer appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY

SEC. 1002. The Secretary may delegate, to such officers of the Government as the Secretary determines to be appropriate, any of the powers conferred upon him by this Act to the extent that he finds such delegation to be in the interest of the purposes expressed in this Act and the efficient administration of the programs undertaken pursuant to this Act.

RESTRICTED INFORMATION

SEC. 1003. Nothing in this Act shall authorize the disclosure of any information or knowledge in any case in which such disclosure (1) is prohibited by any other law of the United States, or (2) is inconsistent with the security of the United States.

REPEAL OF ACT OF MAY 25, 1938, AS AMENDED

SEC. 1004. (a) The Act of May 25, 1938, entitled "An Act authorizing the temporary detail of United States employees, possessing special qualifications, to governments of American Republics and the Philippines, and for other purposes," as amended (52 Stat. 442; 53 Stat. 652), is hereby repealed.

(b) Existing Executive orders and regulations pertaining to the administration of such Act of May 25, 1938, as amended, shall remain in effect until superseded by regulations prescribed under the provisions of this Act.

(c) Any reference in the Foreign Service Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 999), or in any other law, to provisions of such Act of May 25, 1938, as amended, shall be construed to be applicable to the appropriate provisions of titles III and IX of this Act.

UTILIZATION OF PRIVATE AGENCIES

SEC. 1005. In carrying out the provisions of this Act it shall be the duty of the Secretary to utilize, to the maximum extent practicable, the services and facilities of private agencies, including existing American press, publishing, radio, motion picture, and other agencies, through contractual arrangements or otherwise. It is the intent of Congress that the Secretary shall encourage participation in carrying out the purposes of this Act by the maximum number of different private agencies in each field consistent with the present or potential market for their services in each country.

TERMINATION PURSUANT TO CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF CONGRESS

SEC. 1006. The authority granted under this Act shall terminate whenever such termination is directed by concurrent resolution of the two Houses of the Congress.

VETERANS' PREFERENCE ACT

SEC. 1007. No provision of this Act shall be construed to modify or to repeal the provisions of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944.

REPORTS TO CONGRESS

SEC. 1008. The Secretary shall submit to the Congress semiannual reports of expenditures made and activities carried on under authority of this Act, inclusive of appraisals and measurements, where feasible, as to the effectiveness of the several programs in each country where conducted.

REGULATORY PROVISIONS TO APPLY TO ALL INTERNATIONAL INFORMATION ACTIVITIES AND EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGES OF STATE DEPARTMENT

SEC. 1009. All provisions in this Act regulating the administration of international information activities and educational exchanges provided herein, shall apply to all such international activities under jurisdiction of the Department of State.

SEPARABILITY OF PROVISIONS

SEC. 1010. If any provision of this Act or the application of any such provision to any person or circumstance shall be held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the Act and the applicability of such provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

JUSTICE DOUGLAS AND THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senate and the country to an article in the column headed "Matter of Fact," which appeared today in the Washington Post, the article being written by Joseph and Stewart Alsop, and entitled "From Cloister to Convention." I am going to read excerpts from the article, and make some comments about the conditions existing in this country, and in particular in the Southern States. The article states:

The peculiar, intermittent courtship between American politics and Justice William O. Douglas has entered a new and more decisive phase. The leaders of the northern Democratic organizations have sent word to Justice Douglas that the party's 1948 vice presidential nomination is his for the taking.

The message was carried, sometime ago, straight from a leaders' meeting in New York to Douglas' chambers in the gloomy cloisters of the Supreme Court. The executive director of the Democratic National Committee, Gael Sullivan, was the messenger. Douglas did not welcome this political announcement, and has given no subsequent sign of his intentions. But the Democratic leaders feel that if President Truman eventually asks Douglas point blank to be his running mate, the Justice will be forced to accept.

There is, of course, no sort of guaranty that the leaders' message to Douglas will thus be followed up by any request from the White House. As far as President Truman personally is concerned, the choice of his companion on the ticket is still officially open. This will no doubt be asserted by the President himself. Yet, whatever the President may say will not detract from the singular interest of the episode described above.

There are, first of all, the circumstances of the leaders' decision. The New York get-together was held under the informal chairmanship of Edward J. Flynn. It is reported to have been attended by delegates from the satrapies of Ed Kelly and Jake Arvey in Illinois, David Lawrence in Pennsylvania, Frank Hague in New Jersey, and one or two more. In short, the same principalities and powers were assembled that took the lead in 1944 in rejecting both James F. Byrnes and Henry A. Wallace and in conferring the Vice Presidency on Harry S. Truman.

The debates of the satraps were, rather naturally, not formally recorded. Yet it is known that two major points were generally agreed upon.

Point 1 was that Truman would need a running mate linked to the New Deal, rather than a conservative, in order to win this year.

Point 2 is the important one.

Point 2 was that the nomination of such a running mate would arouse bitter opposition in the southern wing of the Democratic Party, but that the North possessed the votes to impose a northern choice on the convention. In both these points the practiced political eye will read much that is significant.

Mr. President, it is true that the North will have the votes at the national convention to impose upon that convention the candidate for Vice President they

desire, but it is not true that, because Mr. Kelly and Mr. Arvey and Mr. Hague get together they can elect their Vice Presidential candidate. In fact, the Democratic electors of the southern wing of the party will not follow Mr. Hague's direction, and will not vote for any candidate for Vice President who we think is inimical to the welfare of our people and whose philosophy of government would be to destroy our social institutions.

Mr. President, I serve notice now, and I think I can speak for the people of one sovereign Southern State when I say it, that we are not going to support any candidate for Vice President who is forced upon us by the convention, if we do not choose to support him, that that is a question which will be determined by our Presidential electors according to the Constitution of the United States. Because a candidate is strong on the East Side and pleases Boss Flynn is not persuasive with us. The Democratic electors of the South will not sacrifice our people upon the cross of political expediency. And this goes for Mr. Justice Douglas, as well as any other candidate who is nominated by the northern Democrats against our will and over our protests.

Mr. President, I think it is a shameful thing that politicians like those named would attempt to put the Supreme Court of the United States in politics. The episode referred to, if it happened—and my information is that it did—will cause the people to think that every decision of Mr. Justice Douglas is swayed by political considerations. It destroys the judicial atmosphere so necessary for confidence in a court. Our people are tired of politicians who plan and plot and politicize the highest court of this country, and I think the people, not only of the South but of the Nation as a whole, will resent it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the whole article may be placed in the RECORD at this point.

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

MATTER OF FACT

(By Joseph and Stewart Alsop)

FROM CLOISTER TO CONVENTION

The peculiar, intermittent courtship between American politics and Justice William O. Douglas has entered a new and more decisive phase. The leaders of the northern Democratic organizations have sent word to Justice Douglas that the party's 1948 Vice-Presidential nomination is his for the taking.

The message was carried, some time ago, straight from a leaders' meeting in New York to Douglas' chambers in the gloomy cloisters of the Supreme Court. The executive director of the Democratic National Committee, Gael Sullivan, was the messenger. Douglas did not welcome this political announcement, and has given no subsequent sign of his intentions. But the Democratic leaders feel that if President Truman eventually asks Douglas point blank to be his running mate, the Justice will be forced to accept.

There is, of course, no sort of guaranty that the leaders' message to Douglas will thus be followed up by any request from the White House. As far as President Truman personally is concerned the choice of his

companion on the ticket is still officially open. This will no doubt be asserted by the President himself. Yet, whatever the President may say will not detract from the singular interest of the episode described above.

There are, first of all, the circumstances of the leaders' decision. The New York get-together was held under the informal chairmanship of Edward J. Flynn. It is reported to have been attended by delegates from the satrapies of Ed Kelly and Jake Arvey in Illinois, David Lawrence in Pennsylvania, Frank Hague in New Jersey, and one or two more. In short, the same principalities and powers were assembled that took the lead in 1944 in rejecting both James F. Byrnes and Henry A. Wallace and in conferring the Vice Presidency on Harry S. Truman.

The debates of the satraps were, rather naturally, not formally recorded. Yet it is known that two major points were generally agreed upon.

Point 1 was that Truman would need a running mate linked to the New Deal, rather than a conservative, in order to win this year. Point 2 was that the nomination of such a running mate would arouse bitter opposition in the southern wing of the Democratic Party, but that the North possessed the votes to impose a northern choice on the convention. In both these points the practiced political eye will read much that is significant.

The northern leaders' insistence upon a New Dealer again underlines the fundamental change that has come over these great political organizations in the last 16 years. In the days before Roosevelt, these organizations were the conservative element in the Democratic Party. They relied on petty favors to hold the mass of their voters in the precincts, and in Washington were glad enough to take a right-wing line.

Now, however, the mass vote of the big cities can only be attracted by progressive personalities and programs. The leaders of the Democratic organizations privately cherish the wholly conservative opinions which they have always held. But they must give the voters the programs and personalities they want because their power depends upon it.

Their attitude was admirably summed up by one of the hard-boiled henchmen of the Kelly-Arvey organization, at the conclave which chose the able Paul Douglas as the Democratic senatorial nominee in Illinois. Douglas was rejected for the governorship nomination, which went to Adlai Stevenson, because he had fought the organization too hard in the past. The organization men could not bear the thought of Douglas passing out the jobs in Springfield, but could just bring themselves to support him for the Senate. The hard-boiled henchman in question put the general view very simply:

"I hate the — — guts of the — — —, but I'm for him because maybe he can win."

As the foregoing remark suggests, the progressivism of the northern satraps is in fact strictly confined to major candidates and party platforms. It is strikingly absent from their approach to the real business of government.

Hence result such oddities as Edwin J. Flynn's support of Commissioner Edmond Hanrahan for the chairmanship of the Securities and Exchange Commission. There is here a certain amusing irony. Justice Douglas, whom Flynn wants for the Vice Presidency, was once the fighting leader of the SEC, while Hanrahan is favored for the SEC chairmanship by precisely the business interests whom Douglas once fought. This kind of thing is the source of the curious split personality of the Truman administration.

Yet even progressivism in word and conservatism in deed is enough to inflame the feelings of the southern Democrats. The

southerners will shortly be aroused into a fury of indignation by a strong Truman message on antidiscrimination legislation. They are sore as bears already. Although Justice Douglas is personally popular with many of them, the southerners will like no choice imposed by the North.

In this matter, as in so many others, President Truman's position recalls the plight of the Light Brigade. Wallace to the left of him, O'Daniel to the right of him, volley and thunder.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the body of the RECORD at this point a great speech delivered by a great American in Chicago recently at the dinner given in honor of a great liberal in American political history, John Peter Altgeld, of Illinois. The speech was delivered by a great Justice of the United States—Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas.

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

John Peter Altgeld is probably unknown to most Americans. He seldom figures in our history textbooks. Few adults or school children identify him with the great human causes which have shaped the American character. His name has not yet become, as it should, a symbol of the clean, powerful force which we call American idealism.

He has, indeed, been an "eagle forgotten." But as Vachel Lindsay nobly said of him, "To live in mankind is far more than to live in a name." Altgeld does, I believe, "live in mankind." It was the cause of mankind which he pleaded. Though his name may no longer be identified with the issues which he espoused, their vitality in the years which followed him reflect the courage and faith with which he embraced them. Moreover, those who would not have seen eye to eye with him on many of the contentious issues of his era nevertheless gain inspiration from the character of his advocacy.

He feared no man. As a lawyer, his clients did not cause him to stand mute when his conscience urged him to speak out. As a politician, he did not follow the safe course of indecision or of ambiguous pronouncement when his instinct for justice told him to meet an evil head-on. As a private individual, he did not turn his back and withdraw to the ease and comfort of his wealth when the victims of an industrial system cried out against its inhumanities.

The powerful social forces of his age moved him to action. He was blunt, outspoken, and at times indiscreet. Edgar Lee Masters once said that perhaps "his weakness was that he hated the bad so much that it obscured his love of the good." He certainly made up in daring what he may have lacked in discretion. His was the frontal attack—he stormed the walls of the enemy at high noon; he did not delay in order to infiltrate their fortress at midnight. He was, indeed, an expendable. The heat of his zeal, the tremendous demands of his nervous energy consumed him in a brief and hectic 55 years.

He lost almost every major cause he pleaded. But those were the skirmishes and the battles which were mere episodes in a larger and more far-flung campaign. His failures caused new recruitments. A full generation later men who never knew his name were summoned by the ideas which he had generated or espoused. They marched to great victories of which he perhaps had never even dreamed.

His activities were, in the main, restricted to Illinois. But the ideas which he represented spread throughout the land as seed travels on the great airways of the world. His platform power was potent, though his spoken word was carried by the tongues of men, not by the magic of radio. The issues of which he spoke later became national

issues. Millions became advocates of his lost causes. A generation unborn at his death witnessed victory in the war of which his lost battles were a part.

One who follows a trail through the wilderness may not know who first laid it out, who blazed the trees that mark its course. The pioneer who went ahead and marked the trail may, like Altgeld, be unsung. Those who later come to know its rigors—the crags which it mounts and the treacherous lowlands which it skirts—will want to pay tribute to him who first dared walk it. As Irving Dilliard said, the State of Illinois paid such a tribute in a literally inspired way in 1941 when it chose Altgeld Hall as the name of the building to house its distinguished college of law. Such monuments to his name do more than honor him. They help insure that his ideas continue as potent forces in our national life.

Altgeld came to maturity during the days of our robber barons. The great industrial and financial strength of the East had won a war and had grown stronger in the process. A large productive capacity, a huge reservoir of capital awaited new ventures. Men of vision saw untold opportunities in the exploitation of the western two-thirds of the continent. Farrington has described the beginning of this gilded age in pungent terms:

"A passionate will to power was issuing from unexpected sources, undisciplined, confused in ethical values, but endowed with immense vitality. Individualism was being simplified to the acquisitive instinct. These new Americans were primitive souls, ruthless, predatory, capable; single-minded men; rogues and rascals often, but never feeble, never hindered by petty scruple, never given to pulling or whining—the raw materials of a race of capitalistic buccaneers. * * * The romantic age of Captain Kidd was come again, and the black flag and the gospel banner were both in lockers to be flown as the needs of the cruise determined. With all coercive restrictions put away the democratic genius of America was setting out on the road of manifest destiny. * * * It was an anarchistic world of strong, capable men, selfish, unenlightened, amoral—an excellent example of what human nature will do with undisciplined freedom. In the gilded age freedom was the freedom of buccaneers preying on the argosies of Spain."

Banker, industrialist, builder, and speculator were the driving forces in that tremendous undertaking. Some maintain that, at least in days of peace, the job never could have been done so fast any other way. However that may be, it is clear that it was extravagant in its cost, inhuman in its methods, corrupt in its influence.

The agrarian groups were exploited by the mercantile and industrial interests. A scourge of poverty and want—10 percent interest and 10-cent corn—swept the farms. Out of such stuff grew the Granger movement and later the Populists and other groups bent on reform.

Jungle warfare was the technique that fashioned the trusts. Big business rose out of the ruins which it had made of little business.

The newly acquired wealth became, in part, a slush fund to corrupt legislatures, to purchase favors from public officers. The Credit Mobilier scandal and the whiskey tax frauds were typical.

The Nation had just rid itself of chattel slavery, renouncing for all time the idea that men could be bought and sold and exploited like cattle. But it seemed to many that the Nation was on the verge of embracing a form of industrial slavery, which in its consequences was almost as vicious as the slavery which had just been abolished.

The great industrial projects of that age required men as well as capital for their execution. But, in the eyes of the promoters, men were as fungible as the ties of the railroad tracks which spanned the continent.

There was at least some effort to protect the capital placed in the ventures and to give it rights against the day of loss and failure. But there was little or no effort made to compensate for the arms and legs and eyes and lives of human beings that went into these great industrial undertakings. Workmen's compensation laws, employers' liability laws were still in the future. There were only a few who talked of social justice.

Many workers, living in company towns, were beholden as in feudal days to a master; and this time their master was a corporation.

Child labor was widespread. Long hours of work obtained for men and women alike. Unhealthy and unsanitary conditions of work were found on every hand. The 8-hour day was a radical idea. Trade unions were sabotaged. Collective bargaining was still largely a dream.

The claims of stockholders and bondholders against enterprises had long been recognized. But there was no similar recognition of the claims of labor. Workers had no right to work; they had no claim to a fair wage.

Men struck for more wages—so that they might live decent lives, so that they might raise sturdy sons. Strikebreakers were brought in; and the poorly organized strikers were usually defeated. A great industrialist handled his strike with these words: "There is nothing to arbitrate. The workers have nothing to do with the amount of wages they shall receive."

The reaction was severe. There were probably some men of violence on the scene who would destroy the system that gave birth to the new industrial oligarchy. But men of good will—zealots and reformers—were also pilloried as anarchists. So were those who only protested against the chains of their new slavery.

There were riots and bombs. Violence beget violence. Troops—Federal troops—were called out to enforce injunctions issued by Federal courts. These were injunctions not only to protect property but to keep plants open and to outlaw strikes. He who defied the injunction went to jail. He was in contempt of court.

A great restlessness swept the country. There was a depression in the early nineties and millions were unemployed. They swept over the Cascades and the Rockies on the move to Washington for currency reforms, for a public works program. Some stole trains and were jailed. So were the hitchhikers who rode the boxcars. Strikers, too, were jailed. Contempt of court became a weapon in industrial warfare. It was a powerful weapon. It aimed the forces of government—the courts, the marshals, the troops—on the side of industry and against the workers. Government was there not to adjudicate the justness of the claims, not to mediate nor to arbitrate the disputes, but to crush and suppress those who protested against the injustices of the new industrial era.

These issues were injected into local and national politics. A distinguished line of muckraking journalists, starting with Henry Demarest Lloyd, emerged and wrote in words that all could understand an indictment against the age of plunder and exploitation.

Antimonopolists pressed their reforms. Those who protested against the great and uncontrolled power of industry often advanced as their cure—all the socialization of business. Many good people were alarmed. Mr. Justice Brewer, who severely criticized Altgeld, was of the view that "the cry for socialism comes largely from the dissipated, the lazy, the dishonest." Men stood condemned as un-American whose programs of reform were not more radical than the vision of our own Tennessee Valley Authority and Grand Coulee. The specter of socialism did indeed stalk the land. Mr. Justice Holmes, writing in 1897, observed that "when socialism first began to be talked about, the comfortable classes of the community

were a good deal frightened"; in fact, the fear of socialism "influenced judicial action both here and in England." Many in high places believed that this society of ours was headed for a pitched battle along class lines.

It is easy in retrospect to draw a false picture of an age merely by emphasizing the extremes which history has recorded. The sketch of the gilded age which I present may suffer that defect. But whether it does or not, I think it fair to say that this is the view Altgeld had of the era. The enormous injustices which he saw violated his sense of social justice. He first wrote and spoke his protests; then he moved to action, giving and expecting no quarter.

As Governor of Illinois he put through a law aimed at sweatshops, at the employment of children who were under 14, and at the employment of women over 8 hours daily or more than 48 hours a week. The latter provision was held unconstitutional on grounds which reflected the dominant political philosophy of the age—that it violated both the employer's and the worker's freedom of contract. He put through a law in aid of collective bargaining, which made it a crime to dismiss an employee because of membership in a labor union, and thus sowed one of the first seeds out of which the National Labor Relations Act grew a generation or more later. He inaugurated a system of mediation and arbitration of labor disputes. He put through a law that outlawed limitation of production, price fixing, pooling agreements, and other restraints of trade. He got an inheritance tax law passed. He was offered \$500,000 if he would sign a bill which would tighten the hold of the traction and other utility interests on the State. He vetoed the bill, stating it was a "flagrant attempt to increase the riches of some men at the expense of others by legislation." Thereafter he campaigned for public ownership of utilities.

He protested vigorously against the use of Federal troops to break strikes. He resisted the use of the injunction in industrial disputes. As Harry Barnard graphically shows, it was Altgeld who coined the phrase "government by injunction" and drove home at every opportunity the oppression which that practice fostered. The Norris-LaGuardia Act, passed in 1932, thus can trace its ancestry to him.

As governor he put his influence behind the development of a strong, progressive university. He feared that monopoly capital might spawn its own seats of learning and dominate the minds of men as well as their bodies. He also knew that the character of a university is a "force that creeps silently over the land, and by day and by night molds the sentiment of men." He therefore wanted a university which would represent the great common people of this country, which would be the friend and the helper of the toiling masses, of those people who do the work of the world.

He well knew the workings of the judiciary because he had been a judge. So when he saw rulings of courts which seemed to him prejudiced and partisan, which tipped the scales against the common man and in favor of the vested interests of that day, he cried out in protest. In 1893 he said, "The men who administer the laws are human, with all the failings of humanity. They take their biases, their prejudices, with them onto the bench. Upon the whole, they try to do the best they can; but the wrongs done in the courts of justice themselves are so great that they cry to heaven." He saw the corrupt use of wealth extending its influence so far as to create judges who do its bidding.

Altgeld knew what we are apt to overlook or forget, that the procedural safeguards of the Bill of Rights were designed to protect the citizen against the tyranny not only of legislatures and of executives, but of judges too. He knew that power could be abused, whether it was industrial power or judicial

power. He knew his history and had read those chapters which reveal that even courts sometimes show a callous disregard for human rights. Their robes do not always conceal their tyranny. The framers of the Constitution, knowing that, designed the constitutional requirement of a fair trial to protect the accused, not only against the police and the prosecutors, but against the judges as well. All these things Altgeld knew; and that is perhaps why, as Charles A. Madison says, "He was harshest on judges who abused the spirit of our laws to the hurt of the people."

When Altgeld became governor four of the men found guilty in the Haymarket riots had been hanged. Three were still in prison. Altgeld reviewed their cases and granted them pardons. The pardon was for him a simple, uncomplicated act. For as he told Brand Whitlock, he knew he was "merely doing right." He felt that way because in his judgment "those fellows did not have a fair trial." Unfair attitudes of both judge and jury had, in his view, infected the trial.

The reaction was violent as Altgeld knew it would be. He at once experienced what many before and after him experienced—that he who calls for the application of the Bill of Rights to unpopular minorities, as well as to the other groups of the community, often becomes himself suspect. Thus when Altgeld insisted that even anarchists were entitled to due process of law, he was dubbed an anarchist. But a man whose devotion to our system of government was so great that he did not want it to become the tool of a capitalist oligarchy was not even remotely related to the anarchists. He was merely seeking to apply the philosophy of Jefferson to the work-a-day world of the nineties—due process of law for every man, whatever his race or creed or political faith; social justice for those at the bottom, as well as those at the top, of the economic pyramid.

But the label stuck. Then came the bitter years. He lost both his wealth and his health under the pressures of his enemies. The man who had the courage to adhere to the spirit of our Bill of Rights and extend its benefits to a despised and hated minority was hounded to his death by powerful influences bent on his destruction. Yet I am confident it will be recognized as true 100 years from now, as it is increasingly recognized today, that of those on the public stage in that era it was Altgeld who brought the brightest honor to the democratic ideal.

Some issues survive all ages. But most of them have a habit of being redefined in the special context of the next generation. Hence this review of the issues which drew Altgeld's fire has relevancy here only as a reflection of his philosophy. It is that philosophy which remains a vital factor in American life, though the issues which gave it content have been resolved or forgotten. Altgeld's philosophy has relevance to current American problems in at least two respects.

First, Altgeld placed human beings higher than the dollar in the national scale of values. A nation's industrial plant represents not only the daring of capital and the imagination of executives, but the blood and sweat of men. The men and women who compose a nation are its greatest natural resource—greater than its mines or forest or rivers. The nation is healthy only if its people are strong. The state must concern itself with their economic disasters. For the greater share of their troubles is due not to laziness but to economic forces beyond their control. There is in most men a lively sense of decency, of good will, of fraternity. The poor have those instincts, as well as those blessed with more worldly goods. The powers of government should be directed to protect them in their struggle to survive and in their efforts to live in dignity and to share the fruits of freedom.

Altgeld felt with Cardinal Manning that even a starving man had the right to eat. And he thought it was an insult for those who "started in life with good brains, good training and excellent advantages and who are now well-housed, well-clothed, and well-fed, who know nothing about the actual conditions or wants of the poor" to lecture them on "laziness or shiftlessness."

We will be wise if we carry that philosophy into the world problems which confront us today. There are active bidders for the good will and support of the common people of the world. There are emissaries of totalitarian regimes in the capitals of the world, bargaining with bags of wheat for the souls of men. They are our competitors; but we need not emulate their example.

The victims of war in Europe and Asia need and ask our aid. But these people must not be treated as if they can be purchased with the dollar. We must not manage this great crisis of democracy as if it were an auction; as if the peoples of the world were on the block and going to the highest bidder. The sensitiveness of people increases with their suffering. The peoples of the world have suffered beyond our comprehension. If we so manage this crisis as to leave the impression that our standards are mercenary, we will have generated a revision to our system which may well be irreparable.

As a result of their struggles all peoples of the world are closer together. Their common interests have made them parts of something which is bigger than their own country. That is true of us, too. We have wider horizons, greater obligations. So when we come to the aid of the distressed people of the world, we act not out of charity alone but in answer to a responsibility to support in peace the ideal for which we were willing to wage a war.

Someway, somehow, we must let the peoples of the world know that. We must reach behind the facade of ministers and cabinets and commissions and let the common people feel our warm handclasp. We must let them know that we understand their suffering. We must make sure they know that our desire is not to make them our satellites but to meet them as equals in a world where standards of decency and justice prevail.

My remarks are not directed to agencies of government. I refer more particularly to the role which all groups—civic, cultural, and religious—can play in keeping close ties with the peoples of the world. Behind even the iron curtain of eastern Europe are human beings whose thirst for freedom is as great as our own. We must manage to let them feel the warmth of our understanding and friendship. We must not let them become the forgotten people of the world. They must know that their problems are our concern too, that we respect their worth as human beings, that they also are part of the brotherhood which we have come to symbolize in the world. Governments may be imposed on these people. But the people themselves are the ultimate source of political power in every state. The pattern of an enduring peace will be found only in their hopes and aspirations.

Altgeld once said that "All great reforms, great movements, come from the bottom and not the top." That is true in the international as well as the national field. Thus it is doubly important that we do not lose the link which we have with all peoples whose dream is political, intellectual, and religious freedom.

Second. There is another current problem to which Altgeld's philosophy is relevant. On the domestic scene his courage and steadfastness of purpose are needed for protection of the civil liberties of our people.

We are apt to leave that task to the far-away court in the State or National Capital. Those courts, by their examples, exert a great influence. But the great percentage of the grist is found in the lower courts. A more

accurate measure of the vitality of our Bill of Rights is not in the sporadic rulings of our highest tribunals but in the day to day attitudes of the lower courts. Moreover, it is not in the courts alone that the strength of our civil liberties is to be ascertained. The executive and legislative branches of government also have responsibilities for enforcement of the Bill of Rights. The administration of the voting booths, the habits of the police in law enforcement, the nature of the city's ordinances—these all are indices of the vitality of the Bill of Rights in the life of the community. So is the attitude of the community. For an indifferent community, like a misguided one, will surely breed disrespect for the standards embodied in the Bill of Rights.

We may never reach perfection in our practice of the ideals of the Bill of Rights. But there is no earthly reason why with education and organization it cannot become an increasingly potent force in the every-day lives of our people. The extent of a community's respect of the human rights of all of its citizens is in fact the measure of its progress in civilization. Altgeld broke the trail—making it easier for every man of conscience who followed.

The creation of a healthy community attitude is not the exclusive task of any one group. The task starts in the homes, in the schools, and in the churches. But city and State officials, editors, lawyers, and other groups of citizens have an important share of the responsibility. I remember recent instances where tyrannical judges sitting in local courts rode roughshod over the civil liberties of defendants charged with crime. In one case it was a doctor, in another an editor who thundered personal disapproval and started campaigns to rid their cities of those oppressive practices. They were indeed the ones that alerted the local bar associations and caused civil-liberties committees to be formed to patrol the local scene.

These are not always easy steps to take. When Altgeld insisted that even anarchists were entitled to due process of law, he himself was labeled a subversive influence. That will often be said today when one insists that the safeguards of the Bill of Rights be extended to all groups, including any minority group in our midst that may be at the whipping post or the subject of temporary hysteria.

Yes; it takes courage to stand between an unpopular minority and the community, insisting that our Bill of Rights was designed for the protection of all people whatever their race, creed, or political faith. The lawyer may feel uneasy when it seems that important clients may slip away because of his attitude. The editor may be tempted to stand mute by reason of the views of important advertisers. Even the clergyman may be under pressure to hold his tongue because of the influence of some of his parishioners.

But those who are devoted to the democratic ideal expressed in our Bill of Rights will take the direct and daring course. Once they are sure of their facts and know they are doing right they will, like Altgeld, espouse the cause of the victims of ignorance, prejudice, or passion. They, too, may be pilloried or cursed. But institutions become great by the greatness of the men who champion them, by the greatness of the advocacy that defends them. A people indifferent to their civil liberties do not deserve to keep them, and in this revolutionary age may not be expected to keep them long. A people who proclaim their civil liberties but extend them only to preferred groups start down the path to totalitarianism. They emulate either the dictatorship of the right or the dictatorship of the left. In doing this they erase a basic distinction between our system of government and totalitarianism.

To allow that to happen is to lose by default. Far better to lose pleading the cause of decency and of justice. Then we win

greatness even in defeat, and leave behind a rich heritage for those who later rebuild on the ashes of our lost hopes. But there will be no failure if we adhere steadfastly to our faith. For the goal of people of all races is toward a system which respects their dignity, frees their minds, and allows them to worship their God in their own way. None has yet designed an article of political faith more suited to those ends than our own Bill of Rights.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session, The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KNOWLAND in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE NAVY— NOMINATION CONFIRMED

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of the nomination of Mark Edwin Andrews, of Texas, to be Assistant Secretary of the Navy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the nomination? The Chair hears none, and the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith of the confirmation.

LICENSING OF COMMODITY SHIPMENTS TO EUROPE

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I learn from a release which came to me today that on January 15 the Department of Commerce issued an order that beginning March 1, 1948, all commercial shipments of commodities to Europe will require individual validated licenses. The Department of Commerce made that announcement yesterday through its Office of International Trade. I do not wish to comment at this time on the order, but I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

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

Beginning March 1, 1948, commercial shipments of all commodities to Europe will require individual validated licenses, the Department of Commerce announced today through its Office of International Trade.

All European countries are included in a new country group which will include all of the countries of continental Europe, the British Isles, Iceland, Turkey, the U. S. S. R., all Asiatic possessions of the U. S. S. R. and Turkey, Portugal, including the Azores and Madeira, Tangier, Spain, and all Spain's colonial possessions, and the Mediterranean islands.

The new procedure will require individual validated licenses for all shipments to these countries, but it does not affect those licensing regulations applicable to specified destinations within countries, such as the arrangements for shipments of gift packages.

There will be no change in the forms and procedures required for obtaining licenses for shipments of goods on the positive list. The positive list is a list of commodities in short supply for which export licenses are required to all destinations.

Department of Commerce officials emphasized that the new regulation does not mean that an embargo will be placed on any particular goods going to particular countries. They explained further that it is the policy of the United States Government to foster a healthy and stable trade relationship which can contribute to a balanced and expanding world economy. The new licensing policy has been established, it was stated, to insure a careful programing of the supply of essential goods to areas of greatest need, and to limit the shipment of commodities which can make no contribution to world recovery.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I wish to state that the step now being taken by the Department of Commerce, as set forth in the release to which I have just referred, was recommended last August by the Senate Small Business Committee. If that policy had been adopted at that time, I am quite satisfied that the acute situation now confronting us in regard to various commodities and articles in short supply, such as petroleum and steel, would not exist.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. TAFT. Would not the adoption of that policy at the time when it was advocated by the Senate committee also have materially lessened the black markets, or the gray markets, in regard to the handling of these products for which export licenses were issued?

Mr. WHERRY. That is the second point I was about to make, and I thank the Senator from Ohio for making part of my speech for me. It certainly would have done that, and I agree in toto with what the distinguished Senator from Ohio has said.

Mr. TAFT. I thank the Senator.

THE OIL SHORTAGE IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, today there has come over the wires a report that the Secretary of Commerce has announced that the total exports of petroleum products for the first quarter of 1948 will be 12,000,000 barrels, or 480,000,000 gallons, and that these exports go to approximately 76 countries.

Although we welcome the news that the exports in the first quarter of 1948 are not being increased, and that news will be of great interest domestically, nevertheless, it does not bar the way to further exports to foreign countries. At the same time, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that there is a shortage of these products, and it is plaguing many sections of the United States at this time. I am quite satisfied that if it is not alleviated it will continue to cause discomfort and in some places suffering before the winter is over. I also point out that we were told recently, at another of our subcommittee hearings, that we must expect shortages of gasoline beginning next May. As one whose only interest arises through his connection with the investigations conducted by the Small Business Committee, which is a nonpartisan committee, I should like to call attention to some of the investigations we have made, what we have found, and what we feel should be done by way of improvement, unless conditions are to become worse instead of better. If the hour were not so late I should like to

make a complete statement at this point for the Record, because I think it is a matter which deserves deep attention and consideration. However, by reason of the lateness of the hour I shall ask that my remarks be printed in the Record instead.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As a Senator from New England, a section of the United States which is vitally interested in the subject under discussion, I should be very much interested to hear what the Senator had in mind to say—if not the complete statement, then a summary of what the committee intends to do respecting the situation in the very near future, particularly in relation to fuel oil for New England, or what can be done by the Department.

Mr. WHERRY. The conclusions I have reached are to be found on page 10 of the statement I hold in my hand. I will act upon the suggestion made by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts and state that on page 10 of the recommendations which I have to make, I call attention to the severe shortage now existing. The testimony is that we have ample sources of crude oil in the country to supply all our needs if we can get the crude to the places where it is needed.

For that reason it is going to be very necessary that there be a reconsideration of the policy which has been followed of sending steel from the United States, such as I described in the beginning of my remarks, to the Saudi Arabia oil field. If we can get the tubular pipe-line material into the sections of this country where it is needed we can provide not only transportation for fuel oils, but for natural gas as a heating fuel, and thereby get to the people of America, within the next year, fuel oil and natural gas, and alleviate fuel shortages in the future. It is my belief that commitments respecting steel exports should be reviewed with that idea in mind.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Am I correct in my understanding that there is no actual shortage of oil, but that the question is one of transportation, and a question of obtaining the proper facilities to produce oil?

Mr. WHERRY. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Illinois that that was the testimony up until last week. There is now apparently developing a shortage of gasoline, for the reason that the oil companies have used oil for the making of lower grades of petroleum products. That will cause a shortage of gasoline early in the spring. Up to now, however, the testimony of the oil industry itself and of the various departments has been that the question is one of transportation, and not a question of production of crude oil.

I believe the Senator from Illinois will recall that the committee invited him to be present at some of the hearings held in Chicago. The Senator at that time may have been obliged to attend some other committee meetings and could not attend the hearings held in Chicago. In

June of this year in Chicago we held a series of meetings at which 258 independent oil men stated they had been cut off from all their supply of fuel oil. The testimony given by the independent oil men was that those who furnished oil to them said they had no fuel oil. When the suppliers of the independents went to their sources of supply for fuel oil and asked about fuel oil, the answer was always given, "We do not have the transportation." So I am quite satisfied that up until now, at least, the difficulty has been a question of transportation, not only of tank cars and tankers, but carrying lines between oil fields and points of distribution.

About the time of the hearings to which I have just referred, as I think the distinguished Senator from Illinois will recall, announcement was made of a commitment made by the Department of Commerce in the amount of 480,000 tons of steel, for the most part various sizes of steel pipe line, which was to be sent to Saudi Arabia upon the theory that Saudi Arabia was a part of world producing fields, and that if petroleum could be produced there and furnished to the Continent it would save the situation.

From the hearings we have had, however, it has been pointed out very definitely that it is not a question of production abroad; 330,000 tons of steel will build a pipe line, which will provide only transportation, and during the 3 years it will take to build it tanker transportation will have to be depended on. Oil will have to be carried until 1951 by tankers.

The Department of Commerce, after the protest referred to, did consider that question, and at that time did reduce exports for the fourth quarter for that particular project to 20,000 tons. But the commitment, I am satisfied, on the long-range period, still exists.

I hope that in light of what has been found, not only by the Small Business Committee, but from other sources of information, even from the Departments further consideration will be given by the Department of Commerce to this huge export of tubular goods out of the United States. The country is behind, in the matter of sinking wells, by 67,000 wells. That includes wildcat wells, as well as wells which should be sunk in proven fields. Had those wells been sunk, we could have kept up production, and the situation would undoubtedly have been much better than it is now.

Mr. President, once again I repeat that the shortage has resulted from lack of transportation.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. What is the latest evidence before the Senator's committee on the subject of the surplus Navy tankers, and the tankers which were under the control of the Maritime Commission?

Mr. WHERRY. I think I can state to the Senator that the only thing we investigated was the T-2 type tankers. I think the testimony is undisputed that so far as the tanker situation is concerned worldwide, the situation is serious. Mr. Ball, Director of the Oil and

Gas Division, first told the committee that there was not sufficient tanker service, but later said there was. He has now said that he feels that if all the tankers are finally put into service which it has been claimed will be, they will possibly be ample. The difficulty is that T-2 tankers have been taken out of coastwise trade domestically. They have gone into world-wide transportation, and that has resulted in lack of domestic transportation.

For example, the committee protested to the President relative to the sale of the 100 United States T-2 tankers by the Maritime Commission to foreign nations and nationals, which I suppose the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts had in mind when he asked his question. Thirty-one of the tankers were firm commitments, which I imagine could not have been changed without a great deal of embarrassment to the administration, because the contracts had been made. Yet 83 of those tankers are being transferred to foreign governments, and will soon be flying foreign flags. They have been taken outside American jurisdiction and cannot operate in coastwise traffic. After they are once sold to a foreign government and sail under a foreign flag, of course, we do not have anything to say with respect to where they shall go.

Twenty-nine of the first 31 of those tankers on the trips made by them prior to their last trips, brought oil from the Gulf Coast to seaport points along the New England coast, in which the Senator from Massachusetts is vitally interested. Since then other tankers have been conditioned. It is our contention that we do not have enough tankers, that we are short of tankers, and that the further sale of tankers to foreign nations should be stopped.

It is the contention of the Interior Department that whether the tankers are carrying petroleum here or carrying petroleum in other parts of the world they are carrying petroleum, and that if petroleum is carried by tanker from Saudi Arabia it will result in relieving the demand for oil at some other place. I suppose on a world-wide basis, which of course is very general, it would be very difficult to attack that conclusion. But I do say that the impact which the sale of these tankers has had upon the domestic economy is now being felt by way of acute shortages along the Atlantic coast.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. The Senator knows that on June 3 of this year there were over 100 tankers that could have been bought by the major oil companies for \$2,000,000 apiece, and the Senator knows that there were bids in for 8 of them, I believe. Is not that true?

Mr. WHERRY. In June of this year, according to the testimony, as I recall—I would have to refresh my memory—there were not on file a sufficient number of applications of United States citizens to indicate that they would take up the tankers that were offered for sale. I agree with that.

Mr. McMAHON. That is correct. If the major oil companies had bought those tankers and put them into operation—

Mr. WHERRY. At that time.

Mr. McMAHON. At that time, when they were offered for sale by the Government, there would not be any shortage of transportation.

Mr. WHERRY. But at that time the oil was being hauled by chartered tankers of the Maritime Commission, instead of tankers purchased for that purpose. The oil companies testified they were not in the transportation business, and that the tankers, which have now been sold, although they were not owned and were not purchased by those companies, were hauling oil for those companies to the people in Connecticut, as chartered boats; and I want to continue that charter; I think it is a good thing. I say now that when the charter expires—and I think it will expire in January—the Maritime Commission should have the right to continue chartering boats. There are many reasons for that. There is the question of labor. There is the question of knowing how to conduct the business. I am not sure about this, but I understand that one of the big reasons why they tried to stop the tankers being sold to foreigners was the fact that some of the companies carrying oil to foreign ports could get cheaper personnel than they could get in the United States. That was brought out in the evidence. But if the distinguished Senator from Connecticut would care to go through the hearings, I am quite satisfied he would find the question he asked was answered as I have answered it; I say to the distinguished Senator that in the Gulf-coast region oil has backed up, I think nearly 10,000,000 barrels over what it was a year ago, because there are not the transportation facilities with which to carry the oil.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I will also say that the reserves on the east coast, including Maryland and New Jersey, and right on up into the Senator's territory, have been depleted in nearly the same degree.

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

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; I am glad to yield.

Mr. McMAHON. It is my information that all the tankers laid up in the fleet will be out by the middle of February, with the exception of two. As the Senator knows, they would have been out before this, except that, first, the major oil companies did not buy them when they should have bought them. They saw oil burners being sold by the hundreds of thousands, and, unfortunately, the industry did not take steps to buy the tankers and put them into service. That is observation No. 1. Observation No. 2—

Mr. WHERRY. Just a moment. I have the floor.

Mr. McMAHON. I thought the Senator yielded to me.

Mr. WHERRY. I yielded to the Senator, but he has made an observation. Now, I should like to say, in reply to his observation, that the burden the Senator

suggests be imposed upon an independent oil company which is dependent upon tankers, whether chartered or owned, to go out and buy tankers for transportation, is one thing. As the Senator has suggested, if the United States citizens' applications had been on file last June and if the companies had not depended upon the chartering provided for in the proposed legislation, to permit them to haul under a charter, what he has said would be correct; but I say also to the Senator that no commitments were made to any foreign country in June of this year; not one. The only time when a foreign commitment was made was in September, when it was brought out by the Maritime Commission that they had prorated the tankers around, after American dollars became short, and they could not pay for the transportation in Europe. Then they started to make these firm commitments, which, indeed, were not firm, and as late as September of this year there were 161 United States citizens' applications on file. They had no consideration, and I think every one of those foreign sales attempted to be made under the War Shipping Act was made illegally. That is what I think about it.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. As I said, all but two of the tankers will be in service by February 15. The delay in putting them in service has been caused by the fact, as the Senator knows, that they have had to be strapped. Due to a breaking in the middle of a couple of them on the east coast, it has been necessary to make this repair on all of them for safety's sake. I have it on very good authority, I will tell the Senator, even though we get everyone of those tankers but two into operation, that, because of a shortage of oil, we shall still have a shortage on the east coast that will not be solved this winter or next winter, or probably the winter thereafter, and we are probably going to have a shortage of gasoline for the next 3 years.

Mr. WHERRY. In respect to that observation, I should like to have the Senator read the report of the Small Business Committee which made its investigation since June. If he will just read it, he will find it is the testimony of all the companies, it is the testimony of the agencies, including Mr. Ball, Director of the Oil and Gas Division of the Interior Department, upon whom the Secretary of Commerce depends for his statistics, that there has been no shortage of oil, that it is a question of transportation. The only time any testimony has been offered that we are now approaching a shortage of oil came within the past 10 days, when Mr. Ball, at a later meeting, stated that the situation has changed, that it is not only a question of transportation, but now a shortage of oil is beginning to develop.

Mr. McMAHON. I will say to the Senator that the truth or the untruth of that assertion of Mr. Ball's will be fairly proved at the end of February or early March, when all the tanker fleet and all the capacity will be in operation, and I say to the Senator—and I have made

something of a study of the matter—that I am convinced we shall still, unfortunately, have a shortage due to a lack of supplies of oil.

Mr. WHERRY. I am not arguing that point at all. The Senator is confirming my statement. Certainly we are going to have a shortage of oil. We are going to have a shortage of oil because we have not had the transportation, for one thing. We are going to have a shortage of oil because we have not the wells. We are 67,000 wells behind in production.

Mr. McMAHON. Well, that is it; we are going to have a shortage even though we solve the transportation problem.

Mr. WHERRY. But it is only now, after the horse is out of the barn, after there has been a failure in transportation, and after the authorities have failed to give the allocations of steel to produce the wells, that they come up against this shortage of oil. I think it is with the absolute purpose of inviting rationing of petroleum products in this country, if the Senator wants to know what I think about it. I did not rise to discuss the former report I made, but the distinguished Senator says he knows something of the situation. I am glad he does, but he has not read the oil report, or he would not have said what he did state. Not only are the recommendations available, but the complete testimony is available.

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

Mr. WHERRY. Yes. Certainly I yield. I always yield to the Senator.

Mr. McMAHON. With all due deference to the magnificence and eloquence and great accuracy of the report that comes from the Senator's committee—and I have not read it—

Mr. WHERRY. That is what I thought.

Mr. McMAHON. I sat for about 10 hours one day listening to this story, over in the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. As a result of that meeting of that committee, we did something about it.

Mr. WHERRY. What date was that?

Mr. McMAHON. Oh, I think that was probably about a month ago.

Mr. WHERRY. It was after the Special Committee to Study Problems of American Small Business made their report to the Senate.

Mr. McMAHON. In any event, without in any way wishing to detract from the magnificent work the Senator's committee did, or its report, all I can say to the Senator is that it is my opinion, based upon the evidence I have heard, that there is going to be a shortage of the product. I certainly hope that that is not going to be the case, but I think we make a mistake when we say that transportation, and transportation alone, is the cause, because the transportation problem is going to be solved, I am told, in the middle of February.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator state who told him that?

Mr. McMAHON. Yes; Mr. Ball and the Maritime Commission.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; Mr. Ball. Now, Mr. Ball is only with the Oil and Gas Division of the Department of the In-

terior. The testimony of Colonel Johnson, who probably knows more about transportation than anyone else in Washington, or in the United States, will inform the Senator just the contrary.

Mr. McMAHON. No; I do not think so.

Mr. WHERRY. That is his evidence. That is the evidence.

Mr. McMAHON. I do not think so. I think the Senator is talking about the situation when he took this evidence some weeks ago.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the Senator can, if he cares to, review the testimony. If the Senator will just read the record he will find that there is a shortage of oil, caused by a lack of transportation; and now, after the horse is out of the barn, of course, there is a shortage; and now the shortage is blamed on something else. I agree with the Senator there is a shortage, and there is going to be a shortage, and in the spring of this year the supply of gasoline will be the shortest it has been in a long time.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I shall be glad to yield, if the Senator wants to add something constructive to this debate. If he does not, I shall refuse to yield.

Mr. McMAHON. Of course.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator has not read the record.

Mr. McMAHON. I have not read the record, because it has not yet been printed.

Mr. WHERRY. After attending one hearing for 10 hours, the Senator is now an expert.

Mr. McMAHON. Oh, no.

Mr. WHERRY. He is an authority on transportation and on oil.

Mr. McMAHON. No.

Mr. WHERRY. And the basis for the meeting the Senator attended, the evidence relied on, was the evidence which we have gathered over the United States since last June, in innumerable hearings, evidence brought out from all the agencies and industry itself.

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

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

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; I am glad to yield to him.

Mr. McMAHON. There is no point in our disputing the question as to who has the greatest basis in fact for the opinions which he is voicing. I think the Senator ought to know that a subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has held many hearings on this subject. Let me point out to the Senator also while we are on the subject, that this shortage basically is caused by the fact that in the year 1947 this astounding thing occurred: We consumed, and are now consuming, at the rate of 586 gallons per capita a year. During 1940 we consumed at the rate of 325 gallons per capita. I think the Senator will agree that there has never been, in the entire history of the oil business, the stupendous increase in consumption which has occurred during the past 12 months. I think we can agree on that statement.

Mr. WHERRY. Certainly, I agree to that. Anyone knows that there has been an increase in petroleum consumption. He can find that out without looking at the record. Such increase has been brought about by the increased sale of oil burners, and by the 101 uses to which petroleum has been put. The amount of money in circulation is also a factor. The same is true of power, and many other things. I agree with the Senator that there is an increase in the domestic use of petroleum products; but the fact that we are producing as much this year as we produced in 1940 does not solve the problem. What we want to do is to produce enough in this country to have a supply which is equal to the demand. If we are to do that, we must have steel to build pipe lines. We must have steel to build tank cars. We must have steel in the proved producing fields to bring in new oil wells. Also we must provide pipe for wildcatters to enable them to bring in 60,000 wells which we do not have today.

Mr. McMAHON. I agree.

Mr. WHERRY. Then we are agreed on that point. I shall be glad now to insert the remainder of my remarks as a statement. I think I have pretty well covered the subject.

I have attempted to do this in the service of a committee which has worked hard. I have no quarrel with the subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. We have gone to any town where the independent oil dealers have asked us to go. We have done a great deal of work in processing claims. The theory which the Senator is advancing, of a pool to allow the big companies to supply hardship cases, would bypass every independent oil operator in the United States. If that is what the Senator wants, very well; but I am not for it. So long as I am chairman of the Small Business Committee, we will continue to work for the interests of small business and the interests of consumers.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one observation?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. I appreciate what the Senator has said about the bypassing of independent dealers.

Mr. WHERRY. That is taking place in the Senator's own State. Today we processed a claim involving an attempt to take oil out of a pool and furnish it to another dealer in the Senator's own State, and thereby bypass the independent dealer who has been the normal distributor. Not only is the independent dealer bypassed, but the customers whom that dealer has built up over the years are bypassed. They have no opportunity to get oil unless they beg the major company to furnish it to them.

That is the kind of service which our committee is giving to independent operators throughout the country. It is the kind of service which they must have. It is the kind of service which will keep them in business. I have worked for 5 years on the Small Business Committee, and I shall continue to work to preserve the small businessman.

Mr. McMAHON. I am delighted to hear of the Senator's devotion.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator can come over to our committee and render a much greater service than by helping the big companies bypass the independent dealers.

Mr. McMAHON. Only today I issued a statement in which I said that unless there were some relief for the independent dealers, if a plan to squeeze them out of business was to be used, then there was nothing for Congress to do except to go to allocation and control.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask that the remainder of my statement be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WHERRY IN CONNECTION WITH OIL SHORTAGE AND ACTIVITIES OF THE OIL SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE SENATE SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE

Mr. President, may I call to the attention of the Senate today a situation, the seriousness of which we are all aware, but about which the administration and the responsible executive agencies are closing the door after the horse is out of the barn.

I refer, gentlemen, to the shortage of fuel oil and other petroleum products which is plaguing many sections of the country at this time, and which will continue to cause suffering and discomfort throughout the balance of the winter.

And beyond that, gasoline will be short in the spring.

The Oil Subcommittee of the Senate Small Business Committee, of which I am chairman, has been investigating problems of oil supply and distribution since June 1947. Since that time, this committee has repeatedly called the attention of Government officials and of the public and the press to situations which were brewing in the oil industry and to related problems which would affect the supply of oil in the immediate months to come.

In August and September of 1947, the Oil Subcommittee conducted hearings throughout the Middle West, investigating complaints of small businessmen in the oil industry; independent producers, distributors, and dealers who are faced with a variety of problems in securing oil for distribution.

Again and again in its investigations the subcommittee was faced with the complaint that development of new oil resources and the building of pipe lines was greatly hampered by the lack of steel.

Better utilization of tank cars for the transportation of oil also became a major project for the Oil Subcommittee, based upon its findings that cars were in desperate short supply and that steel was not available to build sufficient new ones.

The Oil Subcommittee has sought the cooperation of the Office of Defense Transportation and of major oil companies and tanker companies to require that tank cars be used to their full capacity; that hoarding and banking of tank cars be discontinued; that unloading and turn-around time be speeded up; and that truck transports be substituted for tank cars on short hauls.

While in the midst of Midwest hearings in September 1947, the Oil Subcommittee learned that the Department of Commerce was about to issue an export license to the Trans-Arabian Pipe Line Co. to build a pipe line across Saudi-Arabia, which would eventually require 480,000 tons of steel, principally welded pipe—pipe for which the oil industry in the United States had been begging for years—not to mention the needs of other industries.

On September 23, I protested the licensing of steel pipe for the Saudi-Arabian pipe line

and called the attention of the Secretary of Commerce to the fact. I quote from my letter to him of that date:

"Shortages of critical steel in this country have made it impossible for many American businessmen to plan production on a sound basis. The lack of water-well casing and water pipe in the farm and grazing areas of the Nation is acute and may well affect food production. There is a very serious possibility that homes will be cold and businesses forced to operate at reduced levels of operation this winter because of the shortage of steel pipe with which to transport heating oil and gas. Development of new oil resources and the construction of pipe lines in this country have been hampered by the shortage of pipe and tubular goods."

On October 9 the Oil Subcommittee called a hearing with high officials of the Government, including Mr. Forrestal, Secretary of National Defense; Mr. Lovett, then Acting Secretary of State; Mr. Averell Harriman, Secretary of Commerce; Mr. W. John Kenney, Under Secretary of the Navy; and representatives of the Army-Navy Petroleum Board, all of whom participated in the decision to approve 480,000 tons of steel for the Saudi Arabian pipe line.

At the request of the participants, this meeting was a closed session, due to the implication that national defense considerations had played a part in the decision to approve the shipments. Out of this meeting came the answer that the development of the Saudi Arabian pipe line was in the national interest, and in the opinion of our Secretary for National Defense, "was more important than the development of any oil resource in the United States or the Western Hemisphere."

The subcommittee has proved to its satisfaction in subsequent open hearings that either these high officials of our Government were misled in information presented to them, or there is something afoot in our policy-making branch of Government that is neither healthy nor in the best interests of our national welfare.

Not satisfied with the equivocal outcome of its initial inquiry on the Saudi Arabian pipe deal, the Oil Subcommittee pursued the question with other Government officials involved in the decision to develop the project, and also with representatives of the independent oil producers, who have a large stake in and much to lose by the shipment of critically needed steel pipe away from this country.

Mr. Max Bail, Director of the Oil and Gas Division of the Department of the Interior, which Division and agency has the special responsibility for protecting the interests of the oil and gas industry in this country, reported to the Oil Subcommittee on October 15 that he had voted against the licensing of pipe for Saudi Arabia pipe line on July 14, 1947.

But in the intervening weeks between then and September 22, when the license had been approved, Mr. Bail reversed his opinion on the grounds that the pipe line would make the Saudi Arabian oil more accessible, and would relieve a serious shortage of tanker transportation for carrying that oil from the Persian Gulf to the Mediterranean.

It is interesting to note here that the Secretary of Commerce, who has the last word in deciding upon an export license, made his decision at the Cabinet level and not upon the advice of his own Office of International Trade. That office had the courage to tell him that the shipment of 480,000 tons of steel, or any sizable portion of that export per quarter, could not be justified with regard to the domestic economy. Other Government agencies—the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the Office of Defense Transportation also refused to go along with the Department of Commerce's action.

Their objections were of little avail.

The Maritime Commission, which agency should know more about the tanker situation than any other Government agency, was not asked for advice on the Saudi Arabian pipe deal.

When the Oil Subcommittee continued its investigation to find out the true situation with respect to tankers, it found the Maritime Commission busily engaged in selling 100 United States fleet tankers to foreign nations and nationals, in what I believe to be a violation of the law.

Counter to the claim that we must build a pipe line for Middle East oil because of a tanker shortage, valuable tankers have been sold to foreign nations who may or may not transport oil to American ports, and who cannot operate in coastwise traffic in the United States, according to the law.

It was clearly indicated in testimony given by Maritime Commission officials that instructions to sell these tankers had come from the White House upon advice of the State Department.

The sales were still further supported by an opinion of the Attorney General on December 9, which validated 83 of the tanker sales. Seventeen of the allotment were saved for sale to United States citizens.

To the average person, the story of oil supply and distribution would ordinarily seem very remote from a Saudi Arabian pipe line and the sale of tankers to foreign nations. Unfortunately it is as involved as most of our international policies are these days.

The ridiculousness of the situation is that the Oil Subcommittee has found that the building of a Middle East pipe line does not mean increased supplies of oil, simply improved transportation. Furthermore, the pipe line cannot be built for 3 years and in that time the oil must still be shipped by the same number of tankers that have been required right along. A pipe line built with that steel in this country would be put into active use carrying oil to homes and to industry.

World-minded Government officials, it seems, have given too little consideration to the critical and immediate shortages in our own country.

The general impression has also been created by Government officials that oil resources in the United States have been stripped, and for that reason it was most advisable for us to develop Middle East fields.

The oil industry as well as representatives of the Bureau of Mines have told the Oil Subcommittee otherwise.

Sixty-seven thousand more oil wells could have been drilled by the oil industry since the war, had the oil-drilling equipment been available.

One hundred and seventy to one hundred and eighty trillion cubic feet of natural gas are available in this country.

Recovery of oil from shale is only in its infancy. One pilot plant, experimenting with processes, is in operation at this time by the Bureau of Mines; 92,000,000,000 barrels of oil is presently estimated as recoverable from shale in this country.

When we think that Germany fought the recent war on oil in a large measure recovered from shale, from coal, and from natural gas we can realize how far behind the times we are in the development and utilization of our natural resources.

Government officials have repeatedly told this committee that the "cream" has been taken from the oil fields in the United States. A perfect refutation of that is the new oil field which has just been opened in west Texas, covering an area of 800 miles. At this moment 886 barrels per day are being taken out through a 3/8-inch pipe. When brought into full production, this field will be one of the largest developments in recent years.

This shows what American ingenuity can accomplish—even hampered by lack of materials.

Steel pipe and tubular goods are needed to bring this oil, and oil from other fields in the United States, to points of distribution. Instead, it is the apparent attitude of Government officials that our steel should be hurried off to Saudi Arabia, rather than devoted to our own hemisphere.

As to the advisability of the development of a Saudi Arabian pipe line, we have only to study the Arabian-Palestine situation and the Greek and Iran difficulties.

Information has reached me that work on the western end of the Saudi Arabian pipe line has been stopped and work can only be done on the eastern end—a possibility which was discussed with our Defense and State Department officials in the committee's October 9 closed session.

As to the need for tankers in domestic transportation, we have only to read the newspaper accounts of the fuel-oil shortage along the east coast, particularly in the Northeastern States.

From all over the country the Senate Small Business Committee has received complaints and appeals for assistance in serious oil shortages. As the heating season has progressed, the committee has held emergency hearings and consultations with the oil industry and with independent dealers to negotiate emergency shipments of fuel oil and gasoline, where it is necessary to keep families warm, and municipal services running.

In these negotiations, the Oil Subcommittee has attempted to work out solutions to shortage problems, which would result in distribution of oil through smaller independent dealers in proportion to that distributed through company-owned outlets of the major oil-producing companies. Thus, in its emergency assistance, the Oil Subcommittee has sought to restrain monopolistic practices in the oil industry.

Since early summer, then, the Oil Subcommittee has been warning the public; has been proclaiming the oncoming oil shortage; has been trying to prevent the "giving away" of critical materials needed for the production and transportation of oil.

The subcommittee has been trying to effect improved use of tank-car facilities and to promote the more equitable distribution of petroleum and petroleum products by major oil companies to independent distributors and dealers—these small businessmen who through the years have served normal channels of trade.

A report issued by the Senate Small Business Committee on December 18 emphasized these efforts, and called attention to other recommendations by the Oil Subcommittee.

Through all of the warnings and evidence produced by the almost continuous hearings of the Oil Subcommittee over the past 6 months, the responsible Government agencies seemed to have their eyes averted.

On January 15 the Secretary of Interior, Mr. Krug, called a meeting with representatives of industry to discuss voluntary distribution agreements, in accordance with the new Economic Stabilization Act.

Now that the oil emergency is well advanced, I am glad to see that the Interior Department is moving to step into the breach.

In a letter to the National Petroleum Council on setting up this meeting with industry, Secretary Krug has now indicated a need for action in the field of distribution of petroleum and its products. Reference is made to Senate Small Business Committee findings, and to a similar need for action with respect to the allocation of transportation and equipment.

In subsequent releases, Secretary Krug has stated that a return to wartime controls over petroleum are necessary. This is what I mean by closing the door after the horse is out of the barn.

A solution to the immediate oil emergency, which has been suggested by representatives

of industry and representatives of State coordinating committees who have met with the Department of Interior, has been what is called a hardship pool of oil, whereby major oil companies would supply needy cases which have been screened by the State committees.

This is what I call a consumers' hardship pool, and although it may serve consumer needs which we all desire, it will also distribute the oil exclusively through major oil company outlets.

This is a phase of the oil shortage which the Senate Small Business Committee has been fighting and will continue to fight. The smaller, independent businessman in the oil industry has the right of survival, the right to the customers which he has developed over the years, and the right to his share of the Nation's natural resources.

My purpose in this description of the activities of the oil subcommittee is to show the disinclination on the part of executive agencies to profit by the hearings and investigations conducted by a Senate committee, or to be forewarned of national emergencies in time to take preventive action.

We are in the midst of a heating oil crisis today, because Government agencies have not taken precautions to safeguard our domestic supplies, our transportation facilities, or provide the means for the development of new oil resources.

And let me warn you today that when the weather lightens and the use of cars and motor transportation increases, you will hear loud complaints on the lack of gasoline—for business purposes, for family use, and recreation.

We have ample sources of crude oil in this country to supply all of our needs.

The stumbling blocks and limitations in production and distribution of petroleum products are the problems which must be overcome.

We must make sure that the inordinately large exports of oil to Canada or any other foreign country are reduced to normal.

We must watch that foreign-aid oil needs are kept at a minimum and that they are satisfied from sources of oil outside this hemisphere so long as domestic demand exceeds supply.

We must be alert that foreign-aid needs are not disguised under the heading of military requirements.

We must insist that shipments of steel pipe and tubular goods in export be granted only with full consideration being given to domestic needs for these products;

We must see that United States tankers are retained for domestic transportation insofar as the need exists;

We must assure that tank car facilities are used efficiently and that exports of steel are so handled to permit sufficient new tank and freight cars to be constructed;

We must reveal and correct practices in the oil industry which are smothering independent business and affecting the flow of petroleum products from originating fields, and through the various stages of distribution until its delivery to the customer.

During the war we were spurred on by the warning phrase, "too little, too late." It seems to me this is equally appropriate today. If the proper effort were applied to solve such problems as the oil shortage before they reach emergency proportions, there would be no need even to propose the distasteful step of government control and regulation.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. WHERRY. I move that the Senate adjourn until Monday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 29 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, January 19, 1948, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 16 (legislative day of January 14), 1948:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The following-named persons, now Foreign Service officers of class 3 and secretaries in the diplomatic service, to be also consuls general of the United States of America:

William H. Beach, of Virginia.

Frederik van den Arend, of North Carolina.

Walter J. Stoessel, Jr., of California, now a Foreign Service officer of class 5 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul of the United States of America.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

John R. Alison, of Florida, now holding recess appointment, to the position of Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Vincent C. Burke, of Kentucky, to be First Assistant Postmaster General, Post Office Department, vice Jesse M. Donaldson, appointed Postmaster General.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Bernice Pyke, of Cleveland, Ohio, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 41, with headquarters at Cleveland, Ohio. (Reappointment.)

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

Frank E. Flynn, of Arizona, to be United States attorney for the district of Arizona. (Mr. Flynn is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired October 2, 1947.)

William W. Hart, of Illinois, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Illinois. (Mr. Hart is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired October 1, 1947.)

Leslie E. Given, of West Virginia, to be United States attorney for the southern district of West Virginia. (Mr. Given is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired October 2, 1947.)

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

John J. Barc, of Michigan, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Michigan. (He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired November 4, 1947.)

Jack R. Caufield, of Oregon, to be United States marshal for the district of Oregon. (Mr. Caufield is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired October 28, 1947.)

Leland Stanford Finney, of Virginia, to be United States marshal for the western district of Virginia, vice John White Stuart, deceased.

Edney Ridge, of North Carolina, to be United States marshal for the middle district of North Carolina. (Mr. Ridge is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired October 1, 1947.)

CIRCUIT COURTS, TERRITORY OF HAWAII

Willson C. Moore, of Hawaii, to be fourth judge of the First Circuit, Circuit Courts, Territory of Hawaii. (Judge Moore is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired December 27, 1947.)

Albert M. Cristy, of Hawaii, to be second judge of the First Circuit, Circuit Courts, Territory of Hawaii. (He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired December 27, 1947.)

Cable A. Wirtz, of Hawaii, to be circuit judge of the Second Circuit, Circuit Courts, Territory of Hawaii. (Judge Wirtz is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired December 27, 1947.)

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named candidates for appointment in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service:

To be assistant nurse officers (equivalent to the Army rank of first lieutenant), effective date of acceptance:

Mary E. Ingle Genevieve T. Piette
Mary Matula Frances C. Wickham
Elizabeth J. Haglund

To be junior assistant nurse officer (equivalent to the Army rank of second lieutenant), effective date of acceptance:

Mary Ellen Deady

IN THE ARMY

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant and arm or service specified, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Army, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

Samuel T. Rhodes, Infantry.
Andrew J. Roach, Quartermaster Corps.
Robert K. Weaver, Infantry.

IN THE COAST GUARD

The following-named officers of the United States Coast Guard to be rear admirals:

Gordon T. Finlay, to rank from December 30, 1947.

Wilfrid N. Derby, to rank from December 31, 1947.

Edward H. Smith, to rank from January 1, 1948.

William K. Scammell, to rank from January 2, 1948.

Earl G. Rose, to rank from January 3, 1948.

Eugene A. Coffin, to rank from January 4, 1948.

Joseph E. Stika, to rank from January 5, 1948.

Halert C. Shepherd, to rank from January 6, 1948.

The following-named officers of the United States Coast Guard to be captains:

Floyd J. Sexton	Frank A. Leamy
Gordon W. MacLane	John H. Byrd
John E. Whitbeck	Beckwith Jordan
Charles T. Henley, Jr.	Niels S. Haugen
John N. Heiner	Harold S. Berdine
John Trebes, Jr.	Clarence C. Paden
Joseph Greenspun	Donald G. Jacobs
Louis W. Perkins	Carl E. Guisness
Raymond T. McElligott	George W. McKean
Louis B. Olson	William J. Austermann
Charles W. Dean	Gaines A. Tyler
Roderick S. Patch	Ira E. Eskridge
Harold G. Bradbury	Christopher J. Sullivan
Arthur G. Hall	Harry W. Stinchcomb
Norman C. Manyon	Paul B. Cronk
Frederick C. Hingsburg	Harold C. Moore
Paul K. Perry	Richard M. Hoyle
Norman H. Leslie	Stanley J. Woyciehowsky
Albert M. Martinson	Kenneth K. Cowart
Raymond J. Maurer	Rutherford B. Lank, Jr.
George E. McCabe	Dale R. Simonson
Lee H. Baker	Morris C. Jones
Charles W. Harwood	Miles H. Imlay
Severt A. Olsen	Edward M. Kent
Joseph S. Rosenthal	Frank E. Allison
Frank M. Meals	Henry T. Jewell
Thomas Y. Awalt	Gordon A. Littlefield
Alfred C. Richmond	George C. Whittlesey
Walter R. Richards	Donald E. McKay
Roy L. Raney	Vernon E. Day
Russell E. Wood	John L. Steinmetz
Clarence H. Peterson	Stanley C. Linholm
James A. Hirshfield	Fred P. Vetterick
Joseph D. Conway	Carl F. Ganong
Frank T. Kenner	Lawrence M. Harding
George C. Carlstedt	Morris G. Jory
John Rountree	Dwight A. Chase
William W. Kenner	Frank R. Bellomy
Stephen P. Swicegood	George M. Phannemiller
Henry C. Perkins	
Charles W. Thomas	

The following-named officers of the United States Coast Guard to be commanders:

George F. Hicks	Charles E. Brush
Alexander L. Ford	Charles B. Arrington
Stephen H. Evans	Robert T. Alexander
John A. Glynn	Edward A. Eve, Jr.
John E. Fairbank	Howard A. Morrison
Joseph A. Kerrins	Eric A. Anderson
Edward H. Thiele	Marion Amos
Reginald H. French	Halmar J. Webb
John W. Ryssy	Frank A. Erickson
Richard L. Burke	William D. Shields
Nathaniel S. Fulford, Jr.	Chester L. Harding
Albert A. Lawrence	Richard E. Morell
Chester M. Anderson	Aden C. Unger
Jerry B. Hoag	Victor F. Tydlacka
Julius F. Jacot	George I. Holt
Glenn E. Trester	Simon R. Sands, Jr.
Chester A. Anderson	Donald M. Morrison
Edward E. Hahn, Jr.	Christopher C. Knapp
Wilbur C. Hogan	Joseph E. Madacey
Kenneth P. Maley	Elmer E. Comstock
Samuel F. Gray	Henry U. Scholl
Earl K. Rhodes	Elmer J. J. Suydam
Carl B. Olsen	Rufus E. Mroczkowski
Leon H. Morine	James R. Hinnant
Walter C. Capron	Oscar C. B. Wev
Watson A. Burton	Harold B. Roberts
Frank K. Johnson	Ned W. Sprow
Leslie D. Edwards	William I. Swanston
Frederick G. Eastman	William E. Creedon
Arthur G. Morrill	Henry A. Meyer
George N. Bernier	Preston B. Mavor
Dwight H. Dexter	Quentin M. Greeley
Edward W. Holtz	Richard C. Foutter
Herbert F. Walsh	Richard D. Schmidtman
Edwin J. Roland	John T. Stanley
Peter V. Colmar	James D. Craik
George H. Bowerman	Theodore J. Harris
Allen Winbeck	Anthony J. DeJoy
William B. Chiswell	Loren H. Seeger
Oliver A. Peterson	George D. Synon
Marius DeMartino	Irwin J. Stephens
Carl G. Bowman	Donald T. Adams
James C. Wendland	Theodore J. Fabik
Richard M. Ross	Reinhold R. Johnson
John A. Dirks	John R. Henthorn
Harry A. Loughlin	Hollis M. Warner
Henry J. Wuensch	Walter E. Millington
George W. Nelson	John P. German
William P. Hawley	Oscar C. Rohnke
Hans F. Slade	Karl O. A. Zittel
John N. Zeller	Gilbert I. Lynch
Romeo J. Borromeo	George R. Leslie
Donald B. MacDiarmid	Joseph A. Bresnan
Garrett V. A. Graves	Carl H. Stober
William B. Scheibel	John R. Kurcheski
Bret H. Brallier	Frederick G. Wild
George H. Miller	Alvin H. Giffin
John W. Malen	Joe G. Lawrence
Gordon P. McGowan	James A. Alger, Jr.
Kenneth S. Davis	Albert J. Carpenter
William E. Sinton	Willard J. Smith
Henry S. Sharp	Robert S. Lecky
George A. Knudsen	Emmet T. Calahan
John R. Stewart	Joseph F. McCue
Arthur J. Hesford	John H. Forney
William L. Maloney	Eugene A. Coffin, Jr.
Ralph R. Curry	David O. Reed
Harold J. Doeblor	Forrest I. Phippeny
Edmund E. Fahey	Edward W. Laird
Spencer F. Hewins	William G. Wallace
Clifford R. MacLean	Harry S. Salzer
Henry F. Stolfi	Verne C. Gibson
John F. Harding	Russell E. Yates
Herman T. Diehl	George C. Balzer
Leonard T. Jones	Charles R. Monteiro
Montegue F. Garfield	Hugh D. Wear
Searcy J. Lowrey	Daniel J. Lucinski
Samuel L. Denty	Hubert R. Chaffee
George W. Dick	

The following-named officers of the United States Coast Guard to be lieutenant commanders:

Harry E. Davis, Jr.	John H. Wagline
Joseph Howe	John J. Hutson, Jr.
William W. Childress	Robert E. McCaffery

Albert E. Harned	Joseph A. Ciccolella
David H. Bartlett	Ralph S. Feola
Vaino O. Johnson	Howard W. Schleiter
Richard F. Rea	Richard H. Fairman
Louis M. Thayer, Jr.	Clarence N. Daniel
Evor S. Kerr, Jr.	Harold D. Seielstad
Walter S. Bakutis	Joseph W. Naab, Jr.
Edgar V. Carlson	Corliss B. Lambert
Clayton M. Opp	James McIntosh
Loren E. Brunner	Maynard F. Young
Charles E. Columbus	Mark A. Whalen
William L. Sutter	William F. Cass
Gilbert R. Evans	Roger M. Dudley
Wallace L. Hancock, Jr.	Albert F. Wayne, Jr.
Adrian F. Werner	Clement Vaughn, Jr.
Woodrow W. Vennel	Chester I. Steele
Gilbert F. Schumacher	Clarence H. Waring, Jr.
Charles Tighe	Peter J. Smenton
Richard Baxter	John B. Oren
Oscar D. Weed, Jr.	Paul E. G. Prins
Harold Land	Edward P. Chester, Jr.
Ralph D. Dean	Larry L. Davis
Joseph R. Scullion	William J. Conley, Jr.
William J. Conley, Jr.	Alexander W. Wuerker
Richard L. Mellen	John E. D. Hudgens
Glenn L. Rollins	Arthur Pfeiffer
Ernest A. Cascini	George E. Howarth
Frank V. Helmer	Benjamin F. Engel
Robert F. Shunk	Robert Waldron
Justis P. White	George T. Murati
William J. Lawrence	James W. Williams
Bernard E. Scalan	Henry P. Kniskern
Guy L. Ottinger	Cornelius G. Houtsma
Clifford S. Gerde	Edward C. Allen, Jr.
Edward C. Thompson, Jr.	Arthur B. Engel
George R. Boyce, Jr.	James A. Hyslop
Gerald T. Applegate	Benjamin D. Shoemaker, Jr.
George R. Reynolds	Raymond A. Tuttle
Fred J. Scheiber	Donald M. Morell
William B. Ellis	Charles E. Leising, Jr.
Christian R. Couser	George W. Holtzman
Thomas R. Midtlyng	Benjamin P. Clark
Randolph Ridgely III	Thomas R. Sargent III
Harold L. Wood	Edwin B. Ing
Arthur W. Johnson	Winslow H. Buxton
Douglas R. Henderson	Robert D. Brodie IV
Robert Wilcox	Robert W. Goehring
Chester R. Bender	Harry L. Morgan
Richard R. Smith	John D. McCubbin
Samuel G. Guill	Ross P. Bullard
Paul E. Trimble	Orvan R. Smeder
Russell R. Waesche, Jr.	Victor Pfeiffer
Joseph P. Martin	William L. Morrison
George W. Playdon	David W. Sinclair
Thomas F. Epley	Robert R. Russell
Julius E. Richey	Charles E. Masters, Jr.
Frederick J. Statts	James N. Schrader
James S. Muzzy	Harry F. Frazer
Raymond W. Blouin	Julian J. Shingler
Fred F. Nichols	Warner K. Thompson, Jr.
Theodore F. Knoll	William R. Riedel
Frank M. McCabe	Louis B. Kendall
Harold L. Durgin	Ralph M. West
Joseph R. Davis	Charles E. Sharp
Thomas B. McKinstry	Charles W. Schuh
Ellis S. Gordon	Lynn Parker
Myron W. Caskey	Claude G. Winstead
Forrest A. Tinsler	Thomas G. Byrne
Wayne L. Goff	Leslie G. Haverland
Ronald M. Freeman	

The following-named officers of the United States Coast Guard to be lieutenants:

Robert E. Reed-Hill	James W. Paine
Joseph J. McClelland	James A. Cornish
Raymond G. Miller	William K. Earle
John P. Latimer	Robert F. Barber
James A. Martin	Joe L. Horne
Robert E. Hammond	Helmer S. Pearson
Clyde R. Burton	Chester A. Richmond
Ottis T. Estes, Jr.	James M. McLaughlin
James F. Bills	Whitney M. Prall, Jr.
Paul E. Burhorst	Henry F. Rohrkemper
Edwin C. Crosby	Charles F. Scharfenstein, Jr.
Ira H. McMullan	Walter E. Lewis
William C. Foster	Robert P. Cromwell
Holmes F. Crouch	Kenneth R. Goodwin
Kenneth H. Potts	

James W. Kincaid
Kingdrel N. Ayers
Victor A. G. Schmidt
Elmer A. Crook
James A. Palmer
George W. Girdler
Bernhard R. Henry
Robert C. Gould
Henry C. Keene, Jr.
Ellis L. Perry
Loy W. A. Renshaw
Cecil E. Meree, Jr.
Lawrence D. Bradley, Jr.
Clyde L. Olson
Joseph G. Bastow, Jr.
Bob Kirsten
John B. Speaker, Jr.
Louis F. Sudnik
John F. Thompson, Jr.
William E. Chapline, Jr.
Albert Frost
William F. Adams
William F. Rea III
James L. Lathrop
Austin C. Wagner
Stephen G. Carkeek
Norman L. Horton
Henry A. Pearce, Jr.
William A. Jenkins
Charles E. Vautrain, Jr.
John Natwig
Kenneth L. Peterson
Roy M. Hutchins, Jr.
Stanley H. Rice
Roderick L. Harris
Opie L. Dawson
Harold T. Hendrickson
Robert J. Clark
Clinton E. McAuliffe
David W. Woods
Hugh F. Lusk
James D. Luse
George C. Fleming
William C. Morill
Kenneth E. Wilson

Ward J. Davies, Jr.
John M. Waters, Jr.
Walter A. Wright
Frederick C. Munchmeyer
Harry E. Haff
Richard W. Young
Charles Dorian
Roger H. Banner
James W. Moreau
Robert P. Cunningham
Charles A. Greene
James W. Christman
Gerhard K. Kelz
Douglas D. Vosler
Edward D. Schneiderer
Leroy A. Cheney
Frederick A. Goettel
Albert A. Heckman
George F. Breitweiser
Lewis W. Tibbitts, Jr.
Theodore S. Pattison
Donald H. Luzius
Arthur A. Atkinson, Jr.
John W. Sutherland
Uriah H. Leach, Jr.
Richard H. Welton
Frank C. Schmitz
Ernest H. Burt, Jr.
Francis X. Riley
Bainbridge B. Leland
Jerry K. Rea
John L. Haney
Richard L. Fuller
Billy R. Ryan
Charles E. Norton
George H. Lawrence
Robert E. Emerson
Hersey C. Forehand, Jr.
Sherman K. Frick
Marcus H. McGarity
John E. Day
Fletcher W. Brown, Jr.
Charles W. Scharff
Charles M. Shepard III
James W. McGary

The following-named officers of the United States Coast Guard to be lieutenants (junior grade):

James P. VanEtten
Joseph R. Steele
LeWayne N. Felts
Edward M. F. Kirchner
Mitchell A. Perry
Garth H. Read
David R. Domke, Jr.
John D. Richardson, Jr.
William E. Dennis
Robert J. LoForte
Owen W. Siler
Arthur Hancock
Richard A. Pasciuti
William S. Allan, Jr.
Leslie B. George
Robert E. Moore
Charles Wayne
Wallace C. Dahlgren
Harry H. Carter
Bernard E. Kolkhorst
Donald M. Reed
George W. Schm
Carl L. Parrott
Frederick J. Hancox
Robert A. Adams
William M. Benkert
Robert A. Schulz
Warren E. Rast
Curtis J. Kelly
Austin F. Hubbard
Ward R. Emigh
William J. Zinck
Richard E. Hoover
William N. Banks
Keith Low
Daniel J. Scalabrini
Robert E. MacDonald

Edward R. Tharp
Wilfrid N. Derby, Jr.
Alexander Cameron
Alden E. Lewis
Robert T. Norris
James N. Ashbrook
Frank B. Carter
Paul Morosky
Frank M. Fisher, Jr.
Rufus S. Drury
John J. Doherty
David L. Davies, Jr.
Donald A. Caswell
Robert J. Carson
Kenneth H. Langenbeck
Robert D. Johnson
Robert F. Henderson
Paul R. Peak, Jr.
Virgil N. Woolfolk, Jr.
Elmer M. Lipsey
James A. Hodgman
Robert C. Phillips
Albert J. McCullough
Wesley M. Thorsson
Peter S. Branson
Harrison B. Smith
John M. Dorsey
Paul T. Ryan
Paul A. Lutz
Robert C. Boardman
William E. Fuller, Jr.
Parker O. Chapman
Albert B. Ellerman
William H. Brinkmeyer
George H. Weller
David A. Webb
Carl Blanchett
Richard W. Goode

James E. Murphy
James W. Carroll
James L. Harrison
Bernard S. Brown
William E. Murphy
John A. Devlin, Jr.
Milton L. McGregor
John D. McCann
Sumner R. Dolber
Garth D. Clizbe
Julian E. Johansen
Lilbourn A. Pharris, Jr.
Harold L. Davison
Richard L. Bailey, Jr.
John M. Austin
Theodore C. Rapalus
Clarence R. Easter
Harley E. Dilcher
Frank Barnett, Jr.

(All the above nominations are for permanent commissions in the U. S. Coast Guard. Dates of rank to be set forth in the commissions to be issued to the foregoing officers in the rank of captain and below will conform to the dates assigned in the approved precedence list as authorized by the Secretary of the Treasury.)

The following-named person to be a commander in the United States Coast Guard:

Edward A. Richmond

The following-named persons to be lieutenant commanders in the United States Coast Guard:

Claude H. Broach
Kenneth W. Donnell
Douglas R. Shambeau
James L. Thompson
Daniel C. Dickert
John F. Gornell
Donald G. Elliott
Anthony D. Dean
Lloyd R. Morrison
Cyril L. Heyliger
Frank F. Elliott
Paul Olson
Leo M. Mallett
Charles H. Freericks
Paul J. Allman

The following-named persons to be lieutenants in the United States Coast Guard:

Charles F. W. Cullison
Ashton H. Barnes
Martin D. Berg
William D. Strauch
William B. Durham
Herschel E. Sanders
Russell A. Serenberg
Frederick B. Thatcher
Arthur M. Davison
Edward H. Houghtaling
Wilbur S. Doe
Roland H. Estey
George M. Bishop
John L. Barron
Gordon H. MacLane
William J. L. Parker
William H. Fuller
Bernard T. Clark
Louis L. Lague
Walter Curwen, Jr.
David M. Alger
David Oliver
Arnold E. Carlson
Gene R. Gislason
Henry A. Lagasse
William D. Hemeon
Thomas M. MacWhinney

The following-named persons to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the United States Coast Guard:

John W. Hume
Lewis R. Davison
John H. Hawley
Carol L. Mason
Elmer Mathison

Edward D. Middleton, Jr.
Paul P. Perez
Marion G. Shrode, Jr.
George F. Thometz, Jr.
Arthur A. Fontaine
Frederick W. Hermes, Jr.
James T. Maher
Gordon F. Hempton
George A. Warren
William H. Boswell
Vance K. Randle, Jr.
Ricardo A. Ratti
George W. Wagner
John J. Fehrenbacher
Raymond G. Parks, Jr.
James H. Durfee
Harold K. Goodbread
Richard P. Arlander

William W. Richards
Joseph E. Gould
Robert Adamson
David Gershowitz
William H. Dahn
James W. Swanson
Earl S. Childers
Armand J. Bush
Lester A. Levine
John J. O'Meara
George J. Bodie
Donald J. P. Evans
Lewis F. Lovell
Hudson E. Deming
Albert Frevola
Edwin J. Brummeler
Melvin S. Leach
William H. Campbell
James D. Doyle
Caleb M. Sickles
David Block
William H. Schmidt
William J. Donnay

Thomas J. Fallon
William N. Killebrew
Robert A. Lemmon
Thomas J. Hynes
William G. Fenlon
Louis Hopper, Jr.
John M. Tooley
Wilmer Clark
Albert J. Guillemette
Paul McGill, Jr.
Harry U. Potter
George L. Oakley
Elvin F. Yates
Milton B. Williams
Thomas J. O'Brien
James E. Edwards
James S. Cooper
Gwyn A. E. Williams
Louis N. Donohue
Richard C. Ragan
Herman S. McNatt
George H. Wittler, Jr.
Glenn O. Thompson

The following named persons to be ensigns in the United States Coast Guard:

Samuel H. Yearta
Russell W. Lentner

(All the above nominations are for permanent commission in the U. S. Coast Guard. Dates of rank to be set forth in the commissions to be issued to the foregoing officers will conform to the dates assigned in the precedence list as authorized by the Secretary of the Treasury.)

The following-named persons to be lieutenant commanders in the United States Coast Guard:

Willard L. Jones
Irwin D. Weston
Robert N. Williams
Jens B. Krestensen
Chester L. Jordan
Russell W. Thresher
William E. Schweizer
Owen P. Thomas
Walter W. Reynolds
William B. Dawson
Harry E. Rowand
Luther W. Cartwright
Lance J. Kirstine
Charles E. Swanson
Stacy Y. Hammond
Attilio E. Del Pra
William H. Moulton
Thomas E. McCready
Lewis L. Whittemore
Joseph J. DeCarlo
Hugh V. Hopkins
Thomas B. Christian-
sen
Harry C. Gifford
William W. McKellar
Charles N. Hubbard
Augustus F. Pittman
Leo T. Robbins

James Morrison
Oliver F. McClow
David B. Sollenberger
Gustaf A. Nordling
Meyer Robbins
Norman H. Church
Almond L. Cunningham
Alexander Smith
Arendt Michaelson
Francis P. Bergmeister
Walter A. Reynolds
Clyde D. Goodwin
Harry A. Oest
Allen E. Holst
John N. Buckley
Joseph Mazzotta
Samuel D. LaRoue
Victor A. Johnson
Jonas T. Hagglove
Louis I. Rellly
Jens H. Jensen
Harold W. Parker
George V. Stepanoff
Lawrence Ditlefsen
John A. Turmala
Ralph A. Taylor

The following-named persons to be lieutenants in the United States Coast Guard.

William Lieberson
Paul A. Ortmann
Carlton V. Legg
George E. Alston
Cecil C. Humphreys
Virgil L. McLean
George M. Gallagher
Henry M. Anthony
Cloyd C. Lantz
Henry E. Solomon
Herbert L. Scales
William A. Ronning
Robert L. Blanchett
Carl E. Roberts
Harry F. Bradley
James E. Rivard
William E. Lowe
George D. Batley
Garland Sponburgh
John M. Joseph
Norman D. MacLellan

Joseph E. O'Hagan
James W. Stoneypher
Ralph D. Fritze
Alvin N. Fisher
Elmer M. Chandler
Howard M. Sias
Brownlow J. Fadden
Gordon P. Hammond
Ray Thorp
John O'Brien
Linwood Hudgins
Ralph Burns
Donald R. Greenawalt
Clyde R. Brink
Jesse A. Stewart
Charles F. Blake
Valentine Thornton
John L. Morgan
Anthony P. Winkler
David G. Cowie
Norman A. Dreher

Ernest D. Murray
James W. Coste
Burritt K. Cook
John Lencz
Peter Madison
James F. Mace
Stephen B. Heck
Glen S. Jennings
Michael J. Bruce
Charles V. Rudolph
Andrew F. Mackay
Charles P. Moffett
Alfred M. Haynes
George F. Erwin
Wilfred Pantzer
Walter G. Davis
Gillis G. Cook
Martin Lentz, Jr.
Hamlet I. Allen
Michael J. Hoosick
Arthur J. Schletker
Clarence J. Gilleran
William E. Ehrman
William B. Daughtry
Ralph J. Davidson
Charles Ehmann
Leonard M. Cannon
Hans A. Jensen
Arthur I. Roberts
James A. Anderson
Roy F. Sumrall
John T. Cherry
William K. Kehoe
Leonard T. Toner
John E. Klapperich
Raymond J. Buchar
Oswald R. Olsen
Hubert F. Wren
William S. Cochrane
Clifton E. Mosher
Aubrey L. Diggs
Percival A. Williamson
Oskar F. Aune

The following-named persons to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the United States Coast Guard:

Lynn L. Baker
Thomas F. McKenna
Glenn J. Shannon
Ernest A. Bigelow
Sidney K. Broussard
Louis J. Glatz
John Dalin
Ludlow S. Baker
Frank D. Hilditch
Arthur M. Watson
Arthur H. Sheppard
Frank W. Dunford
Robert Hoyle
Donald A. Brown
Charles H. Freymueller
Raymond W. Siegel
Frederick A. Maier
Harry A. Solberg
John S. MacCormack
Herbert Krause
Donald A. MacLean
Earl L. Ottinger
Theodore J. Kozanecki
Errol H. Seegers
Forrest H. Willoughby
Robert D. Burkheimer
Jack E. Forrester
George H. Waddell, Jr.
Robert M. Becker
Franklin A. Colburn
Robert S. Wilson
Eugene F. Walsh
Andrew J. Cupples
John A. Weber
Lloyd E. Franke
Samuel E. Taylor
Richard A. Wilkie
Earl E. Broussard
Cletis L. Caribo
John F. Fitzgerald
Peter E. Gibney
Robert S. Bruce
Lewis R. LaValley
Leonard H. Dalton

Freeman H. Harmon
William M. Powers
Sidney W. Douglas
Henry J. Cookson
Antonie Simon
Theodore M. White
Wesley J. Cumberland
James E. Hannewyk
Joseph Gnas
Carl A. Heintz
Harold A. Hutcheson
Charles H. Langlois
Gregory E. Smith
William L. DeJong
Arthur P. Minor
James C. Waters
Emmett P. O'Hara
Roderick C. Davis
Albert J. Summerfield
Frank H. Stewart
August Kleisch
Theodore McWilliams
Gerald E. McGovern
Charles C. Bennett
Ben B. Dameron
Wilfred C. Gray
Allen H. Graham
John R. MacLeod
Hubert McGee
Walter C. Bolton
William M. Prentiss
Charles Overstreet
Ray M. Marshall
James F. Carr
Robert E. Rountree
Ralph D. Fisher
Francis J. Malloy
James W. Booze
John L. Gillikin
Stewart R. Graham
Kenneth M. Bilderback
Daniel D. Murphy

James E. Nesmith
Robert R. Pope
Albert E. Flanagan
Stanley G. Putzke

The following-named persons to be ensigns in the United States Coast Guard:

George A. Choquette
George A. Gyland
John Kruszewski
Floyd L. Hartson
Jacob C. Sorensen
Earl G. Hamilton
Lloyd S. Sadler
Loren V. Perry
Franklin H. Schone-wolf
Clemens C. Pearson
Elmer Winbeck
Charles W. Smith
Nathan Vanger
Alton F. Pinkham
Ernest W. Payne
Axel R. Mattson
Marvin H. Twiford
Edward W. Jackson
Charles B. Martinson
Leland O. Wilkie
William H. Yates
Byron M. Wineke
Adam Stanzak
Paul A. Berg
Olaf T. Sturdy
Thomas B. Prather
James G. Cowart

(All of the above nominations are for permanent commission in the U. S. Coast Guard. Dates of rank to be set forth in the commissions to be issued to the foregoing officers will conform to the dates assigned in the precedence list as authorized by the Secretary of the Treasury.)

The following-named persons to be captains in the Coast Guard:

Robert E. Coombs
Robert A. Smyth
Edward C. Cleave
William H. McGuire
Eugene Carlson
George W. Callbeck

The following-named persons to be commanders in the Coast Guard:

Howard C. Bridges
Ralph T. Eiland
Lewis H. Shackelford
William W. Storey
Karl C. Nielsen
Hugh A. Cobb
Frederick S. Walker
Frederick A. MacGurn
Alfred W. Kabernagel
Francis W. Leahy
John E. Coiteux
Arthur L. Dickert
Raymond C. Vose
George P. Kenney
Edward P. White, Jr.
William S. Donaldson
David T. Smith
Francis W. Richardson
William T. Butler
Phillip A. Ovenden
James B. Rucker
James W. Fleming
Leo A. Welsh
Petter G. Pettersen
Joseph B. Feder
Charles P. Murphy
John B. Lyman
William E. Coates

The following-named persons to be lieutenant commanders in the Coast Guard:

John A. Brooks
Herbert E. Peters
Thomas K. Whitelaw
Arthur H. Nesbit
Frank H. Nelson
Charles F. Perry
George J. Brill
Robert H. Farinholt
Alexander G. Moberg
Alf S. Lie
William F. Driscoll
Merton Hatfield
John M. Clark
Frank J. Hicken
Robert J. Brown
George E. Dobbins
Harrison M. Suiter
Edward O. Clark
Lester E. Carlson
John T. Leonard
Charles F. Fornason
Alan Mason
Stanley J. Rovinsky
Roderick Y. Edwards
Everett M. Ward
William B. Hogg
Kolbjorn Hansen
James E. Davidson
Richard K. Griswold
James F. Brady
Thomas J. Haley
John F. Kettler
Horatio G. Thompson
Charles C. Plummer
Edmund J. Martin
Gurdon C. Baker
John W. Schmoker
Thomas F. Kane
Mayer Stockman
Harry A. Voight
Harry A. Walker
Lloyd B. Kennedy
James W. Leek
James C. Hunley
Charles W. Beach
Joseph Change

Frederick A. Reicker
Willis A. Brusco
Donald C. Gunn
Addison S. Elliot
Albert Hanna
Sverre S. Arnet
Stuart H. Waring
Jesse O. Thompson
Cortlandt W. Quinby
Lloyd L. Stoltz
Homer D. Babbidge
George E. McCarthy
Raymond J. Fugina
Burton A. Gunderson
Leroy E. Kuhns
Elmer M. Fripp
James E. Skelly
Oscar Olsen
Roland E. Messner
Allen L. Woodruff
Donald V. Reardon
William T. Smith
Toraly A. Berg
Harold C. Jones
Roy E. Van Benthuy-sen
Earl Tillotson
Allan P. Moffat
Thomas H. Gemmell
Robert S. Smith
Charles W. Miller
James P. Chaplin
James L. Jones
John A. Rylander
George P. Creighton
Frederick K. Arzt
Clay Clifton
John B. Hunziker
Charles M. Vasterling
John M. Goddin
Arthur S. Phelan
Paul Pollatt
Gordon E. Howell
Emmett J. Corrigan
John M. Handley
Charles W. Hendrick-son
George D. Skene
William A. McFaull
William E. Pratt
Joseph Gomes
Thomas J. Dromgool
William G. Gillis
George S. Beck
Norman E. Merrill
Lee O. Moyer
Vitus G. Niebergall
Arthur S. Whitehead
John H. Cleary
Henry A. Hansen
Leif H. Konrad
Arthur R. Hognlund
Louis H. Hirschy
Henry A. Mildrum
John Littlefield
Wesley W. Wood
Norman H. T. Studley
Alton E. Borden
Otto V. Knierim
Felix S. DeSoboll
William F. Roe
James L. Raifer
Barney Frankel
John H. Pinney
Frank N. Sampson
William I. Connelly
Stanley W. Burns
Elmont L. Boisen
George C. Ferenz
Bertram J. Tuckey
John A. Rourke
Leonard C. Walen
John F. Powers
George J. Monteverdi
James M. Caulk
Joseph A. Bruno
George M. Russell
Edward B. Wiswell, Jr.
William T. Coyle
Roland P. Fox
Alfred W. Medcalf
Francis R. Dillenkof-fer
Patrick J. Clinton
Earl G. Young
Bernard Trachtenberg
Elmer J. Bodenlos
John H. Holm
Charles E. Klinck
Joseph E. Mallett
Joseph Yamin
Lawrence D. Connor
Lewis H. Brickhouse
Isaac R. Boothby
Clinton Critchfield
Archibald H. McComb, Jr.
John M. Cross
James B. McCarty, Jr.
Leonard E. Penso
John M. Penberthy
John B. Blain
Samuel J. Miller
Thomas P. McMaster
Theodore K. Tischler
Paul E. Savonis
George C. Steinman
John C. Hooker
James Farrelly
John W. Anderson
Charles V. Carson
Ernest S. Rasmussen
Melvin S. Richardson
Edwin W. Wickham
John F. Kinnaly
Adam A. Klein
Alexander W. Calcott
Clarence C. Jones
Horace M. Stewart
Mark B. Wallace, Jr.
Edward A. Wegge
Edward E. Dickey
Lucius E. Wadman
Arthur F. Mason
John P. Fox
Edward W. Kirkpat-rick
Herbert J. Stevens
Edward L. Johnson
Earl N. Story
Ellery H. Capen
Vincent H. Casey
Leo J. Catte
Emilio G. Oliotti
Karl A. Bergman
Charles G. Cotton
James C. Campbell
William J. Willman
Charles Martin
Lewis G. Aufdemorte
Elwyn W. Hersey
Cahir M. Dempsey
Archibald F. Jones
Peter Olsen
Albert M. Curley
Jeremiah J. Cadogan
Arthur M. Vrooman
Henry Dean
Paul N. Planchet
John S. Christensen
William A. Dougan
Benjamin Malloch
William J. Tracy
Thomas E. Julin
Viggo A. Madsen
William A. Williamson
Mark J. Dierlam
Frank W. Larkworthy
Carl A. Sjolund
Raymond A. Hodge
Lester W. Raynes
Frank H. Gordy
Glenn W. Ellis
Charles C. Phillips
George O. Bernsten
Francis J. Swann
George E. Ross
Martin Spain
George E. Holland
Otto H. Hinz
Thomas McCusker
Maurice D. Melanphy

Thomas Dumont
John Utery, Jr.
David S. Garvis
John H. Kieszling
Andrew H. Mack
Samuel O. West
Richard J. Shields
Jesse E. Eastman
Gorwan W. Larsen
Sylvius Pellegrini
Russell H. Coleman
Robert B. Scott
Charles P. McFaul
Thomas A. Powers
Clifford A. Anderson
Fred E. Morton
Albert J. Happel
Robert Murdoch
John M. Marks
James J. Graham
Arthur E. Wilcox
Curtis A. Alexander
James R. Hooper
Harold C. Cooper
Percy M. Endom
Curtis B. Cotton
Gilbert Hinchcliffe
George A. Butler
William C. Mahoney
John D. Hill
Arthur F. Nassie
Thomas J. Ellison
Julius Schuler
Louis A. Grundler
Andrew M. Thomsen
Martin J. Dean
James E. Miller
James H. Coe

Julius Engell
Ernest Potvin
Richard K. O'Connell
Mark L. Hocking
Clement B. Cozad
Carl H. Carlsen
James H. McDowell
Fred H. Cronan
John R. Silliman
John A. Fagan
Harold O. Rasmussen
Reginald G. Dobbin
George H. Grosvenor
Louis P. Laussade
Frederick W. Kilcline
Martin Grade
George W. Nantau
Ellis D. Baker
Carl H. Moen
Robert F. Supper
Eyrone I. Reynolds
Thomas S. Coffee
Francis B. Ford
Seymour S. VanKirk
Robert J. Ernst
Robert Flockhart
Joseph P. Mannix
Edwin J. Lautermilch
Bertrand J. Henesey
William J. Noonan
James J. L. Corkle
Robert H. Burt
Peter Snyder
Gustav E. Johansen
Harry J. Rhodes
Edward R. Doty
Robert G. Frye

(All the above nominations are for permanent commission in the U. S. Coast Guard. Dates of rank to be set forth in the commissions to be issued to the foregoing officers will conform to the dates assigned in the precedence list as authorized by the Secretary of the Treasury.)

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate January 16, 1948:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Mark Edwin Andrews to be Assistant Secretary of the Navy.

SENATE

MONDAY, JANUARY 19, 1948

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

O God, we turn to Thee in the faith that Thou dost understand and art very merciful.

Some of us are not sure concerning Thee; not sure how Thou dost reveal Thy will to us; not sure that it is possible for us to know, in every decision, just what Thou desirest Thy servants to do. But if we could say, "This is what God wants us to do," none would vote against it, and how much time and temper and money would be saved.

Make each one of us willing to yield himself to Thee in prayer and obedience. Come and deliver us, O Holy Spirit, for we have no hope in ourselves. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The Chief Clerk read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,

Washington, D. C., January 19, 1948.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. IRVING M. IVES, a Senator from

the State of New York, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

A. H. VANDENBERG,
President pro tempore.

Mr. IVES thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

ATTENDANCE OF A SENATOR

HARLEY M. KILGORE, a Senator from the State of West Virginia, appeared in his seat today.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, January 16, 1948, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF CABLE A. WIRTZ TO BE CIRCUIT JUDGE OF SECOND CIRCUIT, CIRCUIT COURTS, TERRITORY OF HAWAII

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, January 27, 1948, at 10:30 a. m., in the Senate Judiciary Committee room, room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Cable A. Wirtz, of Hawaii, to be circuit judge of the Second Circuit, Circuit Courts, Territory of Hawaii. Judge Wirtz is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired December 27, 1947. At the indicated time and place, all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], chairman; the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE]; and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF ALBERT M. CRISTY TO BE SECOND JUDGE OF FIRST CIRCUIT, CIRCUIT COURTS, TERRITORY OF HAWAII

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, January 27, 1948, at 10:15 a. m., in the Senate Judiciary Committee room, room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Albert M. Cristy, of Hawaii, to be second judge of the First Circuit, Circuit Courts, Territory of Hawaii. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired December 27, 1947. At the indicated time and place, all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], chairman; the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE]; and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF WILLSON C. MOORE TO BE FOURTH JUDGE OF FIRST CIRCUIT, CIRCUIT COURTS, TERRITORY OF HAWAII

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and

in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, January 27, 1948, at 10 a. m., in the Senate Judiciary Committee room, room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Willson C. Moore, of Hawaii, to be fourth judge of the First Circuit, Circuit Courts, Territory of Hawaii. Judge Moore is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired December 27, 1947. At the indicated time and place, all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], chairman; the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE]; and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF VINCENT C. BURKE TO BE FIRST ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish to give notice of a hearing on the nomination of Vincent C. Burke to be First Assistant Postmaster General, to be held in the committee room of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service a week from tomorrow at 10 o'clock in the morning.

MEETING OF COMMITTEE DURING SESSION OF THE SENATE

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Rent Subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency be permitted to sit in a hearing this afternoon.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

REPORT OF SECRETARY OF TREASURY ON STATE OF THE FINANCES

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the state of the finances of the Federal Government for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

SPECIAL ASSISTANTS, DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report showing the special assistants employed during the period from July 1, 1947, to December 31, 1947, under the appropriation "Compensation of Special Attorneys, etc., Department of Justice" (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

REPORT OF FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the thirty-third annual report of that Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

A petition of sundry citizens of the State of Florida, praying for the enactment of the so-called Townsend plan, providing old-age assistance; to the Committee on Finance.

A paper in the nature of a petition, from the State Committee of the Liberal Party of New York State, relating to the control of in-