

of 1949; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BENDER:

H. J. Res. 382. Joint resolution making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar years 1948 and 1949; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. DEVITT:

H. Con. Res. 186. Concurrent resolution to create a Joint Committee on Intelligence; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HALE:

H. Res. 546. Resolution requesting the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors to review the report on York Harbor, Maine, submitted in House of Representatives Document No. 1088, Sixty-fourth Congress, first session; to the Committee on Public Works.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. DAWSON of Utah:

H. R. 6304. A bill for the relief of Claris U. Yeaton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 6305. A bill for the relief of the aliens Harry Owen White and his sister-in-law, Cecilia M. B. de Silva; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 6306. A bill to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of John Rice Bruckman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLE of Kansas:

H. R. 6307. A bill for the relief of Mrs. E. M. Westenhaver; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LECOMTE:

H. R. 6308. A bill for the relief of Smith Distributing Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MERROW:

H. R. 6309. A bill for the relief of Henry K. Kaminski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN:

H. R. 6310. A bill for the relief of Rudolph Pavlinek; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'TOOLE:

H. R. 6311. A bill to authorize the President of the United States to posthumously award the Congressional Medal of Honor to Marc C. Dauber; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

1807. By Mr. CASE of South Dakota: Petition of Mrs. Fern Rose, chairman, Mrs. Goldie Namock, secretary, and 13 other members of the Friendly Circle Extension Club, Westport, S. Dak., urging favorable consideration of Federal-aid-to-education legislation; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1808. By Mr. REES: Petition signed by E. L. Ganson and a number of other citizens of McPherson County, Kans., in opposition to universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1809. Also, petition signed by Daisy Grinstead and a number of other citizens of Sedgewick County, Kans., in opposition to universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1810. Also, petition signed by Harvey Peters and a number of other citizens of Marion County, Kans., in opposition to universal military training and reenactment of selective service; to the Committee on Armed Services.

XCIV—298

SENATE

THURSDAY, APRIL 22, 1948

Rev. Clarence W. Cranford, pastor of the Calvary Baptist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

In these difficult days, our Father, when no problem seems simple any more and it is not easy to know what we should think and do, give us the wisdom to recognize what is right and the courage to carry it out when we see it. May we never lower our own ideals because there are those in the world who would challenge them. May no fear of others cause us to do that of which we would be ashamed. May we not deviate from our own code of honesty and justice because there are those in the world who recognize no such code. Instead, help us to believe that to choose the side of right is to be on the side of God, and that to be on the side of God is to be on the side that will win the victory over the forces of unrighteousness and oppression. We pray in Jesus' name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, April 21, 1948, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations 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, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1393) to increase the permitted rate of allowance and compensation for training on the job under Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1641) to establish the Women's Army Corps in the Regular Army, to authorize the enlistment and appointment of women in the Regular Navy and Marine Corps and the Naval and Marine Corps Reserve, and for other purposes, with amendments in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate; that the House insisted upon its amendments to the bill, asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. SHAFER, Mr. SHORT, Mr. COLE of New York, Mr. BROOKS, and Mr. DURHAM were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had passed the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 94) to establish the Fort Sumter National Monument in the State of South Carolina, with an amendment in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 5933) to permit the temporary free importation of racing shells, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 329. An act for the relief of Gentaro Takahashi;

S. 560. An act to prohibit the operation of gambling ships, and for other purposes;

S. 936. An act for the relief of Burnett A. Pyle;

S. 1021. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to pay salaries and expenses of the chairman, secretary, and clerk of the Fort Peck General Council, members of the Fort Peck Tribal Executive Board, and other committees appointed by said Fort Peck General Council, and official delegates of the Fort Peck Tribes;

S. 1263. An act for the relief of Fire District No. 1 of the town of Colchester, Vt.;

S. 1304. An act to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the organization of Minnesota as a Territory of the United States;

S. 1312. An act for the relief of Jeanette C. Jones and minor children;

S. 1393. An act to provide additional subsistence allowances and to raise the ceilings on wages and allowances pertaining to certain veterans;

S. 1468. An act providing for payment of \$50 to each enrolled member of the Mesquero Apache Indian Tribe from funds standing to their credit in the Treasury of the United States;

S. 1583. An act to provide for the conveyance to the State of Maryland, for the use of the University of Maryland, of the northern portion of a parcel of land previously constituting a part of the campus of the university and previously conveyed by the State of Maryland to the United States for the use of the Bureau of Mines;

S. 1696. An act to amend the act of August 13, 1940 (54 Stat. 784), so as to extend the jurisdiction of the United States District Court, Territory of Hawaii, over Canton and Enderbury Islands;

S. 2278. An act to authorize the sale of certain public lands in San Juan County, Utah, to the Southwest Indian Mission, Inc.;

H. R. 4931. An act to amend title 17 of the United States Code entitled "Copyrights";

S. J. Res. 189. Joint resolution to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of the Five Civilized Tribes of Indians in Oklahoma; and

S. J. Res. 207. Joint resolution to provide for the commemoration of the sesquicentennial anniversary of the establishment of the Department of the Navy.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

INVESTMENT OF CERTAIN FUNDS IN OBLIGATIONS OF INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT

A letter from the Chairman of the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to permit investment of funds of insurance companies organized within the District of Columbia in obligations of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PENALTY MAIL MATTER

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting, pursuant to section 2 (b) of Public Law 364, approved June 28, 1944, a tabulation showing the number of envelopes, labels, and other penalty inscribed material

on hand and on order June 30, 1947; the number of pieces procured, the estimated mailings, and the estimated cost by departments and agencies for the period July 1 to December 31, 1947 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

AUDIT REPORT OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION AND AFFILIATED COMPANIES—PETROLEUM RESERVES CORPORATION

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, volume 9 of the report on the audit of Reconstruction Finance Corporation and affiliated corporations, which deals exclusively with the activities of the Petroleum Reserves Corporation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1945 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

AUDIT REPORT OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION AND AFFILIATED COMPANIES—DISASTER LOAN CORPORATION

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, volume 10 of the report on the audit of Reconstruction Finance Corporation and affiliated corporations, which deals exclusively with the activities of the Disaster Loan Corporation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1945 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

AMENDMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT RELATING TO MAINTENANCE AND OPERATION OF HOSPITALS

A letter from the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the provisions of title VI of the Public Health Service Act relating to standards of maintenance and operation for hospitals receiving aid under that title (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents in the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. LANGER and Mr. CHAVEZ members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PROHIBITION AGAINST LIQUOR ADVERTISING

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I present and ask to have printed in the RECORD a list of 285 communities in the State of New York which have submitted petitions containing 5,725 signatures favoring the enactment of the so-called Capper bill, Senate bill 265, to prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of advertisements of alcoholic beverages, and for other purposes.

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

FIVE THOUSAND SEVEN HUNDRED AND TWENTY-FIVE SIGNERS FROM 285 COMMUNITIES OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK WHICH HAVE SUBMITTED PETITIONS IN SUPPORT OF THE CAPPER BILL (S. 265)

Adams, Addison, Akron, Alabama, Albany, Albion, Alexander, Alfred, Ames, Amsterdam, Appleton, Arkport, Attica, Auburn, Ava, Avon, Bainbridge, Baldwinville, Ballston

Spa, Barnerville, Barton, Basom, Batavia, Bath, Bay Shore, Bemus Point, Bergen, Berkshire, Binghamton, Bliss, Bolivar, Boonville, Branchport, Brewerton, Brockport, Brooklyn, Brownville, Buffalo, Burnt Hills, Byron, Caledonia, Cambridge, Canajoharie, Candor, Canisteo, Castle Creek, Cato, Cayuga, Cazenovia, Central Bridge, Chautauqua, Chemung, Cherry Valley, Chittenango, Circleville, Clarence, Clarence Center, Clinton Corners, Clyde, Cobleskill, Cohocton, Comstock, Copenhagen, Corfu, Corinth, Cornwall, Cortland, Cuba, Dale, De Ruyter, Dresden, Dundee, Durhamville, Eagle Bridge, Earlville, East Bethany, East Bloomfield, East Hampton, East Moriches, East Pembroke, Eastport, East Rochester, Eden, Ellicottville, Elmira, Endicott, Endwell, Esperance, Etna, Fayetteville, Ferndale, Fillmore, Fort Edward, Fort Johnson, Fort Plain, Frankfort, Freeville, Friendship, Fulton, Gainesville, Galway, Gasport, Geneseo, Geneva, Georgetown, Gerry, Glens Falls, Gouverneur, Gramhamsville, Great Neck, Groton, Hagaman, Hague, Hamburg, Harrisville, Hauppauge, Hawthorne, Hempstead, Herkimer, Highland, Holcomb, Homer, Hornell, Horseheads, Houghton, Hudson Falls, Huntington, Hurleyville, Ilion, Islip, Ithaca, Jamaica, Jamesport, Jamestown, Jeffersonville, Johnsonburg, Johnson City, Johnstown, Kaunongona, Kenmore, Kingston, Lakawanna, Lacona, La Fargeville, Lakewood, Little Valley, Livingston, Livingston Manor, Lock Sheldrake, Lockport, Lockwood, Lowville, Lycoming, Lynbrook, Mannsville, Mayfield, Meadowbrook, Medina, Middleport, Middlesex, Milton, Mineola, Mohawk, Molra, Mooers, Mooers Forks, Morrisonville, Mount Morris, Nelliston, Newburgh, New City, Newfane, Newfield, New Hartford, New Paltz, New Rochelle, New York, Niagara Falls, North Chili, North Granville, North Java, Northport, Nyack, Oakfield, Ogdensburg, Olean, Oneida, Orangeburg, Orwell, Oswego, Otselic, Owego, Painted Post, Palmer, Pavilion, Penn Yan, Pierrepont Manor, Pitcher, Plattsburg, Pleasantville, Port Byron, Port Ewen, Poughkeepsie, Pualaski, Ransomville, Ravena, Red Creek, Remsen, Rensselaer, Rhinebeck, Richburg, Richford, Richland, Richville, Riverhead, Rochester, Rome, Round Lake, Ruhville, St. Johnsville, Salamanca, Salem, Salt Point, Sanborn, Sandy Creek, Saranac Lake, Saratoga Springs, Savona, Schenectady, Sharon Springs, Silver Springs, Sinclairville, Skaneateles, Slingerlands, Sloansville, Smiths Basin, Snyder, Southampton, South Hartford, South Otselic, South Westerlo, Spencerport, Sprakers, Spring Valley, Springville, Staatsburg, Stafford, Stanfordville, Staten Island, Stone Ridge, Sundown, Swan Lake, Syracuse, Tonawanda, Troy, Ulster Park, Union Center, Utica, Vails Gate, Valley Stream, Varysburg, Verona, Vestal, Victor, Wallace, Walton, Warsaw, Water Mill, Watertown, Watervliet, Waverly, Wayland, West Chazy, Westford, West Leyden, West Oneonta, West Sayville, Whitehall, White Lake, White Plains, Woodbourne, Woodgate, Worcester, Wyoming.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

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

H. R. 631. A bill for the relief of the Allied Aviation Corp.; with amendments (Rept. No. 1153).

By Mr. MORSE, from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 657. A bill to provide that service as a cadet, midshipman, or aviation cadet shall be credited for pay purposes, and that service as a cadet or midshipman shall be credited for retirement purposes, in the case of military and naval personnel; with amendments (Rept. No. 1154).

By Mr. TYDINGS, from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 1561. A bill to protect the National Security of the United States by permitting the summary termination of employment of civilian officers and employees of the Departments of State, War, and the Navy, and the Atomic Energy Commission, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1155).

By Mr. MAYBANK, from the Committee on Armed Services:

H. R. 4090. A bill to equalize retirement benefits among members of the Nurse Corps of the Army and the Navy, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1156).

By Mr. BRIDGES, from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 295. A bill to further amend the thirteenth paragraph of section 127a of the National Defense Act, as amended; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1157).

By Mr. SALTONSTALL, from the Committee on Armed Services:

H. R. 4480. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to provide salvage facilities, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1158).

By Mr. KILGORE, from the Committee on Armed Services:

H. R. 1275. A bill to authorize the payment of certain claims for medical treatment of persons in the naval service; to repeal section 1586 of the Revised Statutes; and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1159).

By Mr. BYRD, from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 2033. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize an increase of the number of cadets at the United States Military Academy and to provide for maintaining the corps of cadets at authorized strength," approved June 3, 1942 (56 Stat. 306); without amendment (Rept. No. 1160); and

S. 2034. A bill to increase the number of midshipmen allowed at the United States Naval Academy from the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 1161).

By Mr. WILSON, from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 1599. A bill to prescribe the pay and allowances of aviation cadets in the Air Corps, Regular Army, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1162).

By Mr. BALDWIN, from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 1216. A bill to repeal that part of section 3 of the act of June 24, 1926 (44 Stat. 767), as amended, relating to the percentage, in time of peace, of enlisted personnel employed in aviation tactical units of the Navy and Marine Corps, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1163).

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, April 22, 1948, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions:

S. 329. An act for the relief of Gentaro Takahashi;

S. 560. An act to prohibit the operation of gambling ships, and for other purposes;

S. 936. An act for the relief of Burnett A. Pyle;

S. 1021. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to pay salaries and expenses of the chairman, secretary, and clerk of the Fort Peck General Council, members of the Fort Peck Tribal Executive Board, and other committees appointed by said Fort Peck General Council, and official delegates of the Fort Peck Tribes;

S. 1263. An act for the relief of Fire District No. 1 of the Town of Colchester, Vt.;

S. 1304. An act to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the organization of Minnesota as a Territory of the United States;

S. 1312. An act for the relief of Jeanette C. Jones and minor children;

S. 1393. An act to provide additional subsistence allowances and to raise the ceilings on wages and allowances pertaining to certain veterans;

S. 1468. An act providing for payment of \$50 to each enrolled member of the Mescalero Apache Indian Tribe from funds standing to their credit in the Treasury of the United States;

S. 1583. An act to provide for the conveyance to the State of Maryland for the use of the University of Maryland, of the northern portion of a parcel of land previously constituting a part of the campus of the university and previously conveyed by the State of Maryland to the United States for the use of the Bureau of Mines;

S. 1696. An act to amend the act of August 13, 1940 (54 Stat. 784), so as to extend the jurisdiction of the United States District Court, Territory of Hawaii, over Canton and Enderbury Islands;

S. 2278. An act to authorize the sale of certain public lands in San Juan County, Utah, to the Southwest Indian Mission, Inc.;

S. J. Res. 189. Joint resolution to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of the Five Civilized Tribes of Indians in Oklahoma; and

S. J. Res. 207. Joint resolution to provide for the commemoration of the sesquicentennial anniversary of the establishment of the Department of the Navy.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore 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.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GURNEY, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Col. Kenneth David Nichols O17498, Army of the United States (professor, U. S. Military Academy), for temporary appointment as major general in the Army of the United States under the provisions of section 515 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947; such appointment to continue in force only for the duration of his assignment as Army member of the Military Liaison Committee to the Atomic Energy Commission and Chief of the Armed Forces Special Weapon Project;

Brig. Gen. Edward Allen Noyes, and sundry other officers for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States;

Col. Hugh Chauncey Johnson, and sundry other officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States;

First Lt. James Gyde Owens, and sundry other officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States;

Ruth A. Robinson, and sundry other persons for appointment in the Regular Army in the Army Nurse Corps and the Women's Medical Specialist Corps;

Col. Harry Dumont Offutt, and sundry other officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States;

Col. Frank Frederick Bell, and sundry other officers for appointment in the Officers' Reserve Corps of the Army of the United States;

Inez I. Baum, and sundry other persons for appointment in the Regular Army in the Army Nurse Corps and the Women's Medical Specialist Corps;

Brig. Gen. Errol Henry Zistel, Ohio National Guard, for appointment as brigadier general in the National Guard of the United States of the Army of the United States;

First Lt. Kenneth McMillin Stewart, and sundry other officers for promotion in the United States Air Force;

Col. James Dennett McIntyre, and sundry other officers for temporary appointment in the Air Force of the United States;

Col. Emil Henry Molthan, and several other officers for appointment in the United States Air Force Reserve of the Air Force of the United States;

Rear Adm. Herbert C. Lassiter, Supply Corps, United States Navy, for permanent appointment to the grade of rear admiral in the Supply Corps of the Navy;

John R. Behr, and sundry other officers for appointment in the Supply Corps of the Navy;

James F. Berry, and sundry others for appointment or promotion in the Navy;

Admiral Charles M. Cooke, Jr., United States Navy, when retired, to be placed on the retired list of the Navy with the rank of admiral;

Vice Adm. John L. Hall, Jr., United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as commandant of the Armed Forces Staff College, Norfolk, Va.;

Rear Adm. Arthur D. Struble, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as Deputy Chief of Naval Operations (Operations);

Richard L. Alford, and sundry others for appointment or promotion in the Navy; and Walter E. Anderson, and sundry other permanent warrant officers, now serving in temporary commissioned ranks, to be permanent commissioned warrant officers in the Marine Corps.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 2542. A bill to authorize the construction, operation and maintenance of the Canton Reclamation project, Oklahoma; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CAPPER (for himself and Mr. AIKEN):

S. 2543. A bill to provide for retirement of the Government capital in the central and regional banks for cooperatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 2544. A bill for the relief of Alexis Kivi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2545. A bill to provide pensions for disability and age under Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), part III, in the same amounts as now provided for veterans of the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, and the Boxer Rebellion, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

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

S. 2546. A bill to extend for 1 year the system of nurseries and nursery schools for day care of school-age and under-school-age children in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

S. 2547. A bill to amend section 3 of the Standard Time Act of March 19, 1918, as amended, relating to the placing of a certain portion of the State of Idaho in the third time zone; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming:

S. 2548. A bill to amend the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920, to permit the exercise of certain options on or before August 8, 1950; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TOBEY:

S. 2549. A bill to increase the lending authority of Export-Import Bank of Washing-

ton; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

CHEYENNE RIVER SIOUX RESERVATION TRUST PATENTS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. LANGER submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2315) to authorize the issuance of trust patents in lieu of land-use exchange assignments issued on the Cheyenne River Sioux Reservation prior to January 1, 1948, which were referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and ordered to be printed.

SURVEY OF PROPOSED MISSISSIPPI RIVER PARKWAY—AMENDMENTS

Mr. OVERTON submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 5609) to authorize the survey of a proposed Mississippi River Parkway for the purpose of determining the feasibility of such a national parkway, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and ordered to be printed.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 5933) to permit the temporary free importation of racing shells was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

IMPAIRMENT OF NATIONAL SECURITY BY DISOBEDIENCE TO LAW

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over from the previous day, Senate Resolution 217, officially notifying the Governor of the State of New York of certain testimony before the Committee on Armed Services, submitted April 1, 1948, by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND].

Does the Senator from Mississippi wish to have any disposition made of the resolution of which he is the author, which comes over from the previous day?

Mr. EASTLAND. Let it lie upon the table.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will continue to lie upon the table.

Morning business is closed.

THE INSIDE OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR MARTIN

[Mr. KEM asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject The Inside of the United States Senate, delivered by Senator MARTIN, at the annual dinner of the Amen Corner, Pittsburgh, Pa., April 17, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

LOCAL GOVERNMENT—ADDRESS BY SENATOR KEM

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject of local government, delivered by Senator KEM, at the annual dinner of the Amen Corner in Pittsburgh, Pa., April 17, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

AMERICAN FOREIGN RELATIONS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR LODGE

[Mr. OVERTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on American foreign relations delivered by Senator LODGE at the annual midcontinent business meeting of the Mississippi Valley World Trade Conference, in New Orleans, April 17, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

EXPORTATION OF TOBACCO TO GERMANY—STATEMENT BY SENATOR UMSTEAD

[Mr. UMSTEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement on the subject of exportation of tobacco to Germany, made by him before the Committee on Appropriations, on December 17, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

SENATOR WILEY'S VIEWS ON THE AMERICAN FAMILY—ARTICLE FROM THE AMERICAN FAMILY

[Mr. SMITH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "A United States Senator Looks at the American Family," from the magazine the American Family, for March 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE TAFT-HARTLEY LAW—EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. IVES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Actions Versus Words" from the New York Times of April 22, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

HOW TO BEAT THE COMMUNISTS—ARTICLE BY WALTER P. REUTHER

[Mr. TOBEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "How To Beat the Communists," written by Walter P. Reuther, and reprinted from Collier's for February 28, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, this afternoon in Carlisle, Pa., there is being celebrated the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the founding of Dickinson College, one of the outstanding church schools in Pennsylvania. I am anxious to attend the exercises, and I ask unanimous consent that I may be absent from the Senate this afternoon.

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

Mr. HICKENLOOPER asked and obtained consent to be absent from the session of the Senate for the remainder of today.

Mr. MORSE asked and obtained consent to be excused from attendance upon the Senate for the next few days on necessary business.

Mr. BALDWIN asked and obtained consent to be excused from attendance upon the session of the Senate Monday, April 26.

MEETING OF COMMITTEE DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. WHERRY asked and obtained consent for the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary considering House bill 3214 to meet during the session of the Senate today.

Mr. WHERRY asked and obtained consent for the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to sit during the session of the Senate today.

PERMISSION TO REPORT APPROPRIATION BILLS DURING RECESS

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the rule be waived and that the Appropriations Committee of the Senate be permitted to report, in any recess over the week end, the following appropriation bills: State, Justice, and Commerce; Labor and Federal Security; the civil functions of the War

Department; and the first deficiency supplemental bill.

I also request permission that during the recess minority views on House bill 5524, the civil-functions bill, may be filed; that notices of motions to suspend the rule may be filed, and amendments submitted.

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

THE PALESTINE PROBLEM

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, there appears on the editorial page of this morning's New York Herald Tribune an editorial entitled "The Mandate of Events." It deals with the Palestine situation as it exists at the present time. I read the last paragraph of the editorial because it is most pertinent:

While the talk continues at Lake Success, the future is being indelibly etched by events. A Jewish state can no longer be prevented. UN trusteeship for Jerusalem, backed by whatever forces are necessary to maintain order and essential services, can no longer be avoided. The Arabs can no longer be dissuaded from war merely by words, hopes, or moral pressures. These are facts. They express the actual forces at work upon the ground; they are the materials with which statesmanship has to operate. Statesmanship cannot alter them by dreams of truces or trusteeships that have no basis in realities. What statesmanship can do is to recognize them and build on them concrete proposals that will so far as possible limit the bloodshed and hasten the achievement of practical equilibrium among the forces actually at work in that tortured country.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that this is a very factual and objective presentation of conditions as they are, and I think the editorial is well worth the careful consideration of all of us who are interested in this subject, as I know all of us are. I therefore ask unanimous consent that this editorial, which is comparatively brief, be inserted in the body of the RECORD at the conclusion of these brief remarks of mine.

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

THE MANDATE OF EVENTS

The extraordinary, and profoundly dispiriting, contrast between the realities in Palestine and the arguments, illusions, and futilities at Lake Success drags itself along. While the United Nations committees wrangle in their vacuum of either statesmanship or courage, events in Palestine continue to shape a future daily assuming a greater and greater aspect of inevitability. The UN may talk trusteeship as against partition, but the Zionists have already formed the independent government which will have to take over (because there will be no alternative) on May 16 and make partition a fact. Yesterday the British were evacuating most of Haifa, and the Haganah troops were moving in, as they will have to move in on the heels of British withdrawal elsewhere. Even more significant is the report that a special administration is being formed for the Jews in Jerusalem distinct from the proposed Jewish state and responsible not to its government but to the World Zionist Organization.

Such an administration is again a recognition of facts—of the same facts which led the General Assembly, in its partition resolution of last year, to set Jerusalem aside from the proposed Jewish and Arab states, placing it under international control. Jeru-

salem and its holy places are an international heritage, while the proposed Jewish state, centered along the coast, neither can carry nor should be asked to carry the burden of protecting Jerusalem's Jewish community, cut off in the depths of Arab territory. The Jews of Jerusalem are thus confided not to the nascent Jewish state but to the World Zionist Organization, making possible their ultimate incorporation in the international control of some kind which is the only practicable answer to the problem of Jerusalem.

While the talk continues at Lake Success, the future is being indelibly etched by events. A Jewish state can no longer be prevented. UN trusteeship for Jerusalem, backed by whatever forces are necessary to maintain order and essential services, can no longer be avoided. The Arabs can no longer be dissuaded from war merely by words, hopes, or moral pressures. These are facts. They express the actual forces at work upon the ground; they are the materials with which statesmanship has to operate. Statesmanship cannot alter them by dreams of truces or trusteeships that have no basis in realities. What statesmanship can do is to recognize them and build on them concrete proposals that will so far as possible limit the bloodshed and hasten the achievement of practical equilibrium among the forces actually at work in that tortured country.

PROGRESS OF WORK OF THE COMMISSION ON ORGANIZATION OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF THE GOVERNMENT—STATEMENT BY HERBERT HOOVER

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement issued by former President Herbert Hoover, Chairman of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, which sets forth what to me is the very remarkable progress which the Commission is making. I think the statement will be of great interest and satisfaction to the Members of the Senate, who supported unanimously the resolution creating the Commission at the time it was before the Senate.

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

STATEMENT BY HERBERT HOOVER

Mr. Herbert Hoover, Chairman of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, the members of which are: Dean Acheson, former Under Secretary of State; Arthur S. Flemming, Civil Service Commissioner; James Forrestal, Secretary of Defense; George H. Mead, industrialist; Senator George D. Aiken; former Ambassador Joseph P. Kennedy; Senator John L. McClellan; Dr. James K. Pollock, of the University of Michigan; Congressman Clarence Brown; Congressman Carter Manasco; and James Rowe, Jr., former Administrative Assistant to the President, made the following statement today as to the progress of the work of the Commission:

"The Commission has secured the services of the National Bureau of Economic Research, for a study of Government statistical services. The study will be directed by Dr. Frederick C. Mills, and will include an examination and appraisal of the statistical agencies with regard to the scope and quality of their work and the effectiveness of their administration, with considerations of the problems of coordination, overlapping, or duplication of functions and gaps of coverage.

"Arrangement has also been made with the National Records Management Council, a nonprofit organization recently set up under the auspices of the Social Science Research Council, for a study of records management problems in the Federal Government to be

directed by the executive director of the council, Mr. Emmett J. Leahy, formerly of the National Archives, and Director of Records Administration, United States Navy, during the war. Dr. Wayne Grover, Acting Archivist of the United States; Robert H. Bahmer, Director of Records Management, Department of the Army; Herbert E. Angel, Director of Office Methods Branch, Department of the Navy; and Mr. Edward Wilber, of the Department of State, will serve as consultants in connection with the study.

"Pursuant to arrangements made by Col. Franklin D'Olier, formerly chairman of the Prudential Insurance Co., of Newark, and past president of the American Legion, who is heading up a study for the Commission on the Veterans' Administration, other than their hospital services, the Trundle Engineering Co. will report on certain services rendered by the Veterans' Administration and make recommendations in connection with them.

"In connection with the study which I am undertaking, in association with the Bureau of the Budget, and Mr. Don Price, of the Public Administration clearinghouse, on the Office of the Presidency and its relation to the departments and agencies, I have secured the assistance of Mr. H. Struve Hensel, formerly Assistant Secretary of the Navy, and Prof. John Millett, of Columbia University, for that phase of the study having to do with structural organization of the departments.

"Studies and reports upon the following executive functions have already been announced:

"Public works: Mr. Robert Moses.
"Veterans' affairs, other than hospitals: Col. Franklin D'Olier.

"Revolving funds, other than lending agencies: Maj. Gen. Arthur H. Carter.

"The post office: Robert Heller & Associates.

"Transportation: Brookings Institution.
"Public welfare: Brookings Institution.

"Foreign affairs: Messrs. Harvey Bundy and James Grafton Rogers, with Henry L. Stimson as adviser.

"Federal field offices: Klein & Saks.
"Relations of the Presidency to the executive branch: Herbert Hoover, with Don K. Price and the Bureau of the Budget.

"Regulatory agencies: Mr. Owen D. Young, ex-Senator Robert M. LaFollette, and Prof. Robert Bowie.

"Indian affairs: Mr. Charles J. Rhoads, Dr. John R. Nichols, Rev. Dr. Gilbert Darlington, and Prof. George Graham.

"Natural resources: Leslie A. Miller, Horace M. Albright, John J. Dempsey, Isalah Bowman, Samuel Trask Dana, Donald H. McLaughlin, Gilbert F. White, and J. R. Mahoney, research assistant.

"Medical services of the Government (except those of the National Military Establishment): Mr. Tracy S. Voorhees (chairman), Dr. O. H. P. Pepper, Dr. Hugh Jackson Morgan, Dr. Allen O. Whipple, Dr. W. C. Menninger, Dr. Ray Lyman Wilbur, Dr. Frank R. Bradley, Dr. R. C. Buerki, Mr. Charles Rowley, Mr. Henry Isham, Dr. Paul R. Hawley, Dr. Michael DeBaakey, and Rear Adm. Joel T. Boone, United States Navy.

"Personnel and civil service committee: John A. Stevenson (chairman), James P. Mitchell, George D. Stoddard, Rawleigh Warner, Alfred H. Williams, Lawrence Appley, Vannevar Bush, Alvin Dodd, Col. Franklin D'Olier, Alvin Eurich, Earl G. Harrison, Robert L. Johnson, David Lilienthal, Robert Ramspeck, Andrew Robertson, Senator Harry F. Byrd, and Leonard D. White, and Cresap, McCormick & Paget on research.

"Fiscal, budgeting, and accounting: John W. Hanes, chairman, with T. Coleman Andrews and A. E. Buck.

"Federal-State relationships: T. J. Coolidge (chairman), William Anderson, John Burton, Senator Harry F. Byrd, Gov. Frank Carlson, William L. Chenery, John W. Davis, former Gov. Charles A. Edison, Dean William

I. Myers, Sinclair Weeks, and Frank Bane, research assistant.

"Agricultural activities: H. P. Rusk (chairman), D. Howard Doane, John Gaus, W. H. Martin, F. W. Peck, Chester Davis, Rhea Blake, W. A. Schoenfeld, and G. Harris Collingwood, research director.

"Lending agencies: Paul Grady, of Price, Waterhouse & Co., and the following committee of advisers: Paul Bestor, Donald D. Davis, Walter J. Cummings, Walter D. Fuller, George L. Harrison, Arnold B. Keller, Walter Lichtenstein, James H. McGraw, Jr., Sumner H. Slichter, and Allan Sproul.

"Federal supply: Russell Forbes, former commissioner of purchase of New York City, and the following committee of advisers: W. Z. Betts, Harry Erlicher, R. C. Haberkorn, Carl Ilgenfritz, Thomas Jolly, George A. Renard, John Sanger, and Charles Smith."

EDWARD H. CRUMP

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I send to the desk an article about the Honorable Edward H. Crump, written by Mr. John White, and published in the Washington Times-Herald of this date, and I ask that it be published in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The article is an interesting, attractive, and scintillating tribute to Mr. Crump.

I have known Mr. Crump intimately for more than 50 years. No finer man lives. He is all Mr. White says about him, and a great deal more. He was mayor of Memphis for many years. He served in the House of Representatives for several terms, and is one of the most successful businessmen in the country. He has made a great success in every undertaking.

Mr. Crump is an outstanding citizen and a great leader, and possesses one of the most attractive personalities I have ever known a man to have.

I thank Mr. White for this article, and commend it to the attention of all Senators and other good citizens.

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

DID YOU HAPPEN TO SEE BOSS CRUMP?

"Boss? Who said boss? I am no boss. I am no dictator. I am just an unassuming good citizen, working with and for the people. No, sir. Not a boss and not a politician. Just a good citizen. * * * And I have a captivating personality. I like people.

"You like people and they like you."
It is not hard to get Mr. Ed. H. Crump, good citizen of Memphis, Tenn., to talk. He is no longer a young man; he has lived a busy life, accomplishing and observing much; he is not loath to pass on some of his wisdom.

"I was born in Holly Springs, Miss., a town just big enough for its size; a town you can see for the trees; a town that provided 26 Civil War generals; a fine, fine town.

"My mother's family was from North Carolina, my father's people came from Virginia, and they met in Holly Springs.

"When I was a little boy I worked in a print shop, then in a grocery store. I boarded out debts.

"Remember that, how people boarded out debts? When they couldn't pay, one of the clerks from the store boarded at their house until the debt was cleared."

Boss—excuse it, please, Mr. Ed. Crump, good citizen—didn't stay in that grocery store long. He started running for public office. As a good citizen should.

And, as a good citizen often doesn't, he got elected.

Over and over again. To practically every public office in Tennessee, and particularly

Memphis. Altogether, at the present moment, he has participated in 109 open elections.

And never lost a one.

No, sir. Never lost a one.

And Memphis has no graft, no vice, no organized gambling, no organized betting at the races * * *

Mr. Crump loves the races, but he doesn't plan to make a fortune playing them, because:

You can beat a race, but you can't beat the races.

Furthermore, Memphis has the lowest tax rate of any large city in the country, and it is the best, finest, cleanest.

Yes, sir. I love old Memphis, on the head of the river.

Memphis sort of likes its boss. That is to say its Good Citizen Crump, too. You ask around town and you don't get many complaints.

No, sir. They never accuse me of graft or dishonesty. Only of being a dictator.

And I'm only an unassuming insurance man, with not 1 cent of business from city, county, or State; who likes Dante, Homer, Shakespeare, and the Bible—and people; who shakes for 3 hours before every trip to the dentist; who, like St. Paul, believes in worrying cheerfully, because there is no use worrying about what you can't help.

Not a boss. Just a good citizen. With a captivating personality.

JOHN WHITE.

THE ATTACK ON WALTER P. REUTHER

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, day before yesterday a dastardly attempt was made to take the life of one of the Nation's outstanding labor leaders, Walter Reuther, of Detroit. He still lies critically ill, and an anxious world hopes and prays for his recovery.

Organized labor has no more devoted exponent than Walter Reuther. While often people who do not think matters through are apt to stigmatize, with epithets and appellations, men who do not see as they do, I want to praise this man today, because of his outstanding and consistent record against the enemy of mankind, the enemy communism. Walter Reuther, as a stalwart and true American, has stood four-square against the inroads of communism.

As chairman of the CIO housing committee he has under date of April 20, 1948, sent me a telegram dealing with the pending bill, which I shall read into the RECORD, as follows:

As chairman of CIO's housing committee I urge you to vote for S. 866 as amended by the Flanders amendment. We hope you will also support the Russell-Young farm housing amendment, not only because we favor good housing for people on the farms, but also because labor has a major stake in farm welfare. In many areas farm housing is as bad as that in any city slum. A program of farm housing would provide a new vital market in which labor is vitally interested. This bill when enacted into law will be a strong gesture in this Congress for the welfare of millions of people in this country. Your voting for it will be proof of your interest in the well-being of our citizens.

WALTER P. REUTHER,

Chairman, CIO Housing Committee.

Today I offer my tribute to the man, and I express the wish and join in the hopes and prayers of millions of Americans, that God will spare his life, again to take his place in the cause in which he so truly believes.

NATIONAL HOUSING

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 866) to establish a national housing objective and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof, to facilitate sustained progress in the attainment of such objective and to provide for the coordinated execution of such policy through a National Housing Commission, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], as amended, striking out of the original bill all after line 3, on page 16, as amended, and inserting in lieu thereof other language.

Mr. FLANDERS obtained the floor.

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

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, on Wednesday of last week the Senate accepted 14 amendments submitted by the junior Senator from Wisconsin. Since then we have been arguing at great length respecting the differences between the Taft-Flanders amendment and the McCarthy amendments, and we are happy to say that at this time we have agreed upon practically everything. There are no major differences. Either the amendments to the Taft-Flanders amendment have been accepted, or we have agreed to accept them.

For that reason, to avoid the confusion which might be incident to arguing the very lengthy McCarthy amendments as against the very lengthy Flanders amendment, and in view of the fact that there is now no substantial difference between the two, I ask unanimous consent that the Flanders-Taft amendment be substituted for the McCarthy amendments, and that the Flanders-Taft amendment then be open to further amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator repeat his request? It appears to be somewhat complicated.

Mr. McCARTHY. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to substitute the Flanders-Taft amendment, as amended, for the 14 McCarthy amendments that have been accepted, and that the Flanders-Taft amendment, when accepted, be then open to further amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Do I understand correctly that the Senator from Wisconsin is asking that the Taft amendment, including the 14 amendments to it which the Senator from Wisconsin offered—

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, so as to make myself clear, let me say that the Senator from Wisconsin offered 14 amendments which were accepted.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. McCARTHY. However, while there were 14 amendments, there were only four major differences between those amendments and the Flanders-Taft amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. If they were accepted as part of the Taft amendment, were they amendments to the original bill?

Mr. McCARTHY. They were not accepted as a part of the Taft amendment. They were accepted as a substitute for the original bill, S. 866. There is now pending a motion by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] to strike all the McCarthy amendments and substitute the Flanders-Taft amendment. My request is that, in view of the fact that the four major differences between the Flanders amendment and the McCarthy amendments have been ironed out, there is no longer any great difference between the two of us, certainly nothing of importance, as compared with the importance of the over-all bill. I believe, in order to avoid the confusion of asking the Senate to vote upon the very lengthy and complicated Flanders amendment as against the very lengthy and complicated 14 McCarthy amendments, that we now should substitute the Flanders-Taft amendment for the 14 McCarthy amendments, and that then the Taft amendment, as amended, be open to further amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does that mean that the 14 amendments which have been accepted would be offered again as a part of the Taft-Flanders amendment?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. As the Chair understands the situation, the result of the unanimous-consent request would be to wipe out the McCarthy amendments and to restore the issue to the Taft amendment.

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes. And the purpose for making that request is that now there is practically no difference between the McCarthy amendments and the Flanders-Taft amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Louisiana will state it.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is it not a fact that the Taft amendment is now open to amendment?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is.

Mr. ELLENDER. Then what is the necessity of the procedure suggested by my distinguished friend from Wisconsin?

Mr. McCARTHY. It is a procedure which I have discussed at some length with the proponents of the Taft amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will state that there probably is no necessity for the latter part of the request, but it simplifies the situation and makes it entirely clear in a parliamentary sense.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. In order to make the situation clear in my own mind I desire to ask a question. This action in effect then is to vacate the prior action on the McCarthy amendments, and if that is done, and the so-called Taft-Flanders amendment is pending, it will be subject to further amendment?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is the Chair's understanding.

Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY]?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to say that I am not quite clear that I understand the parliamentary situation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair can well understand the Senator's perplexity, and he shares it.

Mr. RUSSELL. I submit to the Chair that we have had some unusually complex situations in consideration of the bill. The Senator from Wisconsin has asked unanimous consent to adopt the Taft-Flanders amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. To substitute the Taft-Flanders amendment, and that it be open to amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. I dislike to object to the request, but the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Young] and the Senator from Georgia have an amendment to that amendment.

Mr. McCARTHY. The action I propose be taken will not preclude that amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be in order.

Mr. RUSSELL. It might make some difference as to how some Senators would vote on the Taft-Flanders amendment. I mean the vote on the amendment which we propose to offer might affect the votes of some Senators on the Taft-Flanders amendment. So I ask the Senator to withhold his request.

Mr. McCARTHY. Will the Senator from Georgia withhold his objection?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will state to the Senator from Georgia that he has the option of offering his amendment either to the Taft amendment or to the original bill after the Taft amendment is taken care of.

Mr. RUSSELL. The original bill contains very largely the same subject matter as the amendment which will be proposed by the Senator from North Dakota and myself. I see nothing to be gained by this unusual unanimous-consent request. It might preclude some Members of the Senate from voting against the Flanders-Taft amendment, who might prefer the original bill. For that reason I ask the Senator from Wisconsin to withhold his request.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his objection for a moment so that I may explain the situation?

Mr. RUSSELL. Certainly.

Mr. McCARTHY. Originally I was vigorously opposed to the Taft-Flanders amendment, because there were four principal differences between the McCarthy amendments and the Taft-Flanders amendment. We have agreed upon all except one, and we have compromised upon that. There is nothing presently in Senate bill 866 which at all resembles the Senator's amendment. That has all been stricken. Senate bill 866, as of now, contains nothing except the McCarthy amendments. The McCarthy amendments contain nothing comparable to the Senator's farm housing section. All I am doing is attempting to avoid the confusion which I think might result from asking the Senate to compare two very lengthy, complicated measures which are practically identical at this time, or will be practically identical

cal after we accept the various amendments which have been agreed upon.

Mr. RUSSELL. May I ask the Senator from Wisconsin if his amendments struck everything from the Taft-Ellender bill except the policy statement. So the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill as presently constituted is nothing more or less than the 14 McCarthy amendments.

Mr. McCARTHY. My amendments struck everything from the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill except the policy statement. So the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill as presently constituted is nothing more or less than the 14 McCarthy amendments.

In view of the fact that we have amended the Taft-Flanders amendment so that to all intents and purposes it is identical with the McCarthy amendments, I ask that we merely wipe out the McCarthy amendments and substitute the Flanders-Taft amendment. The Flanders-Taft amendment will then be open to further amendment, which will in no way preclude the Senator from offering his amendment on farm housing.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I can see that the Senator might clarify the situation somewhat by eliminating his amendments; but I prefer that he do it by withdrawing them by unanimous consent, which would in nowise prejudice the right of the Senator from North Dakota and the Senator from Georgia to offer an amendment to the pending Taft-Flanders amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If the Chair may state his opinion, the vote by which the McCarthy amendments were adopted could be reconsidered, and they could be withdrawn.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It seems to the Chair that the same net result would be accomplished.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should much prefer to see that course followed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. However, that suggestion on the part of the Chair is gratuitous.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have made the same suggestion. It would not in any wise preclude the Senator from North Dakota and the Senator from Georgia from offering an amendment to the Taft-Flanders amendment which is pending.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, under the circumstances I withdraw my request. I shall make the request again, however, after the amendment of the Senator has been considered.

Mr. RUSSELL. I think that would be the preferable course.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wisconsin withdraws his request. Does the Senator from Vermont yield further to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, unfortunately I was engaged in some desultory conversation. I should like to know the present parliamentary status.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wisconsin withdrew his request during the Senator's desultory conversation.

Mr. McCARTHY. I shall again make the same request, after the amendments have been fully perfected.

Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. I should like to call up at this time for immediate consideration two amendments.

The first amendment which I offer is, on page 18 of the Flanders amendment, in line 14, to strike out the figure "\$4,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figure "\$4,500." This merely deals with the so-called title I, class 3, loans. The Flanders amendment has a figure of \$4,000. The McCarthy amendment had a figure of \$5,000. We have gone over this question in detail, and we feel that a figure of \$4,500 will adequately cover the type of construction we intend to cover in this section. I understand that this amendment is acceptable to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I am glad to accept the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin to the pending amendment, as amended.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and myself, I now offer an amendment dealing with housing for veterans with service-connected disabilities. This amendment is practically identical with a bill which we introduced last year. We are now offering it as an amendment. Last year the bill was recommitted to the committee by a vote of 40 to 37. We feel that we have met the principal objection of Senators who last year urged that the bill be recommitted.

This amendment would provide two things for veteran paraplegic cases, spinal cord injury cases who will be doomed to wheel chairs for the rest of their lives.

First, it will provide at Government expense plans for building special homes for paraplegics.

Second, it will provide that the Government will pay half the cost of a home costing up to \$20,000, for veteran paraplegics. The remainder, of course, they will have to raise by an FHA or GI loan.

Last year the Senator from Ohio made the motion for recommitment. We have met his objections, to the extent that he is willing to accept this amendment for the benefit of paraplegics. The Senator from Vermont supported that provision last year. I understand that he is wholeheartedly in favor of the amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will this amendment be by way of adding a new title to the bill?

Mr. McCARTHY. It will add title VIII to the bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. Would that title in any way affect other titles in the bill?

Mr. McCARTHY. It would in no way affect any other section of the Flanders-Taft amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment will be printed in the Record without reading.

The amendment was, on page 93, after line 2 of the amendment proposed by Mr. TAFT, as amended, to insert the following:

TITLE VIII—HOUSING FOR VETERANS WITH SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITIES

SEC. 801. Section 1, title I, Public Law No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, approved March 20, 1933, as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection known as subsection (g) and to read as follows:

"(g) Any person who served in the active military or naval service of the United States who is entitled to compensation under the provisions of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, for permanent and total service-connected disability due to spinal-cord disease or injury with paralysis of the legs and lower part of the body shall be entitled to assistance in acquiring a suitable housing unit with special fixtures or movable facilities made necessary by the nature of the person's disability, and necessary land therefor, subject to the provisions and limitations of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, part IX."

SEC. 802. Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof a new part to be known as part IX and to read as follows:

"PART IX

"1. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized, under such regulations as he may prescribe, to assist any person (hereinafter referred to as 'veteran') who served in the active military or naval service of the United States, who is entitled to compensation under the provisions of this regulation for permanent and total service-connected disability due to spinal-cord disease or injury with paralysis of the legs and lower part of the body in acquiring a suitable housing unit with special fixtures or movable facilities made necessary by the nature of the veteran's disability, and necessary land therefor: *Provided*, That the regulations of the Administrator shall include, but not be limited to, provisions requiring findings that (a) it is medically feasible for such veteran to reside in the proposed housing unit and in the proposed locality; (b) the proposed housing unit bears a proper relation to the veteran's present and anticipated income and expenses; and (c) that the nature and condition of the proposed housing unit are such as to be suitable to the veterans' needs for dwelling purposes.

"2. The assistance authorized by paragraph 1 shall be limited in the case of any veteran to one housing unit, and necessary land therefor, and shall be afforded under one of the following plans, at the option of the veteran, but shall not exceed \$10,000 in any one case—

"(a) where the veteran elects to construct a housing unit on land to be acquired by him, the Administrator shall pay not to exceed 50 percent of the total cost to the veteran of (1) the housing unit and (2) the necessary land upon which it is to be situated;

"(b) where the veteran elects to construct a housing unit on land acquired by him prior to application for assistance under this part, the Administrator shall pay not to exceed the smaller of the following sums: (1) 50 percent of the total cost to the veteran of the housing unit and the land necessary for such housing unit, or (2) 50 percent of the cost to the veteran of the housing unit plus the full amount of the unpaid balance, if any, of the cost to the veteran of the land necessary for such housing unit;

"(c) where the veteran elects to remodel a dwelling, which is not adapted to the requirements of his disability, acquired by him prior to application for assistance under this part, the Administrator shall pay not to exceed the total of (1) 50 percent of the cost

of the veteran of such remodeling, plus (2) the smaller of the following sums: (A) 50 percent of the cost to the veteran of such dwelling and the necessary land upon which it is situated, or (B) the full amount of the unpaid balance, if any, of the cost to the veteran of such dwelling and the necessary land upon which it is situated; and

"(d) where the veteran has acquired a suitable housing unit, the Administrator shall pay not to exceed the smaller of the following sums: (1) 50 percent of the cost to the veteran of such housing unit and the necessary land upon which it is situated, or (2) the full amount of the unpaid balance, if any, of the cost to the veteran of such housing unit and the necessary land upon which it is situated.

"3. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized to furnish to veterans eligible for assistance under this part, without cost to the veterans, model plans and specifications of suitable housing units.

"4. Any person who accepts the benefits of this part shall not by reason thereof be denied the benefits of title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended.

"5. The Government of the United States shall have no liability in connection with any housing unit, or necessary land therefor, acquired under the provisions of this part."

SEC. 803. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this title.

Renumber the succeeding title and the sections thereof.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I have the assurance of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] that he accepts this amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin to the pending amendment, as amended.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 93, line 6, in the Taft amendment as amended, it is proposed to strike out "Sec. 801" and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 801 (a)."

On page 93, after line 12, it is proposed to insert a new subsection, as follows:

(b) Section 101 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, is amended by inserting "Federal Housing Administration;" immediately after the semicolon which follows "United States Housing Corporation": *Provided*, That as to the Federal Housing Administration, the audit required by section 105 of said act shall begin with the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1948, and the exception contained in section 301 (d) of said act shall be construed to refer to the cost of audits contracted for prior to July 1, 1948.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, the purpose of this amendment is to extend the provisions of the Government Corporation Control Act to the Federal Housing Administration. While this is not technically a corporation, this agency possesses many of the significant attributes of a corporation, and in nearly all major respects is treated as such by both the executive branch and the Congress. The enactment of the proposed provision would therefore help to secure a more

uniform approach to the Government's business activities.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont to the Taft-Flanders amendment, as amended.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I should like to yield to the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] or the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] for them to present their amendment on farm housing.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, at this time I wish to call up the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and myself to Senate bill 866.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, if there is to be a controversy over this amendment, I think a quorum should be present. The amendment is a rather important one.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I may say that the original idea in connection with the committee amendments was that there were one or two questionable points in the farm-housing provision. We have suggested in our amendments that a committee of Government officials be appointed to report on this subject on January 15.

I have stated to the two authors of the amendment that I would not lead any crusade against the amendment, but would leave it to the judgment of the Senate. However, if one particular section, which seems to me to be the most questionable section of the amendment, were deleted, I should be glad to support the amendment.

I am sorry to say that I do not have the particular section of the amendment before me. I think the Senator from North Dakota can tell us the section in question, as he has it marked. I believe it is the one which provides that any amount up to \$2,000 may be applied to building a back porch, or an outhouse, or a chicken house, or what have you.

Mr. YOUNG. I think the Senator has reference to section 704, at the bottom of page 6 of our amendment.

Mr. FLANDERS. Yes; section 704. That is the one.

If the two proponents of the amendment are willing to eliminate that section, I shall gladly support their amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Chair correctly understand that the Senator from Georgia suggests the absence of a quorum?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; 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	Byrd	Ecton
Baldwin	Cain	Ellender
Ball	Capehart	Ferguson
Barkley	Capper	Flanders
Brewster	Chavez	Fulbright
Bricker	Cooper	George
Bridges	Cordon	Green
Brooks	Donnell	Gurney
Buck	Downey	Hatch
Bushfield	Dworshak	Hayden
Butler	Eastland	Hickenlooper

Hill	Magnuson	Smith
Hoey	Malone	Sparkman
Holland	Martin	Stennis
Ives	Maybank	Stewart
Jenner	Millikin	Taylor
Johnson, Colo.	Moore	Thomas, Okla.
Johnston, S. C.	Morse	Thomas, Utah
Kem	Murray	Thye
Kilgore	Myers	Tobey
Knowland	O'Connor	Tydings
Langer	O'Daniel	Umstead
Lodge	O'Mahoney	Vandenberg
Lucas	Overton	Watkins
McCarran	Pepper	Wherry
McCarthy	Reed	White
McClellan	Revercomb	Wiley
McFarland	Robertson, Va.	Williams
McGrath	Robertson, Wyo.	Wilson
McKellar	Russell	Young
McMahon	Saltonstall	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] is necessarily absent.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is absent because of illness.

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

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

The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] for himself and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. Without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD at this point. The Chair thinks that for the information of the Senate perhaps a statement by the author would be more illuminating than for the clerk to read the long amendment.

The amendment submitted by Mr. YOUNG, for himself and Mr. RUSSELL, is to strike out in the amendment proposed by Mr. TAFT, line 3 on page 92 down to and including line 2 on page 93, being title VII, and insert the following:

TITLE VII—FARM HOUSING

ASSISTANCE BY THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE

SEC. 701. (a) The Secretary of Agriculture (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized, through such agency officers and employees as he may determine subject to the terms and conditions of this title, to extend financial assistance to owners of farms in the United States and in the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii and in Puerto Rico, to enable them to construct, improve, alter, repair, or replace dwellings and facilities incident to family living on their farms to provide them, their tenants, lessees, sharecroppers, and laborers with decent, safe, and sanitary living conditions as specified in this title.

(b) For the purposes of this title and the acts amended hereby, the term "farm" shall mean a parcel or parcels of land operated as a single unit which is used for the production of one or more agricultural commodities and which customarily produces such commodities for sale and for home use of a gross annual value of not less than \$400. The Secretary shall promptly determine whether any parcel or parcels of land constitutes a farm for the purposes of this title whenever requested to do so by any interested Federal, State, or local public agency, and his determination shall be conclusive.

(c) In order to be eligible for the assistance authorized by paragraph (a), the applicant must show (1) that he is the owner of a farm which is without a decent, safe, and sanitary dwelling and related facilities adequate for himself and his family and necessary resident farm labor, or for the family of the operating tenant, lessee, or sharecropper; (2) that he is without sufficient re-

sources to provide the necessary housing on his own account; and (3) that he is unable to secure the credit necessary for such housing from other sources upon terms and conditions which he could reasonably be expected to fulfill.

LOANS FOR DWELLINGS ON ADEQUATE FARMS

SEC. 702. (a) If the Secretary determines that an applicant is eligible for assistance as provided in section 60 (c) and that the applicant has the ability to repay in full the sum to be loaned, with interest, giving due consideration to the income and earning capacity of the applicant and his family from the farm and other sources, and the maintenance of a reasonable standard of living for the owner and occupant of said farm, a loan may be made by the Secretary to said applicant for a period of not to exceed 33 years from the making of the loan with interest at a rate not to exceed 4 percent per annum on the unpaid balance of principal.

(b) The instruments under which the loan is made and the security given shall—

(1) provide for security upon the applicant's equity in the farm and such additional security or collateral, if any, as may be found necessary by the Secretary reasonably to assure repayment of the indebtedness;

(2) provide for the repayment of principal and interest in accordance with schedules and repayment plans prescribed by the Secretary;

(3) contain the agreement of the borrower that he will, at the request of the Secretary, proceed with diligence to refinance the balance of the indebtedness through cooperative or other responsible private credit sources whenever the Secretary determines, in the light of the borrower's circumstances, including his earning capacity and the income from the farm, that he is able to do so upon reasonable terms and conditions;

(4) be in such form and contain such covenants as the Secretary shall prescribe to secure the payment of the loan with interest, protect the security, and assure that the farm will be maintained in repair and that waste and exhaustion of the farm will be prevented.

LOANS FOR DWELLINGS ON POTENTIALLY ADEQUATE FARMS

SEC. 703. If the Secretary determines (a) that, because of the inadequacy of the income of an eligible applicant from the farm to be improved and from other sources, said applicant may not reasonably be expected to make annual repayments of principal and interest in an amount sufficient to repay the loan in full within the period of time prescribed by the Secretary as authorized in this title; (b) that the income of the applicant may be sufficiently increased within a period of not to exceed 10 years by improvement or enlargement of the farm or an adjustment of the farm practices or methods; and (c) that the applicant has adopted and may reasonably be expected to put into effect a plan of farm improvement, enlargement, or adjusted practices which, in the opinion of the Secretary, will increase the applicant's income from said farm within a period of not to exceed 10 years to the extent that the applicant may be expected thereafter to make annual repayments of principal and interest sufficient to repay the balance of the indebtedness less payments in cash and credits for the contributions to be made by the Secretary as hereinafter provided, the Secretary may make a loan in an amount necessary to provide adequate housing on said farm under the terms and conditions prescribed in section 702. In addition, the Secretary may agree with the borrower to make annual contributions in the form of credits on the borrower's indebtedness in an amount not to exceed the annual installment of interest and 50 percent of the principal payments accruing during any installment year, up to and including the tenth installment year, subject to the conditions that the borrower's income is, in fact, insufficient to enable the

borrower to make payments in accordance with the plan or schedule prescribed by the Secretary and that the borrower pursues his plan of farm reorganization and improvement or enlargement with due diligence.

This agreement with respect to credits of principal and interest upon the borrower's indebtedness shall not be assignable nor accrue to the benefit of any third party without the written consent of the Secretary and the Secretary shall have the right, at his option, to cancel the agreement upon the sale of the farm or the execution or creation of any lien thereon subsequent to the lien given to the Secretary, or to refuse to release the lien given to the Secretary except upon payment in cash of the entire original principal plus accrued interest thereon less actual cash payments of principal and interest when the Secretary determines that the release of the lien would permit the benefits of this section to accrue to a person not eligible to receive such benefits.

OTHER SPECIAL LOANS AND GRANTS FOR MINOR IMPROVEMENTS TO FARM HOUSING

SEC. 704. In the event the Secretary determines that an eligible applicant cannot qualify for a loan under the provisions of sections 702 and 703 and that repairs or improvements should be made to a farm dwelling occupied by him or his tenants, lessees, sharecroppers, or laborers, in order to make such dwelling safe and sanitary and remove hazards to the health of the occupant, his family, or the community, the Secretary may make a grant, or a combined loan and grant, to the applicant to cover the cost of improvements or additions, such as repairing roofs, providing toilet facilities, providing a sanitary water supply, supplying screens, or making other similar repairs or improvements. No assistance shall be extended to any one individual under the provisions of this section in the form of a loan or grant or combination thereof in excess of \$1,000 for any one unit or dwelling owned by such individual or in excess of \$2,000 in the aggregate to any one such individual, and the grant portion with respect to any one unit or dwelling shall not exceed \$500. Any portion of the sums advanced to the borrower treated as a loan shall be secured and be repayable in accordance with the principles and conditions set forth in this title. Sums made available by grant may be made subject to the conditions set out in this title for the protection of the Government with respect to contributions made on loans by the Secretary. In the case of such loan or grant with respect to a dwelling not occupied by the owner of the land, the Secretary may, as a condition precedent to the grant, require that the landowner enter into such stipulations and agreements with the Secretary and the occupants of the dwelling as will make it possible for the occupant to obtain the full benefits of the grant.

TECHNICAL SERVICES AND RESEARCH

SEC. 705. In addition to the financial assistance authorized in sections 701 to 704, inclusive, the Secretary is hereby authorized to furnish to all persons, without charge or at such charges as the Secretary may determine, technical services such as building plans, specifications, construction supervision and inspection, and advice and information regarding rural dwellings and other farm buildings. The Secretary and the Housing and Home Finance Administrator are authorized to cooperate in research and technical studies in the rural-housing field. In furnishing such services and information, the Secretary may utilize, through the Agricultural Extension Service, the facilities and services of State agencies and educational institutions.

PREFERENCE FOR VETERANS

SEC. 706. As between eligible applicants for assistance under this title, the Secretary

shall give preference to veterans (defined for the purposes of this title to mean persons who served in the military or naval forces of the United States during World War II).

LOCAL PUBLIC AGENCIES AND COMMITTEES TO ASSIST SECRETARY

SEC. 707. (a) Wherever a local public agency now exists or may be hereafter created which possesses authority to assist low-income persons and families outside of urban areas to obtain decent, safe, and sanitary housing and related facilities, the Secretary is authorized, and after agreement with such agency is directed, to utilize the facilities of such local public agency for the purpose of making the benefits of this title available to the eligible owners or operators situated upon farms (as defined in section 701) lying within the boundaries of said local public agency.

(b) Wherever the facilities of a local public agency are not utilized, the Secretary may utilize the services of any existing committee of farmers operating (pursuant to laws or regulations carried out by the Department of Agriculture) in the county or parish where the farm is located. In any county or parish where the facilities of a local public agency are not utilized and in which no existing satisfactory committee is available, the Secretary is authorized to appoint a committee composed of three persons residing in the county or parish. Each member of such committee shall be allowed compensation at the rate of \$5 per day while engaged in the performance of duties under this title and, in addition, shall be allowed such amounts as the Secretary may prescribe for necessary traveling and subsistence expenses. One member of the committee shall be designated by the Secretary as chairman. The Secretary shall prescribe rules governing the procedure of local public agencies and committees utilized pursuant to this section, furnish forms and equipment necessary for the performance of their duties, and authorize and provide for the compensation of such clerical assistance as he deems may be required by any committee.

(c) The local public agency or committee utilized pursuant to this section shall examine applications of persons desiring to obtain the benefits of this title and shall submit recommendations to the Secretary with respect to each application as to whether the applicant is eligible to receive the benefits of this title, whether by reason of his character, ability, and experience, he is likely successfully to carry out undertakings required of him under a loan or grant under this title, and whether the farm with respect to which the application is made is of such character that there is a reasonable likelihood that the making of the loan or grant requested will carry out the purposes of this title. The local public agencies or committees shall also certify to the Secretary their opinions of the reasonable values of the farms. The local authorities and committees shall, in addition, perform such other duties under this title as the Secretary may require.

GENERAL POWERS OF SECRETARY

SEC. 708. (a) The Secretary, for the purposes of this title, shall have the power to determine and prescribe the standards of adequate farm housing, by farms or localities, taking into consideration, among other factors, the type of housing which will provide decent, safe, and sanitary dwellings for the needs of the family using the housing, the type and character of the farming operations to be conducted, and the size and earning capacity of the land.

(b) The Secretary may require any recipient of a loan or grant to agree that the availability of housing constructed or improved with the proceeds of the loan or grant under this title shall not be a justification for directly or indirectly changing the terms or conditions of the lease or occupancy

agreement with the occupants of such housing to the latter's disadvantage without the approval of the Secretary.

SEC. 709. In carrying out the provisions of this title, the Secretary shall have the power to—

(a) make contracts for services and supplies without regard to the provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, when the aggregate amount involved is less than \$300;

(b) enter into subordination, subrogation, or other agreements satisfactory to the Secretary;

(c) compromise claims and obligations arising out of sections 702 to 705, inclusive, of this title and adjust and modify the terms of mortgages, leases, contracts, and agreements entered into as circumstances may require, including the release from personal liability, without payment of further consideration, of—

(1) borrowers who have transferred their farms to other approved applicants for loans who have agreed to assume the outstanding indebtedness to the Secretary under this title; and

(2) borrowers who have transferred their farms to other approved applicants for loans who have agreed to assume that portion of the outstanding indebtedness to the Secretary under this title which is equal to the earning capacity value of the farm at the time of the transfer, and borrowers whose farms have been acquired by the Secretary, in cases where the Secretary determines that the original borrowers have cooperated in good faith with the Secretary, have farmed in a workmanlike manner, used due diligence to maintain the security against loss, and otherwise fulfilled the covenants incident to their loans, to the best of their abilities;

(d) collect all claims and obligations arising out of or under any mortgage, lease, contract, or agreement entered into pursuant to this title and, if in his judgment necessary and advisable, to pursue the same to final collection in any court having jurisdiction: *Provided*, That the prosecution and defense of all litigation under this title shall be conducted under the supervision of the Attorney General and the legal representation shall be by the United States attorneys for the districts, respectively, in which such litigation may arise and by such other attorney or attorneys as may, under law, be designated by the Attorney General;

(e) bid for and purchase at any foreclosure or other sale or otherwise to acquire the property pledged or mortgaged to secure a loan or other indebtedness owing under this title, to accept title to any property so purchased or acquired, to operate or lease such property for such period as may be necessary or advisable, to protect the interest of the United States therein and to sell or otherwise dispose of the property so purchased or acquired by such terms and for such considerations as the Secretary shall determine to be reasonable and to make loans to provide adequate housing for the purchasers of such property;

(f) utilize with respect to indebtedness arising from loans and payments made under this title all the powers and authorities given to him under the act approved December 20, 1944, entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to compromise, adjust, or cancel certain indebtedness, and for other purposes" (58 Stat. 836), as such act now provides or may hereafter be amended;

(g) make such rules and regulations as he deems necessary to carry out the purposes of this title.

OBLIGATIONS AND APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 710. The Secretary may issue notes and other obligations for purchase by the Secretary of the Treasury in such sums as the Congress may from time to time determine to make loans under this title but not in excess of \$25,000,000 on or after the 1st

day of July 1948, an additional \$50,000,000 on or after the 1st day of July 1949, an additional \$75,000,000 on or after the 1st day of July 1950, and an additional \$100,000,000 on or after the 1st day of July 1951. The notes and other obligations issued by the Secretary shall be secured by the obligations of borrowers and the Secretary's commitments to make contributions under this title and shall be repaid from the payment of principal and interest on the obligations of the borrowers and from funds appropriated hereunder. The notes and other obligations issued by the Secretary shall be in such forms and denominations, shall have such maturities, and shall be subject to such terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the Secretary with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. Such notes or other obligations shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average rate on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States as of the last day of the month preceding the issuance of the notes or obligations by the Secretary. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to purchase any notes and other obligations of the Secretary of Agriculture issued hereunder and for such purpose is authorized to use as a public debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under such act are extended to include any purchases of such obligations. The Secretary of the Treasury may at any time sell any of the notes or other obligations acquired by him under this section.

All redemptions, purchases, and sales by the Secretary of the Treasury of such notes or other obligations shall be treated as public debt transactions of the United States.

SEC. 711. In connection with loans made pursuant to section 703, the Secretary is authorized, on or after July 1, 1948, to make commitments for contributions aggregating not more than \$500,000 per annum, and to make additional commitments on or after July 1 of each of the years 1949, 1950, and 1951 which shall require aggregate contributions of not more than \$1,000,000, \$1,500,000, and \$2,000,000 per annum, respectively.

SEC. 712. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary (a) such sums as may be necessary to permit payments on notes or other obligations issued by the Secretary under section 710 equal to (i) the aggregate of the contributions made by the Secretary in the form of credits on principal sums due on loans made pursuant to section 703 and (ii) the interest due on a similar sum represented by notes or other obligations issued by the Secretary; (b) an additional \$1,000,000 for grants made pursuant to section 704 on or after July 1, 1948, which amount shall be increased by further amounts of \$2,500,000, \$4,000,000, and \$5,000,000, on July 1 of each of the years 1949, 1950, and 1951, respectively; and (c) such further sums as may be necessary to enable the Secretary to carry out the provisions of sections 701 to 712, inclusive, of this title.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I shall have to object to the deletion of section 704, as proposed by the able Senator from Vermont. My reason for that, to start with, is that I am more concerned with the farm veterans' housing provisions of the bill than with any other feature of it. Farm veterans have had far less chance to take part in any veterans' legislation than any other group. There are few farm veterans taking advantage of college training. There are very few of them taking advantage of on-the-job training. When the farm veteran seeks to establish himself in the farming business, usually,

because he was away during the war, he has to go to run-down buildings to find a place in which to live. This section would give farm veterans a chance to obtain Government funds to help repair those buildings and to modernize them to a certain extent. For that reason, I would have to oppose deletion of that section of the bill.

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

Mr. YOUNG. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. FLANDERS. I would say on the floor what I have said to the Senator from North Dakota personally, and what I have said to the Senator from Georgia personally, that I still think the committee plan of referring this question to a committee of the Cabinet for report on January 15 is the better way to handle this section, which I think has not had quite the thought put into it that certain other sections have had. I shall feel compelled to vote against this section. I shall not make any campaign against it, but shall leave it to the judgment of the Senate as to whether the amendment should be adopted.

Mr. YOUNG. I thank the Senator from Vermont. Mr. President, I had originally intended to make rather extended remarks on this amendment, but, in view of the sentiment expressed in the Senate in favor of the amendment, I do not think that is necessary. I should, however, like to speak briefly and to ask unanimous consent that the statement I had prepared be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

Mr. President, the national housing bill, in the form in which it is now before the Senate, carries a little bit for almost everybody, and for some it carries a great deal. Everybody shares to some extent, but the farmer shares least of all. Indeed, the present title VII, as it is proposed in the Flanders amendments to S. 866, calls for nothing but a survey and a report. Thus, farmers get barely a crumb from the housing table to be spread for the Nation in this bill.

Yet rural areas are by common consent the worst housed, the most neglected areas in America. As I have said, the present proposal is merely for another survey and another report. But the files of Congress, of the Library of Congress, and of the Department of Agriculture are full of reports on rural housing, dusty and unused, all telling the same story.

Several years ago an interbureau committee of the Department of Agriculture said, "Rural farm dwellings in general are inferior to those of urban families, and the homes of hired farm workers are even less adequate than those of farm operators. Under 1944 conditions of practically full employment, about 5,000,000 operator families were in need of housing on farms. Approximately 2,000,000 now occupy acceptable houses, and about 3,000,000 are in repairable and non-repairable houses, approximately half in each class. Of this 3,000,000, about 2,000,000 are in position to finance acceptable housing, if appropriate housing credit can be made available to serve their needs, while about 1,000,000, even under 1944 conditions, had insufficient income to finance acceptable housing. About half of these 2,000,000 who can finance acceptable housing need to replace their dwellings, and about half of the million who cannot finance acceptable housing also need new homes."

That sums up the national situation in rural housing about as well as could be done if another year or more were wasted, not to mention the money of taxpayers, in another futile survey and report. We know now what needs to be done. All that remains is to go ahead and undertake a rural-housing program.

For that matter, almost exactly 2 years ago a committee of this body, the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, said in its report on the national housing bill of that year, "The relative neglect of rural housing, despite the urgency of the problem in rural areas, has made it unthinkable that a comprehensive housing program should neglect the rural areas."

It remains unthinkable to me that the Senate will approve a bill avowedly embodying a national housing program but actually omitting entirely any program for dealing with the housing problems of farmers, in many ways the area of most acute need.

This is why the Senator from Georgia, Mr. RUSSELL, and myself have joined to propose the amendment now before the Senate. The amendment would provide a relatively modest rural-housing program, if its financial terms be compared with the dimensions of the remainder of the bill, but one which would be of substantial and important service in enabling farm people to improve their housing conditions.

Under the terms of this amendment the Department of Agriculture would be authorized to undertake a program involving no more than \$25,000,000 for the first year, and rising by an additional \$25,000,000 annually until it attained \$100,000,000 in the year beginning July 1, 1951, these moneys to be available for the construction, repair, or improvement of dwellings and facilities on farms.

Section 701, as it is proposed in our amendment would allow such loans to be made only on condition that the applicant for the loan could show that improved housing was needed, that he was without the necessary resources to provide the housing himself, and that he was unable to obtain the required credit elsewhere upon terms and conditions which he could reasonably be expected to fulfill.

This program and the associated provisions of the amendment are carefully drawn, we believe, to take account of the very wide difference between the needs of farmers for housing credit and the needs of city dwellers. Too often, this difference is not realized, and too often well-meant efforts to improve rural housing have failed for this reason.

A prime necessity in rural housing credit is that it be, first, on a long-time, relatively low-interest basis, and, second, that it be related to the profitability of operation of the farm. The farm dwellings are in a sense a part of the farm plant, and this fact must be remembered. Thus, we have provided that the loans to be made will be for a maximum of 33 years and at an interest rate of 4 percent.

Three principal types of programs, aimed at meeting the three major kinds of housing problems in the country, are called for in the amendment. The first of these is simply for loans to provide dwellings on adequate farms, that is, farms of a size and character to warrant the reasonable assumption that the housing loan can be safely carried. The second is for loans to provide dwellings on farms not now regarded as adequate but classified as potentially adequate, that is, where there is a reasonable assumption for the belief that within 10 years the farm will have developed into an adequate farm. This is contained in section 703 in the amendment, and provides a plan for variable payments necessary to make such a program work. Finally, there is, in section 704, provision for a minor improvement program, including grants of up to \$500, if necessary, designed to provide roof repairs,

toilet facilities, sanitary water supply, screening, and similar greatly needed improvements. Such loans, or loans and grants, could not exceed \$1,000 on any one dwelling, or \$2,000 to any individual.

In very brief outline, this is the principal substance of the amendment. It contains, to my mind, adequate safeguards both for the Government and the individual, and opens up a field not now open to many private businesses who would benefit from such a new market as is here offered. At the same time, it is obvious that no private interests would suffer from the adoption of such a program, since even the credit is being provided to those who could not otherwise obtain it.

In conclusion, let me appeal to my fellow Senators to consider that agriculture, which should have a major claim upon them as custodians of the national welfare, has been sadly neglected by Congress in the past whenever such programs as these were being considered. Yet the farms are the principal seedbed of the Nation. From them come many more children, proportionately, than from the cities. We owe it to these children to help see to it that they grow up, not in rural slums, but in decent, healthy, and safe homes, homes of which any American could be proud. For that reason, if for no other, I hope the amendment may be adopted.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, the amendment prepared by the Senator from Georgia and myself is identically, or almost identically, the same as the similar provision in the original housing bill. It gives high priority to veterans. In fact, of the meager amount of money provided in the amendment, I think every bit of it would go to veterans themselves.

Mr. President, during the time I have been in the Senate I have found that about the only way I was able to help the farm veterans was through the Farmers Home Administration. Veterans' loans, as a rule, do not apply to farm veterans and they have not been able to get the loans they need through the banks. As a result, the Farmers Home Administration, with its meager funds, is about the only place the farm veteran can go for financial assistance. It would seem to me unthinkable to pass the housing bill at this time and totally eliminate farm veterans from its help.

Mr. President, I do not think I have any more to add at this particular time, but I shall, perhaps, have more to say a little later.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I desire to make a few very brief observations. I appreciate being associated with the Senator from North Dakota, who is a determined fighter for parity for our farm population, in presenting this amendment. I regret very much the Senator from Vermont is not greatly impressed with the importance of the amendment, because I assume that as one of the conferees on the part of the Senate he will have much to do with the fashioning of the final bill which will evolve in the course of the enactment of any housing legislation at this session. I hope the amendment will not see short shrift in the conference. In my opinion it is one of the most important features of the entire legislation, and that was the impression of the committee as evidenced by its original report. The report on the original housing bill, S. 866, contained substantially

the provisions of this amendment, except this amendment, as stated by the Senator from North Dakota, gives high preference to veterans. I wish to read just a brief statement from the original committee report, at page 15:

In the past, the magnitude of the urban-housing program has tended to divert attention from the problems of farm housing. The fact is that farm-housing conditions are relatively much worse than in our urban communities.

Mr. President, that is a fact that is known to every person who travels around the country. It was recognized by the committee in making this very modest provision for farm housing, when they reported the original bill, which provision was substantially the same as the one contained in the amendment submitted by the Senator from North Dakota and myself.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, if the Senator from Georgia will yield, I should like to say that I have obtained certain very illuminating information, based upon the last census figures, showing the differences between urban and rural housing, at the present time, which I desire to read, as follows:

COMPARATIVE PERCENTAGES ON RURAL-FARM AND URBAN HOUSING

1. Dwellings which are overcrowded (more than 1½ persons per room):

	Percent
Rural-farm.....	16
Urban.....	6

2. Dwellings which have electric lighting:

	Percent
Rural-farm.....	32
Urban.....	96

3. Dwellings which have running water:

	Percent
Rural-farm.....	18
Urban.....	94

4. Dwellings which have mechanical refrigerators:

	Percent
Rural-farm.....	15
Urban.....	56

5. Dwellings which have private flush toilet:

	Percent
Rural-farm.....	11
Urban.....	83

6. Dwellings which have a private bath:

	Percent
Rural-farm.....	12
Urban.....	78

Source: Report of Department of Agriculture Interbureau Committee on Postwar Programs, as submitted to Senate Special Committee on Postwar Economic Policy and Planning, Jan. 17, 1945, and based on 1940 census figures.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for reading those figures. Farm housing, which is for the benefit of only 20 percent of the population, does not enlist the political pressures which are brought to bear when we are dealing with urban housing. Farm homes are on the average more substandard than homes in other areas of the Nation. The rural population does not have the same political effect and strength because the farmers are not as well organized as other groups. As a matter of fact, when a man goes down into the slum section of a city and sees some very deplorable living conditions, he immediately wants to do something

about it. When he goes out into the country and rides around he may see a little farmhouse and never realize its condition. It may be there are holes in the roof, under which it is necessary to put every pot and pan in the house to catch the rain when it leaks through the roof. There may be a hole in the wall through which a cat could be thrown. The plumbing may be 200 yards from the house, a long way out in the garden. But there may be a little vine growing up on the side. There may be two or three towheaded children playing in front of the door or perhaps two little pickaninnies. It does not occur to him ever to do anything about that. He merely says, "How picturesque that is" and then he drives off down the road, to carry on his campaign for slum clearance, where the people already have water in their homes, where they at least do not have leaky roofs. Deplorable as their condition may be, they are not nearly so bad off on the average as are those who live in farm homes.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, if the Senator from Georgia will yield, I should like to suggest one addition to the discussion of the delinquencies in connection with farmhouses which have been listed by him, and that is that there is not only necessity of using water pots and pans but there is the necessity of moving the bed.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct. On rainy days they have to move practically all the furniture. They do that every time it rains. That is the reason I do not understand why the Senator is opposed to this amendment. He is asking for a program of \$7,000,000,000 for urban housing, but cannot approve the allowance of \$25,000,000 for the first year to try to do something to relieve the housing conditions in the rural communities of the Nation.

I continue to read from the original report of the committee:

Data furnished by the Department of Agriculture indicate that in 1944 only 2,000,000 of the 5,000,000 operator families on farms were occupying acceptable houses—

Forty percent of them had acceptable houses on the farms—

and that half of the unsatisfactory houses were in such condition as to be classified as "nonreparable."

Conditions were so bad that the houses were nonreparable—

Farm dwellings occupied by hired farm workers are, of course, substantially less adequate than those occupied by farm operators.

Then the committee made this statement in its report:

It is unthinkable that a comprehensive housing program should neglect the needs of our ill-housed rural families.

In spite of this challenging statement in the committee's report, and the figures submitted by the Senator from North Dakota, it is now proposed to give urban populations housing programs, but in the case of rural populations merely to continue to investigate and study the farm-housing program. As a practical matter, it is an evident fact that farmers will not get any legislation at all regarding housing, no matter how much in-

vestigating and studying may be undertaken, unless they have the votes to enable such legislation to pass in the House and Senate. The suggestion to recommit the subject to further study and investigation is simply a method of slow death for any hope to do anything regarding the most deplorable housing conditions in the Nation.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. Was that report made by the same committee which is now proposing to strike out aid for rural communities?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. LUCAS. It made the report concerning the deplorable conditions obtaining, and then it did nothing about suggesting legislation to remedy the situation. Is that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct. Everyone loves the farmers until the time comes to do something for them, and then there is an effort to delay action and to merely investigate and make a further study, even after the committee has reported the deplorable conditions which exist on the farms and in rural communities.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Is it not a fact that rural housing authorities were established in the late thirties and some developments were started, and that there has been all the investigation which is needed? The subject has been investigated since 1934, and in 1939 there was one little housing unit established in one small rural community in my State. Is not the same true of other Southern States?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am happy to have that statement by a distinguished member of the committee, who is more familiar with the details than I am. I do not like to see the farmer shunted aside and put in a position in which he will be unable to share the blessings of Federal legislation for housing aid.

Mr. MAYBANK. We have rural authorities established under State laws. All that is needed is legislation to provide special funds to be appropriated to the State agencies.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to have the Senator from South Carolina make it clear.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield for a question?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield.

Mr. PEPPER. If I correctly understand the situation, Mr. President, in the original bill which was formulated on this subject, there was intended to be a comprehensive treatment of the problem of inadequate housing in the rural areas. Provision was made for rural housing, but later on that part of the bill was eliminated and is not now even before the Senate. Without the amendment proposed by the able Senators from North Dakota and Georgia there will not be any effective dealing with the problem at all.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes. The farmer is eliminated from any actual assistance in solving his housing problem, but Congress is to study him and investigate him, after reporting that his housing conditions are worse than are conditions in urban centers in which the bill is intended to apply.

Mr. PEPPER. I certainly want to commend the Senators from North Dakota and Georgia for initiating the amendment, and to give them assurance that they shall certainly get my vote when the time comes to pass upon the amendment. As one who was born in an inadequate rural home and has seen such homes all his life in the South where he has lived, I know the severity of the need. I know it would be the grossest injustice to the rural segments of our population if a bill which purports to be a comprehensive housing bill should fail to give some decency and adequacy of treatment to the subject of rural housing.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator. We are merely undertaking to restore to the bill a provision written into it in the first instance, which is now proposed to be deleted, although it carries a very modest sum of money as compared with the staggering sums available for urban housing.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should like to add to the statement which is being made by the distinguished Senator from Georgia that aid is more needful for the farmers than for any other type of our citizens. The bill provides for a first mortgage, a secondary mortgage, and all other mortgages which city dwellers can obtain but which no rural person, living in communities where there are no fire departments, can obtain.

Mr. RUSSELL. I appreciate that statement. I want to make one more brief observation, and then I shall have concluded.

Today veterans are leaving the farms in droves and moving into cities. There is no farm-housing program whatever of which they can avail themselves. They are adding to the difficulties of solving housing problems in the cities, because many veterans are moving into cities seeking to obtain a GI loan or an FHA loan to obtain housing for his wife and family after he has returned from the service. We should see that some modest amount is made available to aid the returning veteran in obtaining a livable home on the farm.

Mr. President, this country depends very largely, in these trying days of uncertainty and stress, when we are being assaulted by foreign ideologies and are being attacked by subversive movements, upon our rural population. We will do well to bear in mind the great strength which supports us from that source. They should not be shunted aside in every piece of legislation. We should see that the veteran has an opportunity to have a home on the farm, through the adoption of this amendment. It is a mere crumb from the table of the six or seven billion dollars provided for in the bill, but it at least shows that Congress recognizes that it has some responsibility

in connection with rural housing. It holds out a hope to the veteran on the farm, and to the nonveteran as well, that someday he may be able to share decent housing by building a home on the farm and share in the same benefits which are available to those who live in the city.

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

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

Mr. SPARKMAN. I commend the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from North Dakota for offering their amendment to the bill and for pointing up the real problem of farm housing. It is something we have never had in this country, and it is something we certainly need. I agree with the Senator that we cannot have a well-rounded housing program without including a provision for farm housing.

I was interested in what the Senator from Georgia was saying with reference to veterans obtaining farms and decent places in which to live, and my thoughts went back to an illustration I should like to present. Of course, the Senator has been interested all the way along in the Farm Tenant Purchase Act; and, by the way, under that act, as the Senator knows, whenever a farm was purchased, the purchaser got good housing with it, principally because there was an agency which was equipped and ready and willing to give technical advice and assistance in building the right kind of housing. Riding through the country where those tenant purchases have been made, I have noticed from time to time that one can almost pick them out in a community, because they have been properly planned, and under the provision proposed a great need will be met.

I started to use an illustration, if the Senator from Georgia will permit me to impose on his time. In 1944 I attended a ceremony in Alabama, along with the late Senator Bankhead, who was author of the Farm Tenant Purchase Act, when the first mortgage in all the United States to be paid off from the products of the farm itself was paid off and delivered. I remember the man and his family quite well. His name was Curtis Haraway.

Several months later I was in Europe, up near the front lines in Belgium, where I met a young man, who told me where he was from, a little community in Limestone County, Ala. His name was Haraway. I asked him if he was related to Curtis Haraway and he said, "Yes, he is my brother." I told him about the ceremony I had attended, during the time this boy had been over in Europe fighting. I said, "By the way, what are you going to do when you get out of the Army?" He said, "You know what I want to do? I want to go back home and get me a farm home as Curtis did."

Mr. President, that is a normal aspiration for every young man in the country, whether he is a veteran or nonveteran. Yet we know that their opportunities along that line have been greatly limited.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, Mr. President, such a man has no opportunity to get a loan from the pittance available to Farmers Home Administration unless

he happens to be a share cropper or tenant farmer. That legislation does not help those who own a little land to get money to improve their homes so that they will have healthy and sanitary places in which to live.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator is right; up to this point the bill would not provide a source of help to which the farmer could look. In other words, he has to be a farm tenant or farm worker, he cannot be a farm owner and hope to get decent housing with help from the Government.

In the hearings of the Joint Committee on Housing held in Birmingham, Representative ROBERT E. JONES, of Alabama, who, by the way, happens to be the Representative from my home district, testified before our committee. He had given a great deal of thought and attention to the need we are discussing, and he used some figures in the hearings which I should like to quote very briefly. He said:

During the years of 1935 through 1938 the deterioration cost on farms in America was more than new construction in any 1 year of those 3 years.

Then he used these figures with reference to Alabama. I am quoting his words:

We have in Alabama 234,000 farm-unit homes. Of that entire number of 234,000, there are 123,000 that have no toilet facilities, no screens, no lights, no electricity. They have nothing but the roof over their heads.

Representative RAINS, who is a member of the joint committee, said:

You mean they are huts?

Representative JONES replied:

I mean they are places that the health department of the city of Birmingham would more than likely condemn.

I think Representative JONES presented the picture very well, and it is a picture which applies largely throughout rural America. I certainly wish to add my endorsement to the amendment the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from North Dakota have sponsored.

Mr. President, if the Senator from Georgia will allow me, I should like to insert at this time a telegram which every Member of the Senate received from Walter P. Reuther, chairman of the CIO National Housing Committee, strongly urging the adoption of the amendment the Senators have offered. I should like to insert the telegram at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

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

WASHINGTON, D. C., April 20, 1948.
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN,
United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.:
As chairman of CIO's housing committee I urge you to vote for S. 866 as amended by the Flanders amendment. We hope you will also support the Russell-Young farm housing amendment not only because we favor good housing for people on the farms but also because labor has a major stake in farm welfare. In many areas farm housing is bad as that in any city slum. A program of farm housing would provide a new vital market in which

labor is vitally interested. This bill when enacted into law will be a strong gesture by this Congress for the welfare of millions of people in this country. Your voting for it will be proof of your interest in the well-being of our citizens.

WALTER P. REUTHER,
Chairman, CIO National Housing
Committee.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Alabama for his contribution. I have practically concluded my remarks.

I wish to point out that the amendment is safeguarded in every possible way. It will have to be established that the borrower cannot secure the funds elsewhere upon terms and conditions with which he could reasonably be expected to comply, and that the loans have the same collateral security as in the case of city housing.

It is of tremendous importance that such an amendment be adopted, and I implore the Members of the Senate who will represent us upon the conference to make a real fight for this provision, and not stand by and see it killed without making an effort to be just to the 20 percent of our people who live on farms.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. This is the first opportunity I have had to look at the amendment, and I have been endeavoring to determine whether there is any limitation in the amendment on the amount of a loan which may be made to a farm resident. I have not been able to find it up to this time.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not think there is any limitation in dollars and cents but there is a provision that the Secretary shall not lend more than he can reasonably expect to be paid from the farm on which the borrower may reside.

Mr. CORDON. I recognize that that appears in one place, and then I find in section 703 that the Secretary is given authority to speculate on what the farmer may be able to do on the farm within 10 years, or by adding another farm to it, going more or less into the realm of speculation. Then he may make grants of a portion of the value. It leaves me confused as to exactly what we are trying to do.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senator will turn to section 711, on page 15, he will find that the total amount available the first year under that section is only \$500,000. It can be no more than an experiment, if we are to appropriate \$500,000 for the whole United States. It is more or less of an experimental effort to do something about improving rural-housing conditions. Only half a million dollars is to be available in the first year, to be used in connection with section 703.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me—

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. GEORGE. I should like to invite attention to an editorial in the Wall Street Journal of Tuesday last in which this significant language is used:

In its latest form the housing bill makes no provision for the farmers. The Senate Committee on Banking, in its report on the

bill, says that provision for the improvement of farm-housing conditions is essential but that further study of this division of the subject is desirable. The bill therefore instructs the Secretary of Agriculture and the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to submit, early in the first session of the Eighty-first Congress, a report on farm housing with recommendations.

If the Federal Government is to go into the business of providing housing at all, the farm population has a right to be considered. This order for a report, however, is a vivid reminder that public-improvement programs have a habit of growing far beyond the plans initially drawn for them. Federal housing could hardly be an exception to this rule.

If the financiers who patronize principally the Wall Street Journal recognize the justice of the amendment it is somewhat strange that the warm-hearted proponents of the measure cannot see that the farmers are entitled to equal treatment with slum dwellers in the large cities.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank my colleague for his splendid contribution.

Since the discussion began my hopes have been increased greatly that a real fight will be made in conference for the amendment. It is endorsed on the one hand by the Honorable Walter P. Reuther in a telegram read by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] and on the other hand by the Wall Street Journal, and certainly with endorsements from those two extremes, from Mr. Reuther and from the Wall Street Journal it would be a great injustice if the amendment were finally omitted from the bill. I sincerely hope the Senate of the United States will not see such an injustice perpetrated.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I just want to have this thought made part of the RECORD. The Senator from Georgia said the amendment should be of significance to the conferees for the reason that it was not the Senate Banking and Currency Committee that requested the proposed action, but it was the Joint Housing Committee. I think the Senator from Vermont should know that the Joint Housing Committee of both Houses asked for this amendment. So far as I was concerned and so far as the other Members on the Democratic side were concerned, we thought sufficient study had been given to the matter, and that the amendment should be included, but in view of the close vote of seven to six it was delayed, because of the joint committee's hope that when we pass the bill it can also be passed through the House, and that the conferees will agree to it. So I just want the RECORD to show that the members of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, certainly on the Democratic side, believe that the amendment should have been in the original bill. I again want to take the opportunity of thanking the Senator from Georgia for bringing the amendment to the floor of the Senate.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator from South Carolina. I hope the Senate will not overlook the diligent efforts of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], who, in the first instance, is the

prime author of the amendment. I am glad to be associated with him, and I hope that the amendment will come before us again, in whatever form the final draft of the housing bill may take.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senator from Georgia for his kind remarks. His enthusiastic assistance and cosponsorship of this amendment has been of the greatest importance. Without this support on the part of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], who always has the farmers' interests at heart, it probably would have been impossible to secure passage of this important provision so important to the farm veterans of America.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator from North Dakota.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the adoption of the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] for himself and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I shall read:

On page 9, in line 16, after "1935", insert "or of any of the village properties under the jurisdiction of the Tennessee Valley Authority."

Mr. President, the Tennessee Valley Authority has under its jurisdiction a number of residential properties. The House Appropriations Committee in 1947 recommended that the Tennessee Valley Authority dispose of a number of these village properties particularly the properties in Norris, Tenn., and the Wilson Dam villages located at Wilson, Ala.

The proposed amendment would simply make FHA insurance available to finance the sale of these properties in addition to the sale of the Greenbelt towns which is already covered by the amendment to section 610 of the National Housing Act.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 9, in line 16, after "1935", it is proposed to insert "or of any of the village properties under the jurisdiction of the Tennessee Valley Authority."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I offer a further amendment, on page 20, after line 13, to insert the following new section:

SEC. 104. The Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out the period at the end of section 500 (b) and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "And provided further, That the Administrator, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, may prescribe by regulation a higher maximum rate of interest than otherwise prescribed in this section for loans guaranteed under this title, but not exceeding 4½ percent per annum, if he finds that the loan market demands it."

Mr. President, developments in the money market generally, and in mortgage financing in particular, have indicated the definite possibility that veterans may

not be able to continue to obtain financing for home purchase under the GI bill of rights at the maximum 4-percent rate of interest now prescribed by law. The purpose of this amendment, therefore, is to grant discretionary authority to the Veterans' Administrator to increase, but only with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, the maximum rate of interest on loans guaranteed or insured under the GI bill of rights from 4 percent per annum to 4½ percent per annum, if the mortgage market shall, in fact, demand such an increase in the future. In this respect it parallels a provision already in the committee amendments to S. 866 with respect to FHA insurance of home loans under its title VI program.

As in the case of the FHA provision, this proposed amendment is not intended to invite an increased interest rate on GI loans. On the contrary, it is not believed that an increase in the maximum rate of interest should be made at this time, and the intention is that the discretionary power provided in this new section should be used only as a last resort. Likewise, if an increase is required in certain areas only, it is intended that this power be exercised only in connection with such areas.

It is, however, desirable to provide necessary and moderate flexibility in the law should an increase in interest rates be absolutely required in order to attain the objectives of title III of the GI bill of rights.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to know to which title the amendment applies.

Mr. FLANDERS. It applies to FHA mortgages in general.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, there are two technical amendments which I desire to offer. One is perfecting amendment No. 1 to the committee amendments. The amendment is on page 82, in line 11, to strike out "(a)" following "Sec. 604."

This is necessary because on a motion of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], which was agreed to by the Senate, section 604 (b)—page 89, lines 13 to 25, inclusive, and page 90, lines 1 to 5, inclusive—was stricken.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont which he has already stated.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FLANDERS. I now offer perfecting amendment No. 2 to the committee amendments on page 87, in line 18, to strike out the word "superseded" and to insert in lieu thereof the word "superceding."

This was a printing error.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I now move the adoption of the Taft amendment, as amended.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the adoption of the Taft amendment as amended.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. President, I should like to make the RECORD absolutely clear at this time so there will be no confusion in the minds of Senators or in the minds of those reading the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

In view of the amendments to the Taft amendment which have been accepted, I think it now is, while not identical to the 14 amendments which the Senate accepted the other day, yet sufficiently parallel so that I have no objection whatever to substituting the Taft amendment for the 14 McCarthy amendments.

I might point out that there is only one remaining major difference, and that is on the question of a secondary market for title I, section 3 loans. I have gone over that with the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from Ohio, and I think there is considerable merit to their objection to that particular provision.

Originally there was substantial difference respecting the size of the loan guaranty. The Flanders amendment contained a provision for \$4,000; my amendment contained a provision for \$5,000. We have gone into that question in some detail, and the Senator from Vermont and I agree that the figure \$4,500, which is halfway between his figure and mine, is adequate to take care of that particular type of housing.

There is one provision in the Flanders-Taft amendment which was not in mine. I think it is an excellent provision. It provides for Federal loans to cover the disposal of the Greenbelt towns and the TVA towns. Other than that the amendments are now identical, so for that reason, Mr. President, rather than to call upon the Senate to vote upon the measure, I am going to ask unanimous consent that the Flanders-Taft amendment be substituted for the 14 McCarthy amendments.

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

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Taft amendment be substituted for the 14 McCarthy amendments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Agreement to the proposal which the Chair has submitted will achieve the result which the Senator seeks.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I still would like to submit my unanimous-consent request. I have a reason for doing so.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator please repeat his request?

Mr. MCCARTHY. I ask unanimous consent to substitute the Flanders-Taft amendment for the 14 McCarthy amendments which were adopted the other day.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is not such a request out of order? The matter before the Senate now is the amendment of the

Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], as amended, to Senate 866. The McCarthy amendments have no standing, except as amendments to Senate 866, now under consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Any unanimous-consent request is in order.

Mr. ELLENDER. I shall have to object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator to tell me why he objects?

Mr. ELLENDER. May I ask why the Senator is insisting on his request? As I have just stated, his amendments have no standing except as amendments to the pending measure. The effect of adopting the pending committee amendments as amended will wipe out the McCarthy amendments in any event, so that his request will accomplish nothing.

Mr. MCCARTHY. It will accomplish a great deal. This morning I received at least 20 telegrams, half of them urging that the McCarthy amendments be accepted and the other half urging that the Taft-Flanders amendment be accepted. One reason why we have had no intelligent housing legislation passed through this body in the past 2 years is that the general public is thoroughly confused as to what we are trying to do. Many Members of the Senate and many Members of the House are thoroughly confused.

Originally there were some substantial, material differences between the amendments which I offered and the amendments offered by the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Vermont. The Senator from Vermont and I have spent a great deal of time going over those differences. We have finally agreed with respect to all of them, with one minor exception.

The Senator from Vermont has agreed to many of the things which I have wanted. I have agreed to some of the things which he has insisted upon. I should like to make it absolutely clear that there is now no major substantial difference between the Taft-Flanders amendments and the ones which were accepted by the Senate last week.

The Senator from Louisiana is asking that the Senate accept the Taft amendment. I am going a step further. I am saying that there is no dispute. I am asking that the Senate do by unanimous consent what the Senator wishes to do by a vote on the Taft amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. Such a procedure is unique, to say the least. The Senator agrees there is no longer any controversy between him and the proponents of the pending committee amendments as amended. Then why not simply adopt the pending amendments, as amended? The Senator states that such a procedure will clear up the issues. I fear that if there is confusion, as he contends, his suggestion will add more confusion.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I cannot conceive of the Senator objecting to my request that we do by unanimous consent what he wishes to do by voting on the Taft amendment. All he would do would be to create confusion in the minds of the

public as to what is in this housing legislation.

We now have two sets of amendments before the Senate, one, the McCarthy amendments, and the other the Flanders-Taft amendments. I believe that the Flanders-Taft amendments now accomplish everything which I wanted to accomplish. I think they go a step further. I freely admit that as of now, the Flanders-Taft amendment is perfected in a better manner than my amendments were. For example, I heartily agree with what the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from Ohio have done in extending loans in the case of the Greenbelt towns or TVA towns.

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

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, at this point I should like to express my satisfaction with the cooperation which the Senator from Wisconsin has given in reaching the large measure of agreement which we have reached in connection with this legislation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection—

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, addressing myself to the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin, I think I know what is in his mind and the minds of other Senators. It is a natural question as to whether the confusion which the Senator from Wisconsin alleges exists in the minds of those in and outside the Capitol would be any less if we were to adopt these amendments by unanimous consent than if we were to follow the usual procedure of a vote. Is that correct?

Mr. MCCARTHY. May I answer the Senator's question?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, what the Senate did several days ago was to agree to amendments to the original bill presented to the Senate on March 10, 1947. It is true, as the Senator from Wisconsin indicates, that the amendments which were agreed to by the Senate several days ago are in line with the amendments incorporated in the Taft amendment. I can see no point in the request made by the distinguished Senator. After all, what is before us now is Senate bill 866. The so-called Taft amendment, as amended, which is the pending amendment, really is in the nature of a substitute for what the Senate did with respect to Senate bill 866 in the past 2 or 3 days.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. President—

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. Is it not a fact that even though unanimous consent were granted and the Taft amendment were substituted for the McCarthy amendments, there would still have to be a vote upon the Taft substitute as amended?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is entirely correct. The granting of the unanimous-consent request would not in the slightest degree change the general situation.

Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wisconsin? The Chair hears none, and the request is granted.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TART], as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the committee amendment, which in effect has been superseded by the amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TART], as amended, will be disagreed to.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I have two perfecting amendments which are necessary.

The first is on page 1, line 5, to strike out "Title I"; and in line 7, to strike out "101" and insert in lieu thereof "2."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. FLANDERS. The second perfecting amendment is to strike out the last sentence of section 2, beginning on page 2, in line 23. That is necessary because the provisions of titles II and III relating to the establishment of the National Housing Commission have already been stricken from the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 866) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to establish a national housing objective and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof, to facilitate sustained progress in the attainment of such objective, and for other purposes."

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to eliminate from the final bill excess commas, quotation marks, and other typographical errors.

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

THE WHEAT CARRY-OVER

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 2158, Calendar 1137.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 2158) to amend the Foreign Aid Act of 1947 and the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1948, so as to eliminate certain provisions of such acts requiring the retention of a specified carry-over of wheat in the United States.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY].

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, 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:

Alken	Bricker	Butler
Baldwin	Bridges	Byrd
Ball	Brooks	Cain
Barkley	Buck	Capehart
Brewster	Bushfield	Capper

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

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

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of Senate bill 2158.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I think it is not necessary to say very much on the pending bill. It seeks to repeal the 150,000,000-bushel carry-over provision inserted in interim-aid legislation last November. I fought the proposal at the time. I think it is unwise and unfair to this segment of American farm economy. It is the first time in the history of the United States that any such legislation has been passed. It is more effective in the control of wheat prices than was OPA itself, and more damaging in its results. While it controls the price of wheat and other commodities which are influenced by the price of wheat, it holds our wheat surplus in the United States and tends to build it up. All the reasons for the original request for this legislation in my opinion have now disappeared. Last November it looked as though we might have a poor winter wheat crop and that there might be a world shortage of wheat, but now the situation has entirely reversed itself.

Europe alone is expected to produce about 500,000,000 bushels more wheat this year than a year ago. Argentina has come through with a larger crop, and now our crop forecast is the second largest in history.

In a letter to the chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee, the State Department stated that there is very dire need of additional food exports to a certain European country.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I think it would be very dangerous at this particular time to remove the inventory control on wheat, in the form proposed by the Senator from North Dakota. At the time we passed the law, by which we restricted the Secretary of Agriculture from exporting below 150,000,000 bushels of wheat as of July 1, 1948. It was then felt to be necessary in order to maintain the security of this country that we always retain that much in the way of a stock pile. I fail to see any change in world conditions since that time to indicate that they have improved to the extent that we could lower the requirement of wheat needed here at home. For that reason I am going to send to the desk on behalf of myself and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] a substitute bill

which would propose to reduce the carry-over to 140,000,000 bushels instead of outright repeal as proposed in S. 2158. I am reluctant even to reduce it by any amount at this time. However, I recognize that there has been some improvement in the crop situation since the time the first bill was passed, and I have made the concession to drop it to 140,000,000 bushels. Even that is lower than I like to go.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I should like to say to the Senator from Delaware I appreciate his willingness to make a reduction, but the difference of 10,000,000 bushels I think would be of no material assistance to the farmers of the United States, or to the countries of Europe. A reduction of 10,000,000 bushels would not be worth while, but if the Senator would agree to reduce it to 100,000,000 bushels, I should be willing to accept that as a substitute.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I could not agree to that proposal. I feel that is entirely too low. Last year I think the carry-over on July 1, was about 100,000,000 bushels, if I remember right. But that is entirely too close to the bottom of the barrel. At that time we were faced with one of the largest wheat crops on record. According to the most recent agricultural report there will be a cut in last year's crop of nearly 200,000,000 bushels, and I feel it would be very dangerous to reduce the carry-over to 100,000,000 bushels as now proposed by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG].

Mr. YOUNG. The European forecast is for about 500,000,000 bushels more. Argentina has, as I pointed out, come through with a larger crop by 60,000,000 bushels. Our wheat forecast is about the second largest in history, and with our greatly increased acreage and new methods of farming and new varieties of wheat and so on, there would be no chance whatever of producing less than our own needs. Last year's carry-over of wheat was actually about 83,000,000 bushels on July 1. To arbitrarily force a greater carry-over now, in the face of a new crop almost certain to be one of the largest in history, might be to legislate into being a tremendous surplus of wheat which would seriously depress wheat prices with consequences disastrous to our farmers. It should, in fairness and as a sound business matter, be eliminated.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I cannot see that an improvement in the European crop to the extent of 500,000,000 bushels would mean we were playing safe if we reduced our own carry-over at this time. Regardless of the favorable European wheat crop report we do not ever want to place the American people in the position of next year having to ask Europe for part of their wheat back.

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

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

Mr. BALDWIN. Apparently when this provision was adopted last year there was in prospect a shortage in the wheat crop, and it will be some time, as I understand, although I know nothing about wheat farming, before another crop is harvested. I am wondering if it is wise to

remove the restriction all at one time. I am wondering whether it would have any effect upon the market. One hundred and fifty million bushels of wheat are to be held as a surplus. What might be the effect of releasing that wheat?

Mr. WILLIAMS. In my opinion, unquestionably it would have an effect on the market to the extent that the market would rise considerably. In fact, I think it is best explained by what took place within a few days after the bill was first introduced. The markets went up to the limit on that particular day. When the bill was reported by the Committee on Agriculture, the markets again went up. So far as I am able to see, there is no question but that repeal today will cause a rise in the commodity markets.

Mr. BALDWIN. If the Senator will yield further, one point made by the proponents of the bill is that there is need of some of this wheat to take care of the emergency situation in Europe. I was wondering if it is desirable to remove this restriction eventually, if it would not be better to remove it piecemeal than to remove it all at once; and there appears to be a compromise by which the Senator from North Dakota says he would be willing, as I understand it, to accept 100,000,000 bushels. The amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware calls for 140,000,000 bushels. I was wondering if there is not some middle ground that might be found on it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I will say, if the Senator from North Dakota would agree to accept my substitute of 120,000,000 bushels, I would so amend it. I do this only because I would rather not gamble on my substitute bill being passed with the result there would be no restrictions left.

Mr. YOUNG. I would accept it with the understanding that my good friend, the poultryman from Delaware, and I, a wheat farmer, get together on our farming and cooperate. In that way, if the Senator would sell me a half interest in his poultry farm in Delaware on a slow note, perhaps we could agree—

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think the Senator from North Dakota owns most of the poultry farms in his State.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I will agree to the Senator's suggestion. I do not think it will have an ill effect on the market if the Commodity Credit Corporation buys its wheat in the orderly manner in which it should buy it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Chair correctly understand that the Senator from Delaware moves to amend the bill on page 3, line 4, by striking out "150,000,000 bushels" and substituting "120,000,000 bushels"?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No, Mr. President. I am advised by the legislative counsel that it cannot be done that way, because the bill as it is now on the desk proposes an outright repeal of all those features. I have a substitute bill, which I should like the clerk to read, and which I have sent to the desk. It strikes out "120" and inserts "140." It is in the form of a substitute bill instead of an amendment to the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the bill in its revised form, using "120" instead of "140."

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

That section 11 (b) of the Foreign Aid Act of 1947 is amended by striking out wherever it appears therein "one hundred and fifty million bushels" and inserting in lieu thereof "one hundred and twenty million bushels."

SEC. 2. The paragraph under the caption "Foreign Aid" in the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1948, is amended—

(a) by striking out "one hundred and fifty million bushels" and inserting in lieu thereof "one hundred and twenty million bushels"; and

(b) by striking out "150,000,000 bushels" and inserting in lieu thereof "120,000,000 bushels."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 2158) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend certain provisions of the Foreign Aid Act of 1947 and the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1948, requiring the retention of a specified carry-over of wheat in the United States."

REVOLVING FUND FOR PURCHASE OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES AND RAW MATERIALS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I now move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1138, Senate bill 2376, to provide a revolving fund for the purchase of agricultural commodities and raw materials to be processed in occupied areas and sold.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 2376) to provide a revolving fund for the purchase of agricultural commodities and raw materials to be processed in occupied areas and sold.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nebraska to proceed with the consideration of Senate bill 2376.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2376) to provide a revolving fund for the purchase of agricultural commodities and raw materials to be processed in occupied areas and sold, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to loan to the Secretary of the Army, at such rates of interest as are necessary to provide full reimbursement to the Treasury, not to exceed in the aggregate outstanding at any time \$150,000,000, to be used by the Secretary of the Army, or his duly authorized representatives, as a revolving fund for the purpose of (a) purchasing natural fibers (including cotton waste) produced in the United States, and

such other materials, including starch, dye-stuff, roller leather, and card clothing as may be used in processing and finishing such fibers; (b) transporting such fibers and other materials to occupied areas, making them available for processing, and having such fibers processed in such areas; (c) insuring such fibers and materials and the products obtained from such processing; and (d) selling products obtained from such processing. In the case of wool, mohair, or flax fiber, only those types and grades shall be purchased hereunder as the Secretary of Agriculture, in the light of supplies on hand in the United States designates as available for export; and stocks held by Commodity Credit Corporation of the types and grades so designated shall be purchased before other purchases are made of such types and grades. For the purpose of this act an occupied area shall be considered as any liberated or occupied area, which is at the time, occupied by United States forces or such an area occupied jointly with another power or powers when it is considered by the Secretary of the Army to be necessary or desirable to include such an area, in order to carry out United States objectives: *Provided*, That a treaty of peace shall not have been ratified and confirmed for such an area.

SEC. 2. Neither the Secretary, nor any duly authorized representative, shall use the fund created by this act for the purchase of any commodity unless, on the date of purchase of such commodity, it appears in his best judgment that within 15 months after such date—

(a) such commodity will be processed, or used in processing operations, in an occupied area; and

(b) so much of the products obtained from such processing will be sold under such terms and for such currencies as will be necessary to cover, in United States dollars, (1) all amounts expended from the fund in connection with such commodity plus (2) an appropriate portion of the interest payable to the Secretary of the Treasury on account of loans made pursuant to this act.

SEC. 3. The proceeds from the sale of products of commodities purchased with moneys from the fund, to the extent of the amounts specified in section 2, shall be returned to the fund.

SEC. 4. Annually after the date of enactment of this act the Secretary of the Army shall make a complete report with respect to the status of the fund. At such time as there shall no longer be any occupied area within the meaning of this act, or at such earlier time as the President or the Congress shall determine that the fund is no longer required for the purposes of this act, the unobligated balance of the fund shall be repaid to the Secretary of the Treasury; and the Secretary of the Army, as expeditiously as possible consistent with orderly liquidation, (a) shall cause to be sold so much of the commodities purchased with moneys from the fund and products thereof which are then on hand as may be necessary to obtain the amount of any balance then remaining owing to the Secretary of the Treasury on account of loans made pursuant to this act, and (b) shall repay such amount to the Secretary of the Treasury.

SEC. 5. Fibers and other materials purchased for processing in any particular occupied area may, if a treaty of peace is ratified and confirmed with respect to such area prior to the processing of such commodities, be processed and sold, or sold, in such manner as the Secretary of the Army may deem to be in the best interest of the United States. If, after purchasing any such commodity with moneys from the fund, it shall appear to the Secretary of the Army that the product of such commodity cannot be sold for as much as the amounts specified in clauses (1) and (2) of section 2 of this act the Secretary of the Army may sell such

product for a lesser amount but, insofar as may be possible, no commodities shall be sold for less than the amounts specified in clauses (1) and (2) of section 2 of this act.

Sec. 6. So much of the commodities purchased with moneys from the fund for processing in any occupied area and so much of the products thereof as are not required to be sold, and so much of the proceeds obtained from the sale of any such commodities or products as is not required to be returned to the fund shall be used and disposed of by the Secretary of the Army, in such manner as he deems fit, for the benefit of the economy of such occupied area.

Sec. 7. In providing for the performance of any of the functions described in section 1 the Secretary of the Army shall to the maximum extent feasible utilize private channels of trade and is hereby authorized to make all necessary rules and regulations for the efficient implementation of the provisions of this act.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the substitute, which is open to further amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Young] to explain the substitute bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from North Dakota is recognized.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, the proposed substitute involves the elimination of hides from the original bill. The original bill provided for the appropriation of \$150,000,000 as a revolving fund to be used for the purchase of wools, cotton, and hides from the occupied areas of Germany, Japan, and Korea. The Committee on Agriculture amended the bill, first, to provide for a loan directly from the Treasury of \$150,000,000 in place of an appropriation, and then it eliminated hides from the operation of the revolving fund. That was done on the insistence of shoe manufacturers and those interested in that industry. I might state, Mr. President, that officials in charge of the Governments of Japan and Germany stated that a fund such as this would permit them to reestablish the industries in Japan and Germany and save \$2 in appropriations next year for every dollar provided in this way now.

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

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. Is it not a fact that by the operation of those industries in the past a net profit of \$10,000,000 a month has been made and that the money has gone into the economy of Japan to reduce by that amount the money we have to appropriate?

Mr. YOUNG. Yes; that is correct. In the opinion of every expert who has been in those countries, unless we provide the raw materials to reestablish those industries we shall have to appropriate more money for years to come.

Mr. EASTLAND. We are presenting a bill which will actually save the Treasury several hundred million dollars.

Mr. YOUNG. I might add, Mr. President, that every dollar of the money is to be returned to the Treasury of the United States. It was the opinion of the committee that all of it would be returned.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the commit-

tee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

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

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. BALL. Do I correctly understand that it would apply to Japan, Germany, Austria, and Korea?

Mr. YOUNG. Primarily to Japan.

Mr. EASTLAND. If the Senator will permit, it applies to all occupied areas. Its principal purpose is to acquire natural fibers, flax, cotton, wool, and mohair for Japan and Korea. Most of the money will be spent there.

Mr. BALL. Are we to purchase wool in the United States and ship it to Japan? I thought there was a shortage of wool.

Mr. EASTLAND. No. The Commodity Credit Corporation has a stock of approximately 200,000,000 pounds of low-grade wool, which is a drug on the market, and the Army will use that for Japanese industry.

Mr. YOUNG. The committee found that we were pretty well tied down to the purchase of surplus wool in the United States.

Mr. BALL. Where in the bill is the language which ties us down?

Mr. YOUNG. I think the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Aiken] can explain it.

Mr. AIKEN. On page 5, line 19, it is provided as follows:

In the case of wool, mohair, or flax fiber, only those types and grades shall be purchased hereunder as the Secretary of Agriculture, in the light of supplies on hand in the United States, designates as available for export, and stocks held by Commodity Credit Corporation of the types and grades so designated shall be purchased before other purchases are made of such types and grades.

That is to make sure that approximately 125,000,000 pounds of wool of a grade which our mills will not use today shall be disposed of before purchases of any other grades are made. It also makes sure that wool which is needed in this country to produce a finer type of textiles will not be sold out of the country, requiring this Nation to purchase wool back from Australia or some other country.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator will remember that the hearings show that the producers and manufacturers in the wool industry in this country favor the passage of this bill.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes. In this country we use either very coarse wool or fine wool. There is a grade in between which our mills will not use, which the Japanese mills are adapted to use, and which the Japanese people and their customers in the East will accept.

Mr. BALL. As I understand, the textile industry in Japan primarily processes cotton. Cotton is not included in the list of fibers which shall be bought only when in surplus.

Mr. AIKEN. Cotton is always in surplus.

Mr. EASTLAND. The textile industry in Japan is not primarily a cotton industry. Japan has the second largest wool-manufacturing industry in the world, and

the proof shows that that tremendous industry spins from 900,000 to 1,000,000 bales a year. They have only 5,000 bales on hand. This is the only source where they can secure the raw material to be used in operating that industry.

Mr. BALL. As I recall, however, one of the complaints of industry in the years just before the war was that Japan was flooding the markets of the world with cotton textiles.

Mr. EASTLAND. An agreement was worked out before the war between the American textile industry and the Japanese, which operated perfectly. So far as the cotton textile industry is concerned, the textile manufacturers of the United States have had a mission in Japan. They came back with the report that the passage of the bill now pending was absolutely essential, and the president of the American Cotton Textile Institute appeared before the committee urging the passage of the bill. He has made several trips to Washington, to my knowledge, working for its passage, the object being to take the Japanese people out of the pockets of the United States.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield further?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. BALL. It is planned to purchase some cotton under the program, I take it.

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes.

Mr. BALL. Why not include cotton in line 19 in the list of fibers which shall be purchased only when the Secretary of Agriculture designates them as available for export? This is a kind of an ERP program for Japan, I take it, and there are tremendous quantities of cotton to be supplied to Europe under the European recovery program. I do not see why the same provision which we apply to wool, mohair, and flax fiber should not apply also to cotton.

Mr. EASTLAND. If the Senator from North Dakota will yield, I will explain that. It is because there is a shortage of those commodities. The United States is a deficit producer of those commodities, while we are a surplus producer of cotton. For that reason the provision in lines 19 to 24 was placed in the bill so that the Army would not be competing with the textile industry of this country for high-grade wool. The cotton textile industry took the position that there was plenty of cotton for itself and for supply to Europe and for the Japanese, and they urged the passage of the bill to permit the Army to go into the cotton market and buy what cotton it desired.

Mr. BALL. Does the Commodity Credit Corporation own any cotton?

Mr. EASTLAND. No.

Mr. BALL. As a matter of fact, then, if we should include cotton along with wool and flax fiber, it would have no effect on the operations under the bill, as the Senator envisages them.

Mr. EASTLAND. No; it would have no effect, but there is utterly no point in putting them in, for the reason that we have a surplus of cotton, and those in this country who consume cotton, our

textile industry, do not favor such a thing.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. I wish to say, in regard to wool, that I agree entirely with what the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] stated. The stock pile which the Commodity Credit Corporation has at present consists largely of low-grade wool, with little or no sale in the United States. As the distinguished Senator pointed out, the United States consumes the fine wools and the very coarse wools produced in this country. Consequently this stock pile has increased, until today it is advisable to get rid of it in some way, by selling it if possible. The pending bill presents an opportunity to do just that, and we feel it very necessary that wool should be included in the bill, so that the present stock pile of wool may be put to use in Japan.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I might add that I understand that at the present time there is a surplus of mohair in this country, which our mills will not use, and that the mohair producers, I believe mostly in Texas, have asked for some relief in marketing their product. The bill would provide such assistance to them, and without cost to the United States, because everyone who testified said there was no question at all that the money would be repaid in full. We also provide that the Treasury shall be reimbursed in full for all interest charges.

We provided for a loan from the Treasury rather than a direct appropriation to the Army, for the reason that the Treasury would then have some supervision over the loan, and would see to it that it was paid back at the proper time.

I think we are as well protected as is possible, both as to the loan and as to the danger of exporting fibers which might be needed in this country, as well as insuring that surplus stocks held in this country which would otherwise be a loss would be disposed of first.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield further?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. BALL. Is the primary purpose of the bill to promote economic recovery chiefly in Japan and Korea, or to take off the market in the United States certain surpluses which have developed?

Mr. YOUNG. I think it would have a twofold effect, but the whole thought originated with our officials in Japan, who are endeavoring to get raw materials for Japan and some manufacturing industries going so the Japanese may be able to earn some money for themselves.

Mr. BALL. Then the object is to promote economic recovery in the occupied areas?

Mr. YOUNG. Yes.

Mr. BALL. What puzzles me is why we are asked to follow this kind of approach in the case of Japan and Korea, as contrasted with our procedure in the case of the occupied zones in Germany and Austria, which are covered under the European recovery program. This is a new approach, putting the Secretary of the Army in the textile business in Japan with a capital of \$150,000,000. We have not followed that procedure in regard to any other industry in any other occupied country. What is the reason for this radically different approach to the problem of economic recovery in Japan as compared with the approach we followed in the case of Germany?

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. It is not a radically different approach. We are not giving the Japanese anything. It might be a radically different approach in one aspect, but this program has been in effect for more than 2 years. Two years ago the Commodity Credit Corporation had large stocks of cotton on hand which it made available for spinning in Japan. That cotton was spun there, and the mills were operated, and, as I stated, a profit of \$10,000,000 a month was realized, which went into the Japanese economy and reduced our cost of occupation by that much. The Commodity Credit Corporation was repaid all that was due it by virtue of that program, which has been very successful. The stocks of the Commodity Credit Corporation, so far as cotton is concerned, are now exhausted.

No funds are appropriated to the Army for the acquisition of cotton. Without such a measure as this, the Army is faced with the prospect of shutting down the textile industry of Japan; and if it does so, then our costs of occupation will be increased by \$10,000,000 or \$15,000,000 a month. The Army is faced with that situation if it does not obtain credit for the supplying of raw materials to Japan.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield for another question?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. BALL. I think it was Dr. Jacobs, of the Cotton Institute, who told me—

Mr. EASTLAND. Dr. Jacobs appeared as a representative of the manufacturers.

Mr. BALL. As I recall, he told me that in Japan there are now on hand stocks in warehouses, I believe he said, amounting to 5,000,000 yards of textiles which they are unable to sell. I wonder whether they are going to sell those textiles. If they cannot sell what is on hand, where are they going to sell what they will process out of the raw materials proposed to be obtained under the credits provided by the bill?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is a fair question, and I am glad the Senator from Minnesota asked it. Since Dr. Jacobs made that statement to the Senator, there has been a sale to Holland of \$26,000,000 worth of textiles. That took care of a good part of the production. The Army has now established a system

to dispose of its textiles. That system has been set up by one of the great textile men of the Nation, a man who was sales manager for the Cannon Mills. He is in charge of the project.

The Commodity Credit Corporation, the Army, those engaged in the cotton business, the cotton mills, all say that there is no doubt that there is a great need for textiles in the world, and that there will be no trouble in disposing of the textiles in question in the Far East. Engagements are being entered into at this time by which the textiles will be furnished to those who are engaged in the production of coconut oil, those who pick coconuts and prepare the copra.

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

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should like to add a thought to what has heretofore been said. The Senator from Minnesota asked why we did this for Japan, and why we did not do it for the European recovery plan in Germany or France or other countries.

Mr. BALL. In Germany.

Mr. MAYBANK. Very well, in Germany. The thought is that Japan has always been a country which manufactured textiles, and that Japan exported those textiles. Germany was not a country which manufactured textiles. France, as the Senator well knows, borrowed from the International Bank certain funds for the purpose of obtaining cotton. But in Japan the manufacture of textiles has been an Army economy since the Army took charge. It has been an Army economy, but it has not been able to sell the goods which are produced in Japan to the Asiatic countries which are dependent on Japan for their goods.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator said they could not sell the goods. They have produced and sold textiles for over 2 years with a very satisfactory arrangement for all parties. The Commodity Credit Corporation has been repaid to the tune of several hundred million dollars for what it has advanced.

Mr. MAYBANK. I said the manufactured goods which the Senator from Mississippi spoke of as being on hand could not be disposed of in these countries without a revolving fund to be used to replace them. A large amount of cotton goods was sold the other day to the Dutch East Indies. Japan is a cotton-consuming nation and a cotton-exporting nation, insofar as the textiles are concerned. The Senator will agree to that statement, will he not?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I may say that I still cannot quite understand why, if they have been operating for 2 years, and have been making ten or fifteen million dollars a month on these textiles, and yet have this tremendous stock of textiles on hand which they cannot sell—and obviously the receipts from their sale could replenish their stock of raw material—we must, if there is a market for the textiles, put up \$150,000,000 to buy raw materials for them.

Mr. EASTLAND. The stock of textiles is not there today. There has been a

sale consummated since the Senator received the information of which he spoke. In the next place, this money has gone into the Japanese economy. We had the choice in Congress of either putting up, I think it was approximately \$300,000,000 in additional appropriations to add to the cost of occupation, or of taking these profits and plowing them back into the economy of the country and reducing the cost of occupation. The latter is what the Army has done.

Mr. BALL. The Senator tells me first that the textile industry has been making \$10,000,000 or \$15,000,000 a month profit.

Mr. EASTLAND. Ten million dollars.

Mr. BALL. Ten million dollars a month profit.

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes.

Mr. BALL. That went back into the Japanese economy.

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes.

Mr. BALL. And our Army was running the economy of Japan.

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes.

Mr. BALL. And instead of setting aside at least part of that to buy raw materials to keep that industry going, they just plowed it all back, and now they wound up with no working fund for buying raw materials, and yet it is proposed to turn this \$150,000,000 business over to the Secretary of the Army to operate.

Mr. EASTLAND. But credits have been furnished heretofore by the Commodity Credit Corporation, and they have been repaid. That has been the source of credit. The organization had some stocks of cotton. All those stocks are exhausted.

Mr. BALL. How much did that credit amount to; does the Senator know?

Mr. EASTLAND. Several hundred million dollars.

Mr. MAYBANK. The stock of cotton sold by the organization was a million bales, I may say.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I should like to make a statement so as to clarify the situation in the minds of Senators. The trouble is that Japan normally, before the war, had about 10,000,000 spindles in the textile industry. Their business has been so built up during the last 2 years through Commodity Credit Corporation funds for the purchase of cotton that somewhat more than 1,000,000 spindles have now come back into use. It is contemplated that it is safe to allow Japan to do a business that will mean the use of two or three million spindles, or about 20 to 25 percent of her former textile industry, without doing any violence to the textile industry of Japan's former enemies.

This industry has been financed through the Commodity Credit Corporation up to date, but the Commodity Credit Corporation, in financing this recovery program, has required that the product be sold for dollars. That means that when the capacity of Japan herself to consume has been reached, and she has to sell to the Dutch East Indies and India, Burma, or China, she may have to take her pay in rubber or crocodile skins or diamonds, or whatever she can obtain

from the countries to whom she sells. The countries must barter between themselves. The bill would require them to barter at a price sufficient to convert the product into dollars to pay back the United States in full.

In the case of Germany, all cotton sent there has been used fully for rehabilitation within the country. But Japan is obliged to export. She will use all the cotton goods she now has on hand within Japan over a period of several months, and can repay the United States in full, but if she sends the goods out of the country, if she exports any of the goods, or increases the number of spindles in use, she must sell for something besides dollars. That means we have got to provide another means of financing that recovery program other than through the Commodity Credit Corporation, and a logical method seemed to be a direct loan from the Treasury, because I am sure the Treasury will see that the money is repaid when it should be repaid.

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

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator from Vermont spoke of further credits from the Commodity Credit Corporation. The Commodity Credit Corporation refuses to extend further credit for the reason that as it says, its funds are trust funds—

Mr. AIKEN. Yes.

Mr. EASTLAND. To be used for agricultural support prices, and that when those funds are diverted for any other purpose they violate the intent of Congress and breach their trust, and therefore they desire to hold those funds for the support of agricultural commodities.

Mr. BALL. Let me get the Commodity Credit Corporation transaction straight in my own mind. As I understand, the Commodity Credit Corporation never extended loans. It never extended credit in that sense. At one time it had bought cotton in support of the price, and was holding the cotton. It sold the cotton to the Japanese textile industry on credit.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct.

Mr. BALL. Does the Senator know what the total of that credit was?

Mr. AIKEN. The total amount has been about \$200,000,000, of which I think \$108,000,000 has been repaid. The remainder is being repaid as rapidly as the goods can be disposed of. The Commodity Credit Corporation has really been purchasing cotton for the Army. It is the purchasing agent for the armed services. It has been using its money to the extent of \$200,000,000 for this purpose, and more than half of it has been repaid up to the present time.

Mr. BALL. The practical effect of this situation is that for a couple of years the Commodity Credit Corporation has been extending credit which formed working capital for the Japanese textile industry. It has now reached the point where it can no longer do so under its charter. This is a proposal for a direct loan from the Treasury to the Secretary of the Army, to provide working capital to the Japanese textile industry.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct. The reason is that it will permit Japan to sell outside the Japanese area cotton goods which she manufactures.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, for the past 2 years the Commodity Credit Corporation has used the cotton which it received under loans to finance these operations, to be refunded in dollars. That cotton is gone. There is no more cotton left under loan. It has all been shipped away. The proposed fund of \$150,000,000 would make it possible for the Army to buy cotton to ship to Japan to be sold. As the Senator from Vermont ably stated, under that arrangement foreign currencies would be convertible into dollars. The Commodity Credit Corporation is not allowed to do that. Japanese cotton goods must now be sold in the sterling areas.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, we have two choices. The first is to pass this bill and make this credit available. The second is to shut down the textile industry of Japan. We must do one or the other. If that textile industry, which represents 65 percent of the entire industrial production of Japan today, is shut down, then we must appropriate millions of dollars through the Army.

Mr. BALL. Can the Senator tell me about what proportion of the working capital will be spent for cotton fiber, and what proportion for other fibers?

Mr. EASTLAND. That will depend upon the sale of the commodities. They are not going to buy any cotton until they can sell it.

Mr. BALL. What is the past history? What is the status of the industry in Japan? About what proportion of cotton is used?

Mr. EASTLAND. There is no past history as to wool, because the wool industry was destroyed during the war, and only a few spindles have been operated. Wool was acquired from Australia under a barter agreement. Now those factories have been renovated, and the Japanese are able to engage in the manufacture of wool in a modest way, just as they are able to engage in the manufacture of cotton today only in a modest way.

Mr. BALL. I take it from what the Senator says that the bulk of the working capital for the first year or two will go for the purchase of cotton.

Mr. EASTLAND. No; I did not say that at all.

Mr. BALL. The Senator stated that only a relatively few spindles were in operation so far as wool was concerned.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator misunderstood me. I said that there was no wool history, because those factories were destroyed by bombing during the war. They have now been repaired, and today the Japanese can spin wool in a modest way if they secure this credit, as they can spin cotton in a modest way.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I may be able to add a little information on the question. When representatives of the Army presented the question to the committee they explained the need of raw materials from the United States, in order to operate the woolen mills in the

same manner that the cotton mills are operated.

The other question which the committee considered at the time was the prospect that unless, to some extent, the economy of Japan was reestablished, we would have to continue to appropriate funds through the Army for the general recovery of Japan. In the event this \$150,000,000 were made available, we would get the benefit through the purchase of cotton and wool in America, rather than having our money appropriated through the Army for assistance to the Japanese economy. In the latter event Japan would acquire not only wool, but cotton, elsewhere in the world. In reality, our dollars would be financing that business transaction. It seemed better business for us to make a loan which would enable the Japanese economy to purchase not only wool, but cotton, from us, and which would permit a speedier recovery of Japan and a lessening of the actual outright appropriations we would have to make to the Army in support of Japan.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] to section 2 (b) of the pending measure, reading as follows:

SEC. 2. Neither the Secretary nor any duly authorized representative, shall use the fund created by this act for the purchase of any commodity unless, on the date of purchase of such commodity, it appears in his best judgment that within 15 months after such date—

(b) so much of the products obtained from such processing will be sold under such terms and for such currencies as will be necessary to cover, in United States dollars, (1) all amounts expended from the fund in connection with such commodity plus (2) an appropriate portion of the interest payable to the Secretary of the Treasury on account of loans made pursuant to this act.

The purpose of that section, as will be noted, is to permit the sale of the commodities manufactured for such currencies which can later be converted into American dollars, so as to cover the amount expended for the purchase of raw materials. As the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. Aiken] pointed out a few moments ago, what is causing difficulty in disposing of the goods now on hand in Japan is the fact that the commodities must be sold for dollars under the terms agreed upon with the Commodity Credit Corporation. Because of that situation, the sale of such commodities has been delayed. Such a situation will not prevail as to goods manufactured from raw materials acquired under the pending measure.

I am hopeful that the bill will pass without further delay.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill (S. 2376) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF SURPLUS PROPERTY ACT OF 1944

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consider-

ation of House bill 2239, Calendar No. 895.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be read by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 2239) to amend section 13 (a) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from North Dakota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments with amendments.

Mr. FERGUSON obtained the floor.

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

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

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from West Virginia submits an amendment which cannot be considered until after the committee amendments are disposed of, unless the Senator's amendment is an amendment to a committee amendment.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I think it proper to consider my amendment after the committee amendments have been disposed of.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment will lie on the table.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the pending bill, which would amend section 13 (a) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, reads as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 13 (a) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, is hereby amended by inserting a new paragraph as follows:

"(3) Surplus property certified by the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Air Force, as the case may be, as being suitable and needed for use in training and maintaining any civilian component of the armed forces under his jurisdiction may be disposed of to States, their political subdivisions or tax-supported instrumentalities, subject to such terms and conditions as the Administrator determines to be necessary to properly protect the interests of the United States. Such disposals shall be without monetary consideration: *Provided*, That the Government shall be reimbursed for such costs incident to the disposal of the property as the Administrator may deem proper, including the expense of removal of any machinery, equipment, or personal property not transferred as a part of such disposal."

The present law allows certain transfers from the War Assets Administration to governmental bodies for the purpose of health or educational facilities. It was discovered that civilian components of the Army could not qualify as such institutions. At the present time National Guard organizations in the respective States are in need of certain property. That is also true of the Reserve Corps. This bill would enable National Guard organizations or Reserve Corps organizations or civilian components of the Army to obtain property without necessarily paying the consid-

eration which private agencies would be compelled to pay.

I think it is well to say that it is essential to build up the National Guard and the Reserve. It seems a waste of funds to require those agencies to purchase property for their needs when the Federal Government, which is later to use those facilities, has a surplus on hand.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The committee amendments will be stated.

The first amendment of the committee was, on page 1, in line 3, after the word "That", to strike out "paragraph (1) of."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in line 5, after the word "new", to strike out "section to be known as paragraph 13 (a) (3)", and insert "paragraph as follows":

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in line 7, after the word "property", to strike out "available and suitable", and insert "certified by the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Air Force, as the case may be, as being suitable and needed."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, in line 2, after the word "forces", to insert "under his jurisdiction."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That completes the committee amendments.

The bill is open to further amendment, and the amendment submitted by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, in line 12, after the word "disposal", it is proposed to insert "*Provided, however*, That the surplus lands in Mason County, W. Va., are hereby excepted from the operation of this act."

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I think it appropriate to make a statement for the RECORD in regard to the amendment I have offered and which has just been read to the Senate.

A rather unusual situation exists in Mason County, W. Va., with respect to some surplus lands. I call attention to the fact that in the amendment the word "lands" is used, and no other kind of property there would be exempted.

During the war the Government purchased some 8,000 acres of land in that county, and there was erected a plant for the manufacture of explosives. It was known as the West Virginia Ordnance Works, and it was operated for the Government.

At the close of actual hostilities the War Department no longer needed the property and declared it surplus. Some of that property has been taken by the State, under its priority, and has been used as an experimental farming area. Another portion has been taken by the National Guard. I may say that I aided the National Guard all I could in helping it obtain a part of this property, and it now has the part that it desires.

There are some several thousand acres remaining. The people of the locality have been active in efforts to bring industrial plants into the area. Today there is high promise that that will be done. Transactions are under way which

will bring industrial plants into the Mason County section.

In order that that progress may not be interfered with, I have offered the amendment. I have talked with the author of the bill, and he has very kindly and considerably agreed to the amendment. But I felt I should make the explanation to the Senate and that I should further show, if I may, so that it may be understood, that there is no conflict in this case with the National Guard of my State. Therefore, I shall read from a letter from Gen. Charles R. Fox, adjutant general and head of the National Guard of West Virginia, under date of March 13, 1948, directed to me. He says:

I understand and appreciate your concern in the West Virginia Ordnance Works.

By that he means this ground—

But I assure you that even if the bill is passed we will not request any real estate at the West Virginia Ordnance Works which would interfere with the sale to an industry. I fully realize the need of additional employment in Mason County and will cooperate with you fully in your objectives.

I urge you to reconsider your objections to H. R. 2239 and to support its passage.

Mr. President, I wish to state that my sole concern is based upon the interests of the people of that county, who have conferred with me, and I wish to state that there is need for places of employment at that point.

Therefore, I ask that the amendment be adopted.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, inasmuch as this amendment applies to only one county in the State of West Virginia, the Senator from Michigan sees no objection to the amendment. If adopted, it would not interfere with the general purpose of the bill, which is applicable to all the States of the Union.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Are there further amendments to be offered to the bill? If none, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and 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 and passed.

FEDERAL CHARTER FOR COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1322, providing a Federal charter for the Commodity Credit Corporation. The bill is Calendar No. 1064.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from North Dakota.

TEMPORARY RETENTION OF GERMAN PAINTINGS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, on April 2, I introduced a bill providing for the temporary retention in this country of the German paintings now on exhibit at the National Gallery of Art.

This bill simply provides for their retention in this country until a government is recognized in Germany, and I believe that will be in conformity with the policy announced some 3 years ago by the President. The bill expressly recognizes the title of the Germans to these paintings. The principal purpose of the bill is to provide for the safety of the paintings until such a government is recognized. The bill also provides, purely as a permissive matter, that these paintings may be exhibited in this country under the supervision of the trustees of the National Gallery of Art.

A subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee held a hearing on this bill on April 16, under the chairmanship of the able Senator from Oregon. At the hearing, representatives of the Army, the State Department—represented by General Saltzman—the National Gallery, the Metropolitan Museum, the St. Louis Art Museum, the Art Digest, and several other groups appeared. It was an excellent hearing, and all present, except the representatives of the Army, favored the bill.

On April 13, before that hearing, the chairman of the Armed Services Committee of the Senate wrote to the Secretary of the Army, the Honorable Kenneth C. Royall. I wish to read a part of that letter, to indicate its principal point. I need not burden the Record with all of the letter. This letter is signed by the chairman of the committee, and it reads in part as follows:

In view of the fact that the committee may not be able to reach a final decision previous to the termination of the present exhibition at the National Gallery of Art, and because of the great public interest shown in these paintings, it may be that you will wish to arrange for an extension of the present showing until such time as the committee can make its final decision on the matter.

Further, it is the committee's feeling that the present date set by the Army for the return of these pictures to Germany should be canceled, and that no substitute date should be announced until such time as the legislation has been finally acted upon.

I call particular attention, Mr. President, to the last paragraph of the letter which I have just read.

In response to that letter, on April 17, the Secretary of the Army addressed a letter to the Honorable CHAN GURNEY, chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee. The letter is rather long, but the last paragraph relates to the point I wish to bring out. He says:

However, in response to your request and to give your committee opportunity for further consideration of this matter, I have asked the National Gallery to continue its exhibit for another week, after which I am firmly of the opinion that the pictures should be returned to Germany.

Mr. President, in view of the nationwide interest in these paintings and the strong letter from the Chairman of the Committee requesting a delay by the Army in the return of the paintings to Germany, I am astonished at the reply which has been made by the Secretary of the Army. To my mind, this answer to a reasonable request by the Senate committee evidences a lack of respect for the

Senate. The Army knows very well that the Senate cannot possibly reach a decision on this matter by next Monday. The Armed Services certainly have not been able to act very quickly in their own re-formation, and I am sure they do not believe that the Senate can act on this matter before next week.

This letter of the Army is, I fear, only typical of an arrogance which all too often characterizes the attitude of the military toward the democratic process and toward the Congress. Apparently the purpose of the Army is to foreclose action by the Congress in this matter. The reasons given by the Army, which apparently are those of General Clay, seem to me to pertain to matters which are not strictly within the purview of the Army. Such matters should be decided by the State Department or by the Congress. I might say the State Department ought to be consulted, and particularly that division of the State Department concerned with our public relations. I refer to the Assistant Secretary, Mr. George Allen. Throughout the dealing with these pictures, the Army has treated the matter as a restricted one, being very careful, until very recently, to keep from the public and from the press what their purpose was. I wish to quote from a hearing on March 4, conducted by a subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee of the Senate, at which only one witness appeared; that is, the Army's witness, Colonel Riggs. The result of that hearing was that the chairman of the subcommittee agreed that the ownership of the paintings was settled by our agreement under the Hague convention concerning articles which may be considered loot or booty of war. In the hearing on March 4 there is one sentence, on page 7 of the transcript, which I think shows fairly clear what the attitude of the Army has been. I want to quote that sentence:

The basic reason for close guarding of the secret has been to prevent conjecture and debate in the press before the position of the Government could be entirely confirmed.

In other words, throughout the handling of the paintings up until the time of the exhibition, which was a little over a month ago, the Army very carefully kept from the public any notice of their plans or any announcement of them. That is one reason why we have had no opportunity to pass upon the subject or to consider it in the Senate.

The pictures have been in storage in the National Gallery of Art for 3 years, and during that period they were not permitted to be exhibited, although I am informed that such institutions as the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, had requested them. In view of that long sojourn in the museum, the unseemly haste with which they must move now, as the letter from the Secretary of the Army indicates, seems to me quite unreasonable, and I think the very least the Army can do is to give the Senate an opportunity to consider the matter and to pass upon it.

I am not so concerned today with what the ultimate decision of the Senate may be, as I am that the Senate may not be foreclosed from passing upon the ques-

tion. I think the least to be expected is that we shall have an opportunity to pass on it. If the committee decides that the paintings must be returned now, I shall be perfectly content with the decision. If, on the other hand, it decides that the matter should be presented to the Senate for decision, I certainly think that ought to be done, and that the Army ought not to foreclose that decision by shipping the paintings back to Germany before we have had an opportunity of passing upon the subject.

I submit to the Senate that this attitude of the Army, in its insistence upon sending these very valuable paintings back before there is an opportunity of passing upon the matter, is unwarranted and unjustified. I hope the Members of the Senate who have been interested in the matter—and I know many of them have been—will take time to consider the matter, and, if they can, give their advice to the Army on the subject. It is a peculiar situation because under the jurisdiction of the Army, which they acquired when they found these paintings in a salt mine in Germany, they seem to have the authority to do with them as they please, in the absence of an act by Congress.

The Army is not subject to criticism for having acquired the art treasures; that came about in the natural course of events in the war. But I think they are subject to criticism for apparently being unwilling to have the Congress consider the matter at all. I hope the Committee on the Armed Services will be able to proceed as rapidly as possible to a decision on this matter.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had insisted upon its amendments to the bill (S. 2195) to amend and extend the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, approved December 2, 1941, as amended, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. O'HARA, Mr. McMAHON, Mr. ALLEN of California, Mr. HARRIS, and Mr. ABERNETHY were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 188) authorizing the Clerk of the House in the enrollment of the bill (H. R. 5328) to amend paragraph 1803 (2) of the Tariff Act of 1930, relating to firewood and other woods, to make certain corrections, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

FORT SUMTER NATIONAL MONUMENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 94) to establish the Fort Sumter National Monument in the State of North Carolina, which was, on page 1, line 3, to strike out "Secretary

of War" and insert "Secretary of the Army."

Mr. BUTLER. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

Mr. BREWSTER obtained the floor.

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

Mr. BREWSTER. I should like to defer yielding at this time.

Mr. MYERS. I may say to the Senator it would only take me a few moments.

Mr. BREWSTER. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act will expire in 2 months unless the Congress takes prompt action to extend this measure, which today—as it has been since its original enactment—is a keystone in our foreign policy and in our determination to achieve a decent world in which free nations can exist.

There is no doubt in my mind that we face the most bitter fight in the Congress in the enactment of the necessary legislation to continue this program. The opposition, I say flatly, is based almost entirely on misconception and distortion of fact. It is, however, exceedingly vocal and exceedingly well financed.

In 1946 an effort was made, which nearly succeeded, to sabotage this program and kill it. We managed to muster enough votes to keep it going. In 1947, the opposition renewed the drive to cripple or end reciprocal trade agreements, but, fortunately, the influence of the chairmen of two of our committees, the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Finance, was sufficient to hold off the attack. As the time approaches for a decision this attack is getting under way again. The Senate cannot act on the matter until the House has acted. Influence must be brought to bear on the responsible leadership of the House for prompt action. The matter dare not be left to the last-minute rush and chaos of adjournment or recess prior to the Republican National Convention in June, but it should be settled now, as soon as possible, in an atmosphere of at least comparative calm such as we shall not have in the closing minutes or days of the session.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a telegram I received recently from a prominent and outstanding Philadelphian, Mr. William Batt, president of SKF Industries, Inc., and a valuable wartime Government production executive, who says that extension of the present Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act is of the most vital importance to the export and import trade of the United States.

I therefore ask that Mr. Batt's telegram be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

PHILADELPHIA, PA., April 15, 1948.

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

The extension of the present reciprocal Trade Agreements Act seems to us to be of the most vital importance to the export-import trade of the United States. This company is keenly concerned that the Congress shall act affirmatively on this matter before the expiration date. Duties on our production have been cut each time but steadily increasing costs abroad give us no fear of any substantial importation that would seriously hurt us. We think the safety measures provided will insure against material damage to American industry. Hope you will support this program.

W. L. BATT.

FEDERAL CHARTER FOR COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I understand the pending question is on agreeing to the motion to take up Senate bill 1322, providing a Federal charter for the Commodity Credit Corporation. Two or three Members of the Senate have approached me, suggesting there has been an agreement not to vote on this bill until Monday. I reported the bill to the floor, and I understood I was to have charge of it. Nobody has approached me in regard to any agreement. I should like to inquire whether there is such an agreement, and, if so, when it was entered into, and what brought it about.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair has no knowledge whatever of such an agreement. The question pending before the Senate is whether the Senate shall proceed to the consideration of the bill. Consideration of the motion has been temporarily suspended to make way for a privileged matter, the laying down of a message from the House of Representatives.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Chair. That had been my understanding.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question now is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from North Dakota to proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1322. The Chair again recognizes the Senator from Maine.

CLARIFICATION OF PALESTINE SITUATION

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, it has seemed the appropriate time today to clarify the situation in the minds of the Senate and, I believe, of the country, as to the precise position which we occupy with regard to the problem of Palestine, which is now having attention at Lake Success. As a text for a possible discussion of the problem I wish to quote from the statement of our Ambassador at the United Nations, the Honorable Warren Austin, formerly a Member of this body, in the speech which he made before the United Nations General Assembly yesterday before the Political and Security Committee, dealing with the problem. I quote one paragraph of that statement, in which Mr. Austin said:

The United States has raised with certain other governments the question of joint responsibility for the security of a temporary

trusteeship. These discussions have thus far produced no tangible result. The United States is willing to undertake its share of responsibility for the provision of police forces which are required during a truce and a temporary trusteeship, along with other members who may be selected by the General Assembly and who are willing to carry out such a task in accordance with the will of the Assembly and with the provisions of the Charter.

That is the end of the quotation from the speech of our Ambassador.

In prior consideration of this subject it had been rather generally understood that the provision of police or military forces would require further implementation by action of the Congress. So there was considerable inquiry, when this statement appeared, as to whether there existed authority for the supplying of forces for such a purpose under existing law, and also whether such a procedure had been a matter of consultation with Members of the Senate, since, at the same time, from what appeared to be authoritative sources, there appeared reports in the public press yesterday and today that consultation regarding this matter had proceeded with certain Senators and Members of the other House. The matter is of such transcendent public importance that it would seem desirable to clarify the atmosphere and the understanding as to whether our procedure in connection with Palestine at the Security Council and the General Assembly in recent weeks had been a subject that had been considered by any competent Members of the Senate, and to what extent any discussion or understanding had been arrived at, and as to what extent they might in future affect the consideration of the matter by the Congress of the United States and the people.

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

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. IVES. Is it the Senator's understanding that Ambassador Austin is the one who made the statement regarding the overtures, or consultation, or whatever it was that is presumed to have occurred?

Mr. BREWSTER. This is a statement in the New York Times of Wednesday, April 21. On page 20 there is what purports to be an excerpt from the address of Ambassador Austin before the General Assembly Political and Security Committee yesterday.

Mr. IVES. I tried to listen as attentively as possible to the reading of the excerpt, but I did not gather from its reading that Ambassador Austin himself had made such overtures. He simply made the broad statement, did he not?

Mr. BREWSTER. The precise statement was as follows:

The United States has raised with certain other governments the question of joint responsibility for the security of a temporary trusteeship. These discussions have thus far produced no tangible result.

Then he says:

The United States is willing to undertake its share of responsibility for the provision of police forces which are required during a truce and a temporary trusteeship, along with other members who may be selected by

the General Assembly and who are willing to carry out such a task in accordance with the provisions of the Charter.

I had understood from the newspapers that this had been a matter of consultation with some Members of the Senate.

Mr. IVES. That is what I wanted to have cleared up. That does not appear in the statement of Ambassador Austin. I read that also in the newspapers.

Mr. BREWSTER. It seems to me, and I think, to other Members of this body, that whether there had been discussions of the matter with those who are primarily charged with the responsibility for advice to this body upon questions of foreign policy would be of very great interest and of much significance. I earlier mentioned the matter to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and I believe that a statement of some character dealing with the subject, to indicate both to what extent consultations may have proceeded so far as the Senate is concerned and to what extent there might be authority for a commitment of this character, would be within the purview of the undertakings which I believe we entered into with the United Nations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. With the indulgence of the Senate, if the Senator from Michigan may speak from the chair, he considers the question entirely appropriate. The answer is that so far as the Senator from Michigan is concerned, while there have been occasional, casual conversations of one sort or another, and while the Secretary of State made a statement to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee one day in connection with a general discussion of foreign affairs, there has never been anything approximating, so far as the Senator from Michigan is concerned, what might be called a consultation on any phase of the subject. There have never been any concrete proposals submitted to him for his advice or approval, and there have been no relationships of that character whatsoever, either here or with the delegate in New York.

Mr. BREWSTER. I am sure that that statement will be very gratefully received as contributing to a clarification of our understanding.

Would it be proper to inquire further as to whether the earlier position of this country last November, in supporting the so-called plan of partition with economic union, was a matter which required or received consultation?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It was not a matter of consultation, although the Senator from Michigan was clearly known to favor viable partition as the best basis of settlement. The Senator from Michigan would like to add to what he said, so that there may be no possible misunderstanding, that he has received mimeographed copies of addresses made by the Ambassador from the United States to the United Nations, but he scarcely considers that to be a consultation.

Mr. BREWSTER. I am sure that would not be so considered. Is it a proper query—and I venture now into the realm of consultation as to the scope

of the United Nations Charter—as to whether there is any question regarding the necessity of congressional action in order to supply police forces or military forces, so far as action under the United Nations is concerned? I am now distinguishing between action which might take place to protect American lives or property unilaterally under our authority, and the question of whether under the United Nations Charter there would be Executive authority for supplying police or military forces for any purpose under the United Nations without further congressional action.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Ives in the chair). Does the Senator from Maine yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator from Michigan is unable to answer the question conclusively, because it is in that borderland area of twilight zone Presidential authority which has been a subject of controversy for nearly 150 years.

As the Senator knows, there have been something like 125 occasions when the President of the United States has used the armed forces of the United States externally without consultation with Congress, under his general constitutional authority as Commander in Chief, which I assume relates to his responsibility for American life and property and national interest. Some of those instances have been challenged, although the President has substantial latitudes according to many constitutional lawyers. As I recall at the moment, in the matter of the use of the armed forces at Veracruz, President Wilson ultimately decided that he voluntarily would come to Congress and seek validation of the decisions he had made in that aspect.

Mr. BREWSTER. Is it a fact that in that instance, while the Senate was debating the question of whether or not intervention should be authorized, directions did go to our Navy to take action at Veracruz? That is my recollection of the episode.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am not sufficiently familiar in my memory with the detailed record to answer categorically, and I would not want to answer otherwise.

Coming down, then, to the Senator's present question, I suppose we still confront the same old argument as to the latitudes within which the President can operate under his Presidential responsibility to protect American life and property and to protect the American interest under his responsibility as Commander in Chief. Beyond that I think he would require the consent of Congress to use the armed forces of the United States for any external purpose.

Mr. BREWSTER. To what extent was that question discussed or clarified in connection with the ratification of the United Nations Charter? It seems to me the matter did receive considerable attention, and I was under the impression—perhaps erroneously—that it was

generally considered that further congressional action would be taken to implement any provision for the use of force under the Charter.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator will recall that there is a section of the Charter in respect to the armed forces which has never been implemented.

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is the section of the Charter which contemplated agreements between the member nations of the United Nations and the Security Council, identifying specific quotas of the armed forces which should be held available by each member nation for the ultimate use of the Security Council.

The Senator will recall that it was provided in the Charter that any such agreements, before they became effective, had to be approved by constitutional processes. Therefore, if there were any such force in existence, it would be the result of constitutionally approved agreements, so far as we were concerned.

As the Senator knows, the Security Council has never been able to come to an agreement on the subject because of the intransigence of the Soviet Union and its satellites. Therefore, there is no such force. Therefore, there have been no such agreements. Therefore, there has been no constitutional action on the part of the American Congress in respect to the subject.

If there had been such constitutional action in respect to an armed American contingent identified for the use of the United Nations under the terms of the Charter, I think again an argument might be made that that particular force having been set aside, with the approval of Congress, for the use of the Security Council of the United Nations, the President could commit it without further congressional action. But that situation has not occurred, and I am reciting the matter solely in order to be responsive to the Senator's inquiry as to whether or not it was not contemplated that there might be some armed force available exclusively under the jurisdiction of the President of the United States. I think there was such a contemplation. Indeed, my recollection is, as I think further on the matter, that our own United Nations Participation Act spells out the authority of the President in respect to armed forces thus identified in a ratified agreement. But obviously there is none at the present time, because that particular machinery had never been set up, and no such agreement has ever been made.

Mr. BREWSTER. Is that possibly what Ambassador Austin referred to in the concluding line, "who are willing to carry out such a task in accordance with the will of the Assembly and with the provisions of the Charter"?

Under the statement of the Senator from Michigan, just made, the provisions of the Charter contemplating this United Nations police force did contemplate also the constitutional implementation of that force by the actions of the respective governments.

Mr. VANDENBERG. In the first instance—

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Leaving open the question whether, after it was constituted, there was not a fluxing power in the hands of the President either to act or not to act, depending upon the point of view, without further congressional action.

Mr. BREWSTER. But we do not need to consider crossing the second bridge, since we have not even approached the first bridge.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is correct, and that is what I am trying to make plain.

Mr. BREWSTER. So that the provisions of the Charter might well, within the contemplation of the Ambassador, mean that the question would have to be submitted to the Congress. I trust that is the construction; but perhaps we cannot be assured.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Obviously I would not undertake to state what was in the Ambassador's mind when he made the statement to which the Senator refers, because I have no information about it. Nor would I undertake to speak for the President or the State Department in respect to their attitudes in this matter, because I have had no consultations with them on this subject. I can simply say to the Senator that we are right where we started in this colloquy, so far as the Senator from Michigan is concerned.

There is a general constitutional power resident in the President of the United States as commander in chief which has been exercised a hundred or a hundred and twenty-five times in the last 150 years, to use the armed forces of the United States externally for the protection of American life and property and the national interest without the direct license and direction of the Congress of the United States. Therefore there is some such authority resident in the President of the United States. It is an authority, I repeat, which I think is without any specific boundaries. I think it is an authority which has always been the subject of more or less difference of opinion and controversy. I think it still rests in the twilight zone, and that is the only authority I know of touching the situation to which the Senator from Maine refers.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I should like to incorporate certain statements in the Record at this point, following the statement made by the Senator from Michigan, for which I am very grateful, and I believe many other Members of the Congress, and the country, will welcome this statement as assisting in some degree to clarify the problem. I wish to quote from the statements of Sir Carl Berendsen, the representative of New Zealand, and Mr. Hood, the representative of Australia, on the somewhat anomalous situation with which we are confronted. I quote from the New York Times of Wednesday, April 21, in which issue it comments on the Palestine problem, and the decision last November to support partition, and the present somewhat anomalous situation that is presented. I quote now from the speech of Sir Carl Berendsen:

The problem, I repeat, was susceptible of no perfect solution. But if there were in

this room any who believed that the partition of Palestine could be accomplished peacefully and with good will on all sides and without enforcement, then I must say that that is a degree of naivete which did them little credit.

That is a comment, apparently, upon the position assumed by the representative of the United States, and it is a matter of profound regret when as thoughtful a student of affairs as Sir Carl Berendsen, representing New Zealand, speaking the sentiments of many of the countries of the world, is obliged to make such a statement. He said further:

I say to you not only that these abominable incidents should have been foreseen and prevented, but that to put them forward as a reason for abandoning the decision arrived at after most careful and anxious consideration only a few months ago seems to the New Zealand delegation to be a most fantastic distortion of logical thought.

I say again it is regrettable when the action of this country must be characterized in such terms by as considered a statesman as Sir Carl Berendsen.

Mr. Hood, the Australian representative, followed in the discussion. He said:

The resolution of November last can certainly not, to say the least, be lightly deferred. For our part, the Australian delegation cannot see why thought should be given to determine it at all except for reasons equally valid in justice and in objectivity, if they exist as those which shaped the decision of the last General Assembly.

To the whole complex of facts comprised in the Palestine question, there has now been added, since last year, this further and momentous one—that the authority and credit of the United Nations is now committed in the sense of last year's resolution. This is not something with which we can afford to play fast and loose. For its own sake and for the sake of the interests of all members of the organization in other matters at issue internationally, it need not be said that to maintain and protect this authority and moral standing is of vital importance.

The fighting and bloodshed which has occurred in Palestine this last year are deplorable, yet let it be recalled that the question of Palestine was deferred to the United Nations by the United Kingdom Government precisely because it had not been found possible to secure Jewish-Arab agreement. The disagreement between the two parties was therefore one of the main questions before the United Nations. It was well realized in the debates of last year that certain aspects of the partition plan would be resisted by one party or the other, and it was exactly for that reason that provision was made in the plan both for the establishment of Arab and Jewish militia forces in Palestine, and also for reference to the Security Council.

In our view, all the circumstances referred to in the commission's report, so far as they come before this Assembly, should be considered from the standpoint of the maintenance of the Assembly resolution and not from that of hasty and ill-considered thoughts of its deferment or even reversal.

Mr. President, this raises the question of our policy. This is not perhaps the appropriate time nor is this possibly the forum for discussion of that subject, but in the light of all that has transpired and all that is implicit in the Palestine

problem, which we thought last November had been solved by the determination upon partition under the leadership of the United States, it is, I think, a matter of profound regret that this reversal of policy has occurred, which has been characterized by these representatives of two of the British Dominions, who are certainly not prejudiced regarding its consideration in such language as they have used.

The refusal also as to the embargo of arms and of men is a matter of considerable concern. Some time ago I pointed out the apparently very tenuous legal base upon which the existing embargo regulations had been issued, lacking a declaration by the President as to the authority for the act, under the citations which I placed in the *Record* at that time.

I called attention as long ago as December 1 last, immediately following the decision of the United Nations in the General Assembly, to the immediate necessity of recruiting a volunteer force which should be available for the United States in case there should be any call for a force to implement the decisions of the United Nations, either in Palestine or elsewhere.

It is, in my judgment, profoundly regrettable that no such force has been recruited. It is easily possible, within the limits of existing law, for the Executive to have taken action that there should be one of our divisions composed of men who had voluntarily given their service with the understanding that they might be used to implement the action of the United Nations.

So far as Palestine is concerned, there has been the voluntary effort of many thousands of our young men in America who have indicated their readiness to participate. Why no action of any character has been taken by the Executive to implement that voluntary effort is to me a matter of regret, particularly as historically this country came into being as the result of the voluntary aid of other lovers of liberty from other lands. Lafayette, Kosciusko, and Von Steuben are names still with which to conjure, the statues of whom are in Lafayette Square opposite the White House, bearing enduring testimony to the character of assistance which came to us in our great hour of need when our own Nation was experiencing the throes of birth.

More recently we remember the Lafayette Escadrille. We remember the thousands of young men who volunteered in the First World War before we were participants, who without let or hindrance went across the border and enlisted to help other nations that were in peril.

We remember the Flying Tigers of the more recent war who went over to China. We remember the shipment of arms and of munitions and of fighting planes in order to assist in the fight, and of men relieved from our own armed services in order to participate. All this has been the effort of an America which desired to help the cause of freedom everywhere.

The birth of a republic in Palestine has an authenticity which has never been possessed by any other people in the world who have bespoken their free-

dom by their own effort. When we declared our independence we did not have the sanction of a United Nations of the world in a resolution approved by two-thirds of them. Yet now, although the resolution was adopted by the overwhelming majority of all the nations composing the United Nations and of peoples of the world outside the Moslem countries, for the first time we see the inauguration of an embargo upon munitions, and upon the participation of our young men, in violation of the precedent of almost a century and a half, and with glittering exceptions to the rule which has always hitherto prevailed. This is the reason why there seems to be increasing concern over the policies which we are pursuing.

There is a very great desire on the part of the American people, in my judgment, for a clarification of a policy or for the justification of a reversal of a course which had seemed last November as the most practical solution of this long-studied problem. A solution was arrived at after 17 commissions had considered it, after the Anglo-American Commission had considered it, after the United Nations, composed of many countries, had considered it, and arrived at that decision as the most practical solution—partition with economic union.

Why we should now be thrown back to this chaos and confusion is a matter which must be answered at the judgment tables of the world.

I conclude with the statement of the Australian delegation:

The Australian delegation at this Assembly will consider every proposal that may be brought forward on its merits. In doing so we shall form our opinion on what is just and in accordance with the principles of the Charter, and not on grounds, expressed or implied, of strategical expediency or of power politics and groupings outside the spirit and procedures of the United Nations. We will support, and hope to be supported by, all others who are similarly interested in cooperating to secure a fair settlement of this difficult problem and in upholding the authority of the United Nations.

The Australian delegation reserves its right to introduce a resolution accordingly at the proper time.

Speaking in the presence of the one who, perhaps as much as any other single individual, was responsible for the fruition of this great dream of the centuries that the United Nations might really bring to pass this peace on earth, good will to men, I express the profound hope that there shall be no deviation from the broad, great principles laid down in the Charter and from a considered action which shall hold the authority and the respect of the United Nations among the peoples of the earth, and that this Government, above all others responsible so largely for its implementation, shall not now take a position which in all future time might result in discrediting the efforts which we shall make for a continuance of peace on earth, good will to men.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I of many who have been very much disturbed by the action of our country, through the United Nations organization, with respect to Palestine. It seems

to me that anyone who is familiar with the tragic history of the Jewish people, especially in the past few years when four or five million of the six million European Jews have been butchered by nazism and fascism, would recognize the immense and unanswerable moral challenge of the Jewish people to the American Government and to the conscience of mankind for a just solution of the Palestine question.

The just solution of the Palestine question is simply that the Jewish people shall have an opportunity to fulfill the promise which was made to them by the Balfour Declaration, and which has been reiterated time after time by the Congress and the President as the policy of the American Government.

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

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I invite attention to the declaration of this body in Senate Concurrent Resolution 44 on December 17, 1945, when we resolved—

That the interest shown by the President in the solution of this problem is hereby commended and that the United States shall use its good offices with the mandatory power to the end that Palestine shall be opened for free entry of Jews into that country to the maximum of its agricultural and economic potentialities, and that there shall be full opportunity for colonization and development, so that they may freely proceed with the upbuilding of Palestine as the Jewish national home and, in association with all elements of the population, establish Palestine as a democratic commonwealth in which all men, regardless of race or creed, shall have equal rights.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the Senator from Maine for calling my attention to this latest expression of the Congress. That is substantially a repetition of an earlier declaration, going back as far as 1923 or 1924.

So, Mr. President, there is no doubt about what have been the promises of the American Government, the commitments of the American Congress, and the obligations of American Presidents for decades since World War I.

We thought this question was settled in the United Nations organization, where it should have been settled, and should be settled now. After long-drawn-out deliberations, after reports of committees numbering more than 20 over the past years since World War I, after the examination of the problem by representatives of various nations, it was finally resolved in the United Nations that there should be partition of Palestine. That was a solemn commitment arrived at by this international organization.

I do not know what caused the American Government to withdraw its support from that policy arrived at by the United Nations. I do not know who was responsible for the change of that policy, for the rescission of that commitment, and for the introduction of an entirely new approach to the problem in the United Nations. Now, instead of a United Nations policy in the partition of Palestine, we are urging in that organization the establishment of a trusteeship for Palestine.

Mr. President, if we have a trusteeship, what will be the significance of it? Will it assure that the Jews shall have the right of immigration into Palestine, as they are supposed to have enjoyed that right since the Balfour Declaration and since our early commitments in 1920? Does it mean that the Jewish people will have an opportunity to become a majority in the territory occupied by the Jews? Does it mean that this aggregation of people will have the right to call themselves a state, and to act as a state in the sisterhood of states of the world? Does it mean that the United Nations will protect the people of such an area against aggression from an outside source? If so, who will afford the protection? Where will the troops come from to afford security to those people against aggression from the states round about?

It seems to me that, if the proposal of the United States is adopted and a trusteeship for Palestine is established, it will afford not hope, but the blight of hope which every Jew and every sympathetic person has entertained since the Balfour Declaration. It means not the opening of the doors and gates of Palestine to Jewish immigration. It probably means that those doors will be closed, because the trusteeship will take in the whole of Palestine, which at the present time has a majority of Arab people.

It means that the United Nations will be powerless to protect the trusteeship which it assumes, if it has no international police force—and today it has none. We are not told by anyone of any prospect for establishing an international police force.

What, therefore, does that course offer but utter despair and hopelessness for the Jewish people, who have seen five million of their fellow Jews cut down in our own time in barbarity which not even Genghis Khan was able to approach. Those people will continue to live in concentration camps—although they are now called displaced-persons camps. There is hardly a family which was in existence in 1939 among all the Jewish population of Europe, which is now united.

What, therefore, should we do? I think we should have adhered to the partition commitment which was arrived at by the United Nations organization. I do not know of anything to justify a change in American policy. Evidently other nations have seen no reason to change the course which they followed in arriving at the partition decision. The initiative seems to have been confined entirely to the United States. Yet to my knowledge, Members of Congress are not told of any necessity for the complete and humiliating reversal of the United States policy upon this partition question.

Some have said, "If we had partition, there would be no international police force which would be able to protect the partitioned state and give them security against aggression from the outside." There would have been the same force, the same authority, the same power to

protect that state against outside aggression which exists at the present time to protect any other state against outside aggression. They would have been no worse off, if no better off, than any other world state, until we create an international police force.

Mr. President, the implications from the partition of Palestine into a state which would have had cognizance by the nations of the world would have made a vast difference in the practical sense. The Jewish part of Palestine would have become a legal state. It would have assumed and would have had the right to exercise the functions exercised by other sovereign states in the world.

Mr. President, that would have meant that that area and those people would have had the same immunity from outside aggression which the people of any sovereign nation possess. That would also have meant that those people would have had the right to have called upon the other nations of the world not only for recognition but for the right to buy arms, the right to purchase the matériel with which to defend themselves, their homes, their state, their lives. And, Mr. President, they would have had the right to have invoked the moral obligation upon every member of the United Nations organization to lend them succor, to protect and maintain their security against outside invasion. Mr. President, if we then failed to protect that little state of Palestine against outside invasion and outside aggression, then the United Nations and every nation that stood callously by would give encouragement to a lawless world. I cannot believe that the United Nations membership, including our own country, would stand by and see a sovereign state set up by the United Nations organization ravished and ravaged by invading armies and by embittered foes.

Mr. President, that was one way by which that state might have acquired sovereignty, to have been established by the United Nations organization, the only world government that can speak for the family of nations at the present time. Once having done that, we should have adhered to the decision we made.

However, now that we have receded from that decision, if the United Nations is powerless to act, what can we do as the United States of America? I venture to suggest that in this case we can do just what we have done in other cases in which nations or peoples have appealed to our country on the basis of justice and right. That is to say, when those brave people declared that a provisional government did in fact exist in Palestine, when they called into being the natural right of man to independence and freedom—the same right we declared in our own immortal Declaration of Independence—when they constituted themselves before God and man an independent and a united people, and stated before the world that they were a de facto government, they had the same right to appeal to us for succor and for support and for full recognition that the American Colonies had, and exercised, to appeal to the family of nations for recognition after our own Declaration of Independence from the British crown.

Mr. President, if they declare a provisional, de facto government, if they appeal for recognition, if they ask for aid, then in justice and in good conscience it would seem to me proper that we extend such recognition and recognize as de jure the de facto state which they declare to exist. We have done that in many other instances, Mr. President, here in our own hemisphere, in respect to other nations. When we become satisfied that a people have the right to call themselves a state, it is recognized practice in international law for other sovereign states to recognize that new entity and receive it into the family of nations and states. That is what we could do as the United States of America, Mr. President. That is what I propose we do, if we are not going to find an effective way to solve this problem where it should be solved, and where it once was solved until we reversed ourselves, in the councils of the United Nations.

Mr. President, once we recognize the provisional government of Palestine, the Jewish people there will have a Jewish state, and then we shall have a right—and a duty—if they are threatened with invasion, to give them the privilege, at least, to purchase and to ship from our shores arms for their defense; and then we shall also have the right and the obligation to make loans to that government, to assist it in its struggle for survival against those who would destroy it.

Mr. President, I have no doubt but that, if the United States of America were to give unreserved recognition to such a government, other nations would follow our course, and if it were once recognized that the part of Palestine which has been set aside for the Jewish people was a sovereign state, aid would be forthcoming to them from the other nations and the peoples of the world. But as the matter stands at the present time, those who would destroy them have ample access to aid and to arms; but the Jewish people are being massacred, without even having the right to buy weapons with which to defend their lives and their families, their homes, and their ancient land.

Mr. President, once Palestine became a state, not only would the other individual states of the world have the right, if not the duty, to aid Palestine against aggression, but it would also become the duty of the Security Council of the United Nations organization to protect them, on the theory that their invasion might constitute a threat to the peace of the world. I base what I say now upon article 39 of the Charter of the United Nations, which reads as follows:

The Security Council shall determine the existence of any threat to the peace, breach of the peace, or act of aggression and shall make recommendations, or decide what measures shall be taken in accordance with articles 41 and 42, to maintain or restore international peace and security.

Mr. President, there the duty is squarely put upon the Security Council to take measures which it deems proper to protect against threats to the peace, breach of the peace, or acts of aggression.

Article 30 says that the steps to be taken shall be taken in accordance with

articles 41 and 42. Here is article 41 of the Charter:

The Security Council may decide what measures not involving the use of armed force are to be employed to give effect to its decisions, and it may call upon the members of the United Nations to apply such measures. These may include complete or partial interruption of economic relations and of rail, sea, air, postal, telegraphic, radio, and other means of communication, and the severance of diplomatic relations.

Mr. President, in that article we find the power to apply sanctions. They do not have to employ force; they do not have to send armed might. If there be those who say that, if we set up this nation as a recognized sovereignty, we shall have to send American troops to protect and defend them, I say I believe that necessity would never arise; and I shall give my reasons for taking that position. First, I believe that their security could be protected by the action of the Security Council in applying measures other than the sending of armed might, if we acted in concert. Second, I believe that if the nations of the world once recognize the Jewish state, and if we make it possible for them to purchase arms and assure the delivery of those arms, I believe the Jewish people love their liberty to such an extent that they could be depended upon to protect it against any neighboring invader.

So, Mr. President, I say that, if we and other nations partition Palestine, through the United Nations, and set up the Palestinian state as a sovereignty, or if we as nations individually recognize the sovereignty of that nation, then we can, I believe, through the Charter of the United Nations, provide the means by which that state can be protected, without having a single American soldier called upon, either directly or indirectly, to go to its aid and defense.

Here is article 42 of the Charter of the United Nations:

Should the Security Council consider that measures provided for in article 41 would be inadequate or have proved to be inadequate, it may take such action by air, sea, or land forces as may be necessary to maintain or restore international peace and security. Such action may include demonstrations, blockade, and other operations by air, sea, or land forces of members of the United Nations.

Mr. President, we have been able to make demonstrations in the Mediterranean when we were interested in the security of Greece against some outside assault. We have been able to make naval demonstrations in the eastern Mediterranean when that was consistent with our policy to protect Turkey against some outside threat.

I wonder, Mr. President, whether we could not make some demonstration in the same Mediterranean Sea in order to protect the Jewish people, whose integrity and sovereignty we should legitimately have recognized, without the necessity of actually sending a soldier to fight a battle or to shoot a gun. So, Mr. President, it is not the way we lack; it is the will we lack to help Palestine. I do not make any suggestion unworthy of the integrity of our country or of its policy, Mr. President, but there are those

who suggest that we have had a self interest that was more commanding upon our conscience than the pitiable appeal of the Jewish people for a homeland, than the sacred right of sanctuary against future brutality and butchery.

Mr. President, I like to feel that America really means what that symbol in New York Harbor suggests, to mankind, that we are the friend of the oppressed, that we will try to defend the persecuted, that we will stand bravely by the victims of aggression everywhere in the world. We have done that in other spheres; we have been extremely solicitous, Mr. President, to see that a certain power does not transgress upon other people, that they do not by force compel their ideology upon others. To that end we are spending billions of dollars, we are almost prepared to make up full-scale military commitments. We have been able and willing to make demonstrations by air and by sea, and to use every diplomatic and economic power that our great prestige put in our hands as a weapon. Why, Mr. President, are we so impotent to save the Jews from further destruction and to give them sanctuary in their ancient family homeland?

I say again, Mr. President, it is not the way we lack, it is the will we lack which has kept America impotent in the face of this problem, the greatest moral challenge of the day. I cannot understand, Mr. President, how we can continue to dishonor this moral claim upon our action. Surely those of us in this body who have looked upon, with horror, the concentration camps, the crematories, the places where the blood is still thick which spewed from their bodies when they were being butchered—the ashes which still contain their bones and the residue of their bodies; surely those who know, Mr. President, the hunger that the Jews of Europe have to secure a place where they feel there will not be another pogrom cannot deny that this is the supreme moral challenge being unanswered by our country today. The longer we put off the matter, the longer we delay the decision, the worse the situation gets.

I would say only this, Mr. President: I am totally unable to reconcile the fact that we were able to induce the British Government and the other beneficiaries of the Marshall plan in Europe to work in such magnificent harmony with us for a certain security for western Europe; yet, Mr. President, we seem so utterly incapable of bringing about any concerted action for the salvation of the Jews of Palestine. Great Britain, Mr. President, who, as announced by Mr. Paul Hoffman, Administrator of the Economic Cooperation Administration, is to receive the largest single amount of Marshall plan money of any nation, has told us that they are going to withdraw their forces in mid-May, and we seem so utterly incapable of persuading them to work in harmony with us even one step of the way in this matter of Palestine. I wonder, Mr. President, if we really have let the British people know how deeply our citizenry feels about this subject, and if we have let them know that we expect

them to cooperate with us in this sphere as in the one closer to their own home, and that the Jews have got the same right to security that western Europe has. It makes no difference that the invasion comes from one source in one instance and from another, in another.

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

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

Mr. KILGORE. I would ask the Senator from Florida, is it not true, that really and actually a state of warfare exists in Palestine with reference to the Jews?

Mr. PEPPER. There is no doubt of it. How can the nations of the world, our Government included, stand idly by and see armies concentrated and mobilized in the Middle East and gathered on the border of Palestine, and then invade the Palestine State, without some remonstrance or effective protest?

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, the condition now existing in Palestine is affecting all Jews in that land. In other words, those Jews who went to Palestine a long time ago, settled, and bought homes, are suffering just as much as those against whom the opponents of the Palestine partition operate. Is that not true?

Mr. PEPPER. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. KILGORE. In other words, it is not merely a question of a fight against the partition of Palestine, it is a question of preservation of the lives of those Jews who went to Palestine, even saying the partition was not right, but it is a fight against those Jews who went to Palestine at a time when it was perfectly proper for them to do so, who bought their homes, who bought land, who settled down, and who had been living peaceably, trying to build up the country. Are the attacks not directed against them just as much as against anybody else, and are they not equally sufferers with anybody else?

Mr. PEPPER. Unmistakably so, unmistakably so.

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

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I have not been able to hear the entire address by the Senator from Florida, which I regret. Has the Senator called attention to the extraordinary circumstances surrounding the so-called Transjordan Legion, which has been officered by British officers, some 30 of them, which is almost entirely supported by grants from the British Treasury, which grants were renewed within the past month with the grant of \$8,000,000 a year to support the Transjordan Arab Legion under Emir Abdullah, the ruler of the Arabs of Transjordan, who are assisting in the policing and who are to be apparently associated in the carrying out of the insurrection against the decision of the United Nations?

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the able Senator from Maine for emphasizing that point.

Mr. President, the British record in Palestine will not be recorded as one of its noble areas of activity when the history of the whole matter is written. Mr.

President, the British Government undertook a mandate in Palestine with a solemn obligation. It gave that commitment to the League of Nations and, in a direct treaty, to the United States of America, as well.

Mr. President, the British Government, on the record, never did fulfill that obligation. To the contrary, in 1939, it issued what is called a white paper, which definitely limited the number of immigrants that might come into Palestine, and then closed the door, or slammed it, in the faces of the Jewish people.

Not only that, Mr. President, but Transjordan was a part of the mandate. The British Government separated Transjordan from the remainder of Palestine, made it into a sovereign, and, I think history and the facts will show, a puppet state, officered by British officers, if reports be true, supported and financed by British money and arms and protected by British power. In fact, spokesmen of the British Foreign Office have admitted to the press that Great Britain is furnishing arms to the Arabs.

The last step is that the Transjordan Army appears to be a part of the invading force now, so far as I know—and I assume it to be true—officerd by British Army officers, armed with British equipment and guns, and certainly not acting contrary to British policy, so far as I have been able to see it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The fact that Transjordan was established as it has been established has made the Palestine question a very difficult one to solve. Had Transjordan not been established the solution of the question would have been much easier. There would not have been so much resistance. There would have been a give-and-take policy which would have worked out far better if that policy decision had not been made. As the Senator points out, and I agree, it was an unlawful disposition and an unlawful decision when Transjordan was established as a separate state.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the Senator very much. It is unmistakably true that it was an unlawful decision and that it should never have occurred.

As I said a moment ago, Mr. President, I appreciate the fraternal spirit—

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

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I would not wish the Senator from Florida to leave any implication that the British Government was not supporting the Transjordan matters, because it has been officially announced that the British Government has been carrying on for a long time, as a matter of official record, and have renewed the treaty during the past month, obligating itself to pay \$80,000,000 a year as a grant. Meanwhile Transjordan is an applicant for membership in the United Nations and is qualifying for membership by invading precincts of Palestine to enforce action against the decision of the United Nations.

Mr. PEPPER. And yet, on the record, the United States of America is helpless

to restrain Transjordan. On the contrary, I believe we are advocating its admission to the United Nations organization, which means that we thereby ratify the illegal British action in separating Transjordan from Palestine and giving it recognition as a sovereign state among the family of nations.

Mr. President, I say I honor the fraternal relationships existing between this Nation and the British people. I have tried as long as I have been a Member of the Senate to help that great people in their hard struggles for democracy, and I still wish to see that citadel of democracy preserved intact as one of the glories of our present civilization. But I have never been able to understand why we are called upon to do so much for Britain and are unable to get Britain to do so little with us. I believe in a fraternal relationship that works both ways, Mr. President. We are committed in Palestine. It looks as if the British should be willing to bend their will and work with us in this humanitarian manner, since we are digging deeply into the pockets of the American people to save Europe from complete deterioration and destruction, including the isles of the United Kingdom. Yet, Mr. President, to me it seems strange that nations in western Europe whose very lives we are saving with our money and, indeed, all our might, show so little disposition to support us in a great humane appeal for the tortured people of Palestine.

Mr. President, in this great body I have always said that our policy must be one which is world-wide in scope. If we are to defend the victims of aggression in one part of the world we must do so wherever aggression occurs, if we are to be morally and politically consistent.

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

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I am sure the Senator from Florida would not wish to be too critical of the nations of western Europe for not following our leadership, when it is so difficult to determine what has occurred. It seems to me that until we put our own house in order and pursue a consistent, responsible, and respectable policy we should not be very critical of either Great Britain or any other country.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, there is no doubt but what the leadership has fallen upon us and we shall have to discharge that obligation.

What I had in mind was the fact that the British have announced their departure from Palestine on May 15, apparently without the concurrence or consent of the United Nations, leaving the Jewish people, who now cannot get arms, to be butchered by their enemies. They will occupy until the very last the one port through which we might get aid in arms to the Jewish people of Palestine. If the British in their retreat cover the avenues through which aid might go, the inevitable effect will be the butchery of the Jewish people, and there will be a moral accountability on someone's escutcheon.

Mr. BREWSTER. Will not the responsibility for that bloodshed rest squarely on those who either have re-

fused the shipment of arms under ample authority which exists or have refused entry of those arms to the people seeking simply the arms and the assistance to defend their very lives as well as the state which we contemplated was coming into being?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, it will certainly rest upon those who have failed to take effective action to prevent that result.

So it seems to me we could go back to the decision that originated in the United Nations, namely, partition. We should find out what are the lawful borders of the Jewish land and mark them.

I pause, Mr. President, to make this observation. I am aware of the twenty-some-odd Russian vetoes in the Security Council, but in this particular case, I believe, it cannot be charged that it is Russian stubbornness or vetoes now preventing effective Security Council action. Let us at least put the decision up to the Security Council for an applicant for sanctions after the partition has established the Jewish state. Then, if anyone vetoes the action by the Security Council, all mankind will know who the obstructor is.

It just so happens, Mr. President—and what a lesson in cooperation it is between our two peoples—it happens in the partition decision that the two greatest powers in the world, the United States and the Soviet Union, were working together. How we wish that were true in every other troubled part of the world. They seemed to have worked together in good faith and with honest accord. What an example it is to both nations to try to find means by which we can work together, because in accord and honorable cooperation, dealing each with the other, we can make this a peaceful and prosperous world.

So I say, Mr. President, let us go back and reinstate the partition decision in the United Nations. Then let us carry through in the United Nations to the protection and preservation of that ancient people. In the alternative, if we do not do that, let us recognize, as we have a right to do, the de facto Jewish government in Palestine as a de jure government, and let all the blessings which result flow therefrom.

I believe, Mr. President, that if we will follow one or the other of those courses, we will set a grave and challenging example to the nations of the earth; indeed, the countries of mankind will at long last give not only security and sanctuary but a home to the wandering and persecuted Jews.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President—

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. I have been wondering whether the Senator from Florida, in his able discussion, had intended to refer to the spectacle of the so-called Arab League, which is nothing but a vehicle of six Arab states which are all members of the United Nations, which have subsidized and used the Arab League as the vehicle through which to carry out this insurrection against the United Nations—a plain violation of the very provision of the Charter, and one which cannot be disregarded because of the

cloak with which they seek to enshroud their identity.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, there is no doubt that what the Senator from Maine says is correct. If the United Nations had made its decision for partition and stuck to it, had recognized the existence of the Jewish state, then if, as they threatened to do and did, the Arab states organized armed forces, if they brought those armed forces to bear across the border in Palestine, what could have been a ranker aggression or invasion than that? How is that to be distinguished from what happened when the Russians went over into Iran—and, I may add, got out after pressure was brought in the United Nations councils—or when any other nation goes across the border of another people? With the action of the United Nations in favor of partition, the Jewish state would have had the same right to existence and we would have had the same duty to defend it against aggression as we would have to do for every other state with regard to which we have that obligation.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in connection with the debate on the floor this afternoon during which some of my colleagues in the Senate have discussed certain facets of the Palestine issue, I should like to ask unanimous consent to have published in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks a statement which has been sent to me by the Jewish Agency dealing with the so-called American delegation proposal of the United Nations of a truce. I should like to have it made a part of the RECORD because I am not in a position to say whether or not the allegations set forth in the statement of the Jewish Agency are right or wrong. But I think the questions raised are ones which should be considered by our Government and an answer thereto provided.

The statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JEWISH AGENCY STATEMENT ON TRUCE PROPOSAL

The question of truce in Palestine was raised in the Security Council as part of a general proposal to set aside the plan adopted by the General Assembly for the future government of Palestine and to substitute for it an entirely different solution of the Palestine problem which the Jewish Agency found utterly unacceptable.

Actually, the resolution calling for a truce was adopted by the Security Council in conjunction with the decision to convene a special session of the Assembly for the purpose of undertaking the revision of the plan. Thus, the truce proposal in its very inception appeared to load the dice very heavily against Jewish interests.

Moreover, the wording of the resolution on truce, by referring merely to a truce between the Arab and Jewish communities of Palestine, ignored the major aspect of the present disturbed condition of the country, which is its invasion by armed forces from outside, organized by the governments of the neighboring Arab states, members of the United Nations and, in the case of Syria, member of the Security Council itself, and tolerated by the mandatory power.

The resolution of the Security Council called upon Arab and Jewish groups in Palestine to cease acts of violence. It addressed no admonition to the neighboring Arab states to discontinue the recruiting, training, and arming of military contingents in

their territories for armed intervention in Palestine, and the actual sending of such forces across their frontiers into Palestine. According to reliable press reports, further large-scale incursions of armed units and further importation of war materials from the neighboring countries into Palestine took place only within the last 2 or 3 days as the first installment of a new wave of invasion.

Nevertheless, the Jewish Agency declared itself willing to enter into a truce arrangement so that an end may be put to the bloodshed and destruction which is now ravaging the life of Palestine and claiming a mounting toll of victims. In its readiness to contribute its full share to the immediate restoration of peace in Palestine, the Jewish Agency was concerned to safeguard two main objectives:

First, that the truce should be an effective one and that it should not serve as a mere cover and protection for the preparation of further aggression. Secondly, that the conclusion and observance of the truce should not jeopardize legitimate long-term Jewish interests and should not prejudice the main issue which is now at stake.

Accordingly the executive of the Jewish Agency in Palestine on April 4, 1948, adopted the following resolution regarding the truce proposal:

"The Jewish Agency welcomes the efforts of the Security Council to produce a cessation of hostilities in Palestine and to prevent a continuation of bloodshed in the future. The Jews of Palestine were forced to defend themselves against a series of attacks launched against them by the Arabs since December 1, 1947. Responsibility for the situation in Palestine falls also upon the mandatory power, which, despite its duties and its public declarations, failed to preserve law and order, failed to prevent the invasion of Palestine by organized Arab guerrilla bands from neighboring states, provided arms to Arab states which have been sending these guerrilla bands into Palestine and suffered these foreign invaders to establish themselves in military camps in Palestine, to disrupt communications in various parts of the country, and to besiege the city of Jerusalem.

"The agency will gladly agree to a military truce which will put an effective and immediate end to all acts of violence, reestablish freedom of movement throughout the land on all roads and highways, restore free access to the holy places, withdraw all foreign troops and guerrillas, remove all units of the Transjordan Arab Legion to Transjordan, and prevent the incursion of such foreign forces and armed bands into Palestine in the future. To make such a truce effective, provision must be made for an international commission to supervise its execution. The Jewish Agency cannot rely in this respect upon the British authorities.

"It must be clearly understood that such a military truce shall not impede Jewish immigration and shall not affect preparations now in progress to assure essential public services, and for the establishment of an autonomous government in the area of the Jewish state immediately after the termination of the mandate on May 15."

This remains the attitude of the Jewish Agency.

The Jewish Agency was subsequently honored by an invitation from the distinguished President of the Security Council to attend a conference with a view to discussing the terms of the truce. There was only one brief formal meeting, attended by representatives of both the Arab Higher Committee and the Jewish Agency for Palestine, after which the President of the Security Council held a series of informal talks with the representatives of those two bodies separately. In reply to the President's question as to the condi-

tions under which we would be prepared to conclude a truce, we defined our attitude in the following terms:

Had the aggression against the Jews been confined to the Arabs of Palestine, we would have been ready for a truce unconditionally. In actual fact, in that eventuality, the question of a formal truce and of negotiations in that regard need not have arisen at all, as it would have been enough for the Arabs to cease fire in order to produce an immediate cessation of all armed reaction against them on the part of the Jews. But the military situation in Palestine has been completely transformed by the invasion of the country from outside.

The very presence on the soil of Palestine of foreign armed forces is a permanent act of aggression against the Jews. Unless these forces are removed and further armed incursions prevented, the truce would be a godsend to the aggressor, for under its cover and without the fear of any interference on the part of the Jews, the Arab command would be able to bring up further reinforcements, to occupy points of vantage, to perfect its military organization and to be ready for renewed assault under much more advantageous conditions.

We, therefore, have to put forward, as essential conditions of the truce, that the armed units which were brought into Palestine from outside be withdrawn and that no further incursions should be tolerated. This is the summary of our position as explained by us to the President of the Council.

It would be observed that the two stipulations which we have made are purely military in character. They are intended to insure that the truce should be a real truce and not a sham. We have put forward no political conditions in connection with the truce. We gathered, however, from questions put to us by the President of the Security Council that political conditions had been put forward by the other side. These conditions we had to resist.

In the light of these general observations, I now propose, Mr. President, with your kind permission, to deal in some detail with the provisions regarding the truce included in the draft which was communicated to us yesterday and which now lies before the Security Council.

As a first general observation, I would point out that the scheme of the truce here outlined is founded on the assumption that the present mandatory administration in Palestine would discharge its functions under the mandate to preserve law and order. Quite apart from the question whether the present mandatory can be relied upon to do so in view of its recent record, it is clear that the truce arrangement proposed is thus by its very terms limited in its duration to the very short period which remains between now and May 15, on which date, according to the mandatory Government's decision which is announced to be irrevocable, the mandate is to be terminated. It is on this definite assumption that we now discuss the truce proposals.

I now address myself to the preamble of the draft resolution. Its third recital states "that the United Kingdom Government, so long as it remains the mandatory power, is responsible for the maintenance of peace and order in Palestine and should continue to take all steps to that end." We must, with all due respect to the Security Council, take exception not merely to the word "continue" which implies that the mandatory administration in Palestine has hitherto discharged its responsibilities in maintaining peace and order—this is most lamentably not the case—but to raise objection to the mandatory administration being given the sanction of the Security Council in advance for

whatever step it might deem fit to take in the field of security.

The recent record of the mandatory administration makes it impossible for us to repose any trust in it in that regard and we would regard it as nothing short of calamitous if in the light of that record it were thus formally assured of full international support for whatever, in its own wisdom, it might do or leave undone. We would, therefore, urge that the recital should be limited to the recognition of the fact that the mandatory power is responsible for the maintenance of peace and order while the mandate lasts, and that the remaining part of the recital after the word "Palestine" should be deleted.

In regard to subparagraph (A) of paragraph 1, I would observe that the requirement that all activities of a military or paramilitary nature should cease is far too wide to be practicable. It may be interpreted as involving the discontinuation of all normal defense arrangements without which the Jewish population of Palestine will be seized by a feeling of insecurity which will be inimical to any truce. The Jewish Agency would therefore propose that the clause should read "cease all acts of violence, terrorism, and sabotage."

A point of fundamental importance arises in connection with subparagraph (B), which contains the most important and welcome injunction against the bringing in to Palestine of armed bands or individuals from outside. With the injunction so formulated we are heartily in agreement, but what we cannot accept is that it should be extended to include "individuals capable of bearing arms," as this would affect Jewish immigration. We cannot possibly agree that Jewish immigrants into Palestine, whatever their age group or physical condition, should be put on the same footing with those elements who are now being sent into Palestine in violation of its land frontiers with the deliberate purpose of upsetting the peace of the country and committing acts of aggression against the Jews and against the authority of the United Nations.

These people have not a vestige of any legal or political right to be in Palestine. They come there with the avowed object of breaking the law and disturbing the peace. By contrast, Jewish immigrants come to Palestine by virtue of an internationally recognized right. Palestine is their home in which they come to live. The equation of the two categories is untenable. We would urge that the words "capable of bearing arms" be deleted and that instead the wording should be "armed or entering Palestine with the deliberate purpose of taking part in the fighting."

Coming to subparagraph C, I would point out that as worded it goes much too far in a most sweeping manner and may be interpreted as imposing during the truce period a world embargo on the acquisition of arms for future Jewish defense, while leaving it free to Arab states to accumulate any quantities of arms they may be able to purchase for future fighting in Palestine. We, therefore, urge that the subparagraph should read "refrain from importing weapons and war materials" and that all reference to acquisition should be deleted.

A point of most far-reaching significance arises in connection with subparagraph (D). Here each party is called upon to refrain pending further consideration of the future government of Palestine by the General Assembly "from any political activity which might prejudice the rights, claims or positions" of either community.

The mere introduction of a political subject into the question of a military truce is liable to vitiate the issue. And we should urge that this whole subparagraph be de-

leted. Should its deletion not commend itself to the Council, we would urge that it be amended. To begin with, the term "political activity" seems inappropriate. It is too loose and might be taken to refer to any meeting, any public address, any article in the press, any resolution.

We would suggest to substitute the word "action" for the words "political activities." Further, the question of prejudicing claims does not arise at all. My claim can be prejudiced only if I myself renounce or compromise it. It cannot possibly be prejudiced by whatever the other party does. We suggest, therefore, that the word "claims" should come out altogether. But the main difficulty arises in connection with the word "rights."

The position as far as rights are concerned cannot be left in its present vague form, liable to be interpreted at will. The Arab community may claim as its right the spreading of its dominion over the whole of Palestine and the subjugation of the Jewish community. Can the Jews be expected to refrain from any action which might prejudice that alleged right which they categorically deny and whose exercise would affect the very roots of their existence.

An objective, internationally recognized, criterion is here imperative. We therefore suggest that the paragraph should be amended to read "refrain, etc., from any action which might prejudice the rights or position of either community under the mandate and the resolution of the General Assembly." It cannot be a moot point in an organ of the United Nations that pending further consideration of the future government of Palestine by the General Assembly, the existing resolution of the General Assembly stands and is fully valid.

With regard to subparagraph (E), I must state that the mandatory administration, by its own record and by what we would describe as its sins of omission and commission, about both of which enough has been said in our previous statements to the Security Council, has forfeited its title to Jewish cooperation.

Nevertheless, in the interest of preservation of life we would be prepared to cooperate with the various organs of the present Palestine government in certain spheres where we would regard cooperation as necessary and warranted, but there can be no question of our pledging general cooperation to the British administration of Palestine which has so manifestly disregarded and even acted contrary to its most basic responsibilities.

Subparagraph (F) seeks to secure the safety of the holy places. We submit that this is not enough. What has to be secured is also free access to all shrines and sanctuaries for those who have an established right to visit and worship at them. It is not enough, for instance, to lay down that the Wailing Wall might not be blown up. Free access to the Wailing Wall must be guaranteed for the Jews in accordance with the immemorial practice which has been internationally sanctioned.

I now come to paragraph 2. Despite the unquestionable default of the British mandatory administration in the maintenance of law and order and its particularly lamentable and most alarming failure to prevent the invasion of Palestine by armed forces from outside, this paragraph proposes to charge that administration with the duty of supervising the execution of the truce provisions. The Jewish Agency cannot possibly agree that the mandatory administration is impartial in the present conflict and can properly be entrusted in this highly responsible task which requires complete objectivity. If the draft is left in its present form and no authoritative United Nations organ is set up to supervise and insure the observance of the truce, we could consider

that no adequate provision at all has been made in this record.

Paragraph 3 seeks to prevent further infiltration into Palestine of armed forces from outside. What I said in regard to the expression "capable of bearing arms" with reference to subparagraph (B) of paragraph 1 applies equally to the same phraseology in paragraph 3. The injunction itself against the mere entry into Palestine of armed bands, etc., does not go far enough.

We would urge that the governments of states neighboring to Palestine should be called upon to prohibit in their territories the recruitment and preparation of forces for eventual incursions into Palestine. Moreover, there is no reference in the paragraph, or anywhere else in the draft, to the fate of the foreign armed units already in Palestine. They all live in special camps, the location of which is common knowledge.

By omission, the draft resolution suffers them to remain where they are, or even to change their location and select better sites for their future activities. I have already stated that the mere presence of these bands on the soil of Palestine is regarded by the Jews as a permanent act of aggression. They are, indeed, a constant irritant and a perpetual source of danger. The absence of a clear provision to evacuate or at least to immobilize these bands forces the Jewish agency to reserve its position in this regard.

In conclusion, I would take the opportunity of emphasizing again that foreign invasion is the crux of the whole difficulty, and the fact that the mandatory government has allowed it to proceed unchecked mars its record more than anything else.

The Security Council has not so far deemed fit to place on record in clear and unequivocal terms the responsibility of either the Arab Governments or the Government of the United Kingdom for the present intolerable situation which has been created in and around Palestine by this continued process of invasion.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I would make this additional comment on this matter. It is my understanding, at least to date, that it is not the position of our Government that on the merits the decision for Palestine partition was unsound. Rather, as I interpreted the position of our Government, it is that an attempt at this time to enforce the partition would disturb the peace of the world; although I cannot ignore the fact that our failure to take any definite action one way or another seems also to be disturbing the peace of the world, in Palestine.

I also must take note of the fact that until we take a definite position one way or another on the merits of partition itself, international peace through international order by law, administered by the United Nations, is itself in jeopardy.

Although I am perfectly willing to await the position of our Government on the merits of the issue, if our Government proceeds expeditiously to consider the merits, I do want to point out that the position of our delegation to the United Nations leaves me somewhat puzzled and confused, because, that, too, is pregnant with many implications. If I understand that position correctly, it is to the effect that we will supply troops, to enforce trusteeship, provided certain other nations also provide troops. It seems to me what we are faced with is

the question of whether or not we are going to go forward with an international police force under the United Nations. I am very sure that the Palestinian issue is not the proper issue on which to raise the question as to whether or not the members of the United Nations really could go forward with the establishment of an international police force to be maintained not only in Palestine but elsewhere in the world where the peace is threatened.

There is one part of this statement put out by the Jewish Agency that at least seems to me to be one that is so plausible in nature that it calls for a clarification of America's position on it.

The point is that, after all, the conflict in Palestine today is not between the Jews of Palestine and the Arabs of Palestine, but between the Jews of Palestine and powerful Arab forces outside Palestine, who have been sent into Palestine. So that we have in effect a foreign army in Palestine, or in the Palestinian territory. I think that raises some very serious questions, Mr. President, as to the position that our delegation to the United Nations should take, even in regard to a trusteeship. I want the record to be perfectly clear that I am not purporting this afternoon to take a position on the merits of the position our delegation to the United Nations has taken on this question; but I do want the record to be perfectly clear that I think many other persons, in the Senate and in the Nation, share my puzzlement as to just what our position is. It is very difficult to find in our delegation's discussion of the Palestinian issue any consistent, logical case as to what our policy is toward Palestine. In the interest not only of the future of the United Nations, but in the interest of world peace, we should hasten our final decision as to our final policy in Palestine and make that decision so crystal clear that all parties concerned and all groups will know exactly where we stand on the merits of the issue.

FEDERAL CHARTER FOR THE COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I believe the pending business is Senate bill 1322, to provide a Federal charter for the Commodity Credit Corporation; is it not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A motion was made by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] that the Senate proceed to consider that bill. Does the Senator from Vermont now wish to press the motion?

Mr. AIKEN. I do.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1322) to provide a Federal charter for the Commodity Credit Corporation, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with amendments.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, this is a bill to grant a charter to the Commodity Credit Corporation. It follows out the requirements of the so-called Byrd-Butler law, which requires all Federal corporations to proceed under Federal charters after July 1, 1943. The committee has amended the bill in several

places. I shall not explain each amendment in detail unless some Senator desires me to do so.

In brief, the committee has made an effort more strictly to define the duties and authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and certain amendments are placed in the bill for that purpose.

The committee has also amended the bill so as to include the amount of guaranteed bank loans under the total authorization granted to the Commodity Credit Corporation. I think that Members of the Senate know that much of what the Commodity Credit Corporation has done has been through local banks, and that the loans so made should be included in the over-all limitations.

The committee also amended the bill to provide that any research work conducted by the Commodity Credit Corporation should relate to the servicing or disposal of commodities owned or controlled by the corporation, and should be conducted in collaboration with the research agencies of the Department of Agriculture. This is an effort to control the different agencies of government which are showing a tendency of late to set up full-fledged research departments of their own, without regard to similar research which may be conducted by other agencies of the Department of Agriculture.

The last amendment to which I shall call attention requires the Commodity Credit Corporation to pay to the United States Treasury a sum which will reimburse the Treasury in full for the interest on the money which the Commodity Credit Corporation may borrow from the Treasury.

There will be offered to the bill several other amendments, which I have discussed with the Senators who will offer them. I think we have worked out solutions to practically all of the proposed amendments. There may be one exception.

Unless there are some questions to be asked about the bill, I ask that the committee amendments be acted upon. I know of no objection to any of the committee amendments. Then we can take up the amendments which will be proposed by Members of the Senate.

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

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. I first wish to say that, in general, I am in thorough sympathy with the program of the Commodity Credit Corporation. It has served a good purpose. However, I should like to invite the attention of the Senator from Vermont to the fact that it was found that private enterprise could serve just as well in the purchase of some commodities. Let us take coal, for instance. The tonnage of purchases of coal in this country to go to Europe is about the same as the tonnage of grain. Instead of handling the purchases through a Government corporation, the work has all been done through private enterprise, and it is the recommendation of the official who is handling the coal purchases that the same program be followed with respect to the grain purchases.

I realize that it is too late to amend the measure to any degree in that respect, but I should like to ask the Senator one question. Is it the purpose of the sponsors of the bill to make permanent the activities of the Government in business, or are they looking forward to the time when business can again be returned to private enterprise?

Mr. AIKEN. It is my understanding that an amendment will be proposed to the charter bill which will limit the length of time the charter will continue in operation to the same period which has been granted in the case of the RFC, which serves the banking and industrial interests of the United States just as the Commodity Credit Corporation was originally created to serve the agricultural interests.

I understand that coal referred to by the Senator has not been purchased by the Commodity Credit Corporation. The armed services and other agencies which have designated the Commodity Credit Corporation the purchasing agency for grains and foodstuffs apparently have designated other agencies, or have bought direct such of their supplies as may have been needed for the European Recovery Program, for the people of the occupied areas, and for the armed services themselves. That is a matter which has been left to the armed services themselves, and is not written into the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter bill as being obligatory, although they are permitted to make purchases for other agencies of Government when they are required or requested to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendments of the committee.

The amendments of the committee were on page 1, line 6, after the word "purpose" to strike out "of promoting the general welfare by stabilizing, supporting, and protecting farm income and prices, by assisting in the maintenance of balanced and adequate supplies of agricultural commodities, products thereof, foods, feeds, and fibers (hereinafter collectively referred to as agricultural commodities), and by facilitating the orderly distribution of" and insert "of stabilizing, supporting, and protecting farm income and prices, assisting in the maintenance of balanced and adequate supplies of agricultural commodities, products thereof, foods, feeds, and fibers (hereinafter collectively referred to as agricultural commodities), and facilitating the orderly distribution of."

On page 4, line 22, after the word "Corporation," to insert:

The Corporation shall at all times reserve a sufficient amount of its authorized borrowing power under the act of March 8, 1938 (U. S. C., title 15, sec. 713a-4), which, together with other funds available to the Corporation, will enable it to purchase, in accordance with its contracts with lending agencies, notes, or other obligations evidencing loans made by such agencies under the Corporation's programs.

On page 5, after line 13, to strike out:

(m) May conduct researches, surveys, and investigations relating to the conduct of its business.

(n) Shall have such powers as may be necessary or appropriate for the exercise of

the powers specifically vested in the Corporation, and all such incidental powers as are customary in corporations generally.

And insert:

(m) Shall have such powers as may be necessary or appropriate for the exercise of the powers specifically vested in the Corporation, and all such incidental powers as are customary in corporations generally; but any research financed by the Corporation shall relate to the conservation or disposal of commodities owned or controlled by the Corporation and shall be conducted in collaboration with research agencies of the Department of Agriculture.

On page 7, after line 2, to strike out:

(g) To the extent specifically authorized by law, make payments with respect to, or purchases for resale at a loss of, agricultural commodities, for the purpose of maintaining the maximum prices established under the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended.

(h) Carry out such other operations as the Congress may authorize or provide for.

And insert:

(g) Carry out such other operations as the Congress may specifically authorize or provide for.

On page 8, after line 3, to insert:

The Corporation shall pay interest to the United States Treasury on the amount of its capital stock, and on the amount of the obligations of the Corporation purchased by the Secretary of the Treasury pursuant to the act of March 8, 1938 (U. S. C., title 15, sec. 713a-4), at such rates as may be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury to be appropriate in view of the terms for which such amounts are made available to the Corporation.

On page 14, after line 20, to insert the following new section:

SEC. 19. Effective date: This act shall take effect on July 1, 1948.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act."

SEC. 2. Creation and purposes: For the purpose of stabilizing, supporting, and protecting farm income and prices, assisting in the maintenance of balanced and adequate supplies of agricultural commodities, products thereof, foods, feeds, and fibers (hereinafter collectively referred to as "agricultural commodities"), and facilitating the orderly distribution of agricultural commodities, there is hereby created a body corporate to be known as the Commodity Credit Corporation (hereinafter referred to as the "Corporation"), which shall be an agency and instrumentality of the United States, within the Department of Agriculture, subject to the general direction and control of the Secretary of Agriculture (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary").

SEC. 3. Offices: The Corporation may establish offices in such place or places as it may deem necessary or desirable in the conduct of its business.

SEC. 4. General powers: The Corporation—

(a) Shall have accession in its corporate name.

(b) May adopt, alter, and use a corporate seal, which shall be judicially noticed.

(c) May sue and be sued, but no attachment, injunction, garnishment, or other similar process, mesne or final, shall be issued against the Corporation or its property. The district courts of the United States, including the district courts of the District of Columbia and of any Territory or possession, shall have exclusive original jurisdiction of all suits brought by or against the Corporation: *Provided*, That the Corporation may

intervene in any court in any suit, action, or proceeding in which it has an interest. Any suit against the Corporation shall be brought in the District of Columbia, or in the district wherein the plaintiff resides or is engaged in business. No suit against the Corporation shall be allowed unless it shall have been brought within 2 years after the right accrued on which suit is brought. All suits against the Corporation shall be tried by the court without a jury. Notwithstanding any other provision of this act, the Federal Tort Claims Act (Public Law 601, 79th Cong.) shall be applicable to the Corporation.

(d) May adopt, amend, and repeal bylaws, rules, and regulations governing the manner in which its business may be conducted and the powers vested in it may be exercised.

(e) Shall have all the rights, privileges and immunities of the United States, including, but not limited to, the right to priority of payment with respect to debts due from insolvent, deceased, or bankrupt debtors, and immunity from the imposition of court costs, fees, and charges, from the allowance of interest on claims and judgments, and from State and local statutes of limitations on suits, actions, or proceedings. The Corporation may assert such rights, privileges, and immunities in any suit, action, or proceeding.

(f) Shall be entitled to the use of the United States mails in the same manner and upon the same conditions as the executive departments of the Federal Government.

(g) May enter into and carry out such contracts or agreements as it deems necessary or desirable in the conduct of its business. The Corporation may, whenever, it deems it necessary or desirable in the conduct of its business, consent to the modification of any term or condition of any contract or agreement of any kind to which it is a party. State and local regulatory laws or rules shall not be applicable with respect to contracts or agreements of the Corporation or the parties thereto to the extent that such contracts or agreements provide that such laws or rules shall not be applicable, or to the extent that such laws or rules are inconsistent with such contracts or agreements.

(h) May in any manner acquire, hold, and dispose of such real and personal property or any interest therein as it deems necessary or desirable in the conduct of its business.

(i) May borrow money subject to any provision of law applicable to the Corporation. The Corporation shall at all times reserve a sufficient amount of its authorized borrowing power under the act of March 8, 1938 (U. S. C., title 15, sec. 713a-4), which, together with other funds available to the Corporation, will enable it to purchase, in accordance with its contracts with lending agencies, notes, or other obligations evidencing loans made by such agencies under the Corporation's programs.

(j) Shall determine the character of and the necessity for its obligations and expenditures and the manner in which they shall be incurred, allowed, and paid.

(k) Shall have authority to make final and conclusive settlement and adjustment of any claims by or against the Corporation or the accounts of its fiscal officers.

(l) May make such loans and advances of its funds as it deems necessary or desirable in the conduct of its business.

(m) Shall have such powers as may be necessary or appropriate for the exercise of the powers specifically vested in the corporation, and all such incidental powers as are customary in corporations generally; but any research financed by the Corporation shall relate to the conservation or disposal of commodities owned or controlled by the Corporation and shall be conducted in collaboration with research agencies of the Department of Agriculture.

SEC. 5. Specific powers: In the fulfillment of its purposes and in carrying out its annual

budget programs submitted to and approved by the Congress pursuant to the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U. S. C., 1940 ed., Supp V, 841), the Corporation is authorized to use its general powers only to—

(a) Support the prices of agricultural commodities through loans, purchases, payments, and other operations.

(b) Make available materials and facilities required in connection with the production and marketing of agricultural commodities.

(c) Procure agricultural commodities for sale to other Government agencies, foreign governments, and domestic, foreign, or international relief or rehabilitation agencies, and to meet domestic requirements.

(d) Remove and dispose of or aid in the removal or disposition of surplus agricultural commodities.

(e) Increase the domestic consumption of agricultural commodities by expanding or aiding in the expansion of domestic markets or by developing or aiding in the development of new and additional markets, marketing facilities, and uses for such commodities.

(f) Export or cause to be exported, or aid in the development of foreign markets for, agricultural commodities.

(g) Carry out such other operations as the Congress may specifically authorize or provide for.

SEC. 6. Existing statutes applicable to the Corporation: The Federal statutes applicable to Commodity Credit Corporation, a Delaware corporation, shall be applicable to the Corporation. Commodity Credit Corporation, a Delaware corporation, shall cease to be an agency of the United States as provided in section 7 (a) of the act of January 31, 1935, as amended (15 U. S. C., 1940 ed., Supp. V, 713 (a)).

SEC. 7. Capital stock: The Corporation shall have a capital stock of \$100,000,000 which shall be subscribed by the United States. Such subscription shall be deemed to be fully paid by the transfer of assets to the Corporation pursuant to section 16 of this act. The Secretary is hereby authorized and directed to receive such stock and to exercise, on behalf of the United States, any and all rights of the United States arising out of the ownership of such stock. The Corporation shall pay interest to the United States Treasury on the amount of its capital stock, and on the amount of the obligations of the Corporation purchased by the Secretary of the Treasury pursuant to the act of March 8, 1938 (U. S. C., title 15, sec. 713a-4), at such rates as may be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury to be appropriate in view of the terms for which such amounts are made available to the Corporation.

SEC. 8. Funds: The Corporation is authorized to use in the conduct of its business all its funds and other assets, including capital and net earnings therefrom, and all funds and other assets which have been or may hereafter be transferred or allocated to, borrowed by, or otherwise acquired by it.

SEC. 9. Directors: The management of the Corporation shall be vested in a Board of Directors (hereinafter referred to as the "Board"), subject to the general direction and control of the Secretary who shall be a director and serve as Chairman of the Board. The Board shall consist of not less than 3 nor more than 11 persons employed in the Department of Agriculture who shall be appointed by and hold office at the pleasure of the Secretary. The directors so appointed shall receive no compensation for their services as directors. Nothing herein contained shall preclude any director from serving the Corporation in any other capacity and receiving compensation therefor.

SEC. 10. Personnel of Corporation: The Secretary shall appoint such officers and employees as may be necessary for the conduct of the business of the Corporation, define their authority and duties, delegate to them

such of the powers vested in the Corporation as he may determine, require that such of them as he may designate be bonded and fix the penalties therefor. The Corporation may pay the premium of any bond or bonds. With the exception of experts, appointments shall be made pursuant to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended (5 U. S. C., 1940 ed. 661).

SEC. 11. Cooperation with other governmental agencies: The Corporation may, with the consent of the agency concerned, accept and utilize, on a compensated or uncompensated basis, the officers, employees, services, facilities, and information of any agency of the Federal Government, including any bureau, office, administration, or other agency of the Department of Agriculture, and of any State, the District of Columbia, any Territory or possession, or any political subdivision thereof. The Corporation may allot to any bureau, office, administration, or other agency of the Department of Agriculture or transfer to such other agencies as it may request to assist it in the conduct of its business any of the funds available to it for administrative expenses. The personnel and facilities of the Corporation may, with the consent of the Corporation be utilized on a reimbursable basis by any agency of the Federal Government, including any bureau, office, administration, or other agency of the Department of Agriculture, in the performance of any part or all of the functions of such agency.

SEC. 12. Utilization of associations and trade facilities: The Corporation may, in the conduct of its business, utilize on a contract or fee basis, committees or associations of producers, producer-owned and producer-controlled cooperative associations, and trade facilities.

SEC. 13. Records; annual report: The Corporation shall at all times maintain complete and accurate books of account and shall file annually with the Secretary a complete report as to the business of the Corporation, a copy of which shall be forwarded by the Secretary to the President for transmission to the Congress.

SEC. 14. Interest of Members of the Congress: The provisions of section 1 of the act of February 27, 1877, as amended (41 U. S. C., 1940 ed. 22), shall apply to all contracts or agreements of the Corporation, except contracts or agreements of a kind which the Corporation may enter into with farmers participating in a program of the Corporation.

SEC. 15. Crimes and offenses.—

FALSE STATEMENTS; OVERVALUATION OF SECURITIES

(a) Whoever makes any statement knowing it to be false, or whoever willfully overvalues any security, for the purpose of influencing in any way the action of the Corporation, or for the purpose of obtaining for himself for another, money, property, or anything of value, under this act, or under any other act applicable to the Corporation, shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than \$10,000 or by imprisonment by not more than 5 years, or both.

EMBEZZLEMENT, AND SO FORTH; FALSE ENTRIES; FRAUDULENT ISSUE OF OBLIGATIONS OF CORPORATION

(b) Whoever, being connected in any capacity with the Corporation or any of its programs, (i) embezzles, abstracts, purloins, or willfully misapplies any money, funds, securities, or other things of value, whether belonging to the Corporation or pledged or otherwise entrusted to it; or (ii) with intent to defraud the Corporation, or any other body, politic or corporate, or any individual, or to deceive any officer, auditor, or examiner of the Corporation, makes any false entry in any book, report, or statement of, or to, the Corporation, or draws any order, or issues, puts forth or assigns any note or other obligation or draft, mortgage, judgment, or

decree thereof; or (iii) with intent to defraud the Corporation, participates or shares in, or receives directly or indirectly any money, profit, property, or benefits through any transaction, loan, commission, contract, or any other act of the Corporation, shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than \$10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 5 years, or both.

LARCENY; CONVERSION OF PROPERTY

(c) Whoever shall willfully steal, conceal, remove, dispose of, or convert to his own use or to that of another any property owned or held by, or mortgaged or pledged to, the Corporation, shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than \$10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 5 years, or both.

CONSPIRACY TO COMMIT OFFENSE

(d) Whoever conspires with another to accomplish any of the acts made unlawful by the preceding provisions of this section shall, upon conviction thereof, be subject to the same fine or imprisonment, or both, as is applicable in the case of conviction for doing such unlawful acts.

GENERAL STATUTES APPLICABLE

(e) All the general penal statutes relating to crimes and offenses against the United States shall apply with respect to the Corporation, its property, money, contracts and agreements, employees, and operations: *Provided*, That such general penal statutes shall not apply to the extent that they relate to crimes and offenses punishable under subsections (a), (b), (c), and (d) of this section: *Provided further*, That sections 114 and 115 of the act of March 4, 1909, as amended (18 U. S. C., 1940 ed. 204, 205) shall not apply to contracts or agreements of a kind which the Corporation may enter into with farmers participating in a program of the Corporation.

SEC. 16. Transfer of assets of Commodity Credit Corporation, a Delaware corporation: The assets, funds, property, and records of Commodity Credit Corporation, a Delaware corporation, are hereby transferred to the Corporation. The rights, privileges, and powers, and the duties and liabilities of Commodity Credit Corporation, a Delaware corporation, in respect to any contract, agreement, loan, account, or other obligation shall become the rights, privileges, and powers, and the duties and liabilities, respectively, of the Corporation. The enforceable claims of or against Commodity Credit Corporation, a Delaware corporation, shall become the claims of or against, and may be enforced by or against, the Corporation.

SEC. 17. Dissolution of Delaware corporation: The Secretary, representing the United States as the sole owner of the capital stock of Commodity Credit Corporation, a Delaware corporation, is hereby authorized and directed to institute or cause to be instituted such proceedings as are required for the dissolution of said Corporation under the laws of the State of Delaware. The costs of such dissolution of said Corporation shall be borne by the Corporation.

SEC. 18. Corporation administrative accounts: In the event that the personnel or facilities of any bureau, office, administration, or other agency of or within the Department of Agriculture, including the Corporation, are utilized in the performance of functions, including those of the Corporation, for which separate funds are available, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed, upon the request of the Secretary, to establish one or more separate accounts into which there may be transferred, by advance payment or reimbursement, all or any part, as determined by the Secretary, of the funds available for administrative expenses in the performance of such functions. The funds so transferred shall be expended only for the purpose for which appropriated or made available.

SEC. 19. Effective date: This act shall take effect on July 1, 1948.

The amendments were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. On behalf of myself, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 10, line 13, after the words "fee basis", it is proposed to insert the words "privately owned and operated plants and facilities."

On page 10, line 15, it is proposed to strike out all after the word "and" and insert in lieu thereof "shall to the fullest extent practicable utilize existing trade channels for the marketing, sale, and distribution of such agricultural commodities."

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I have proposed this amendment to the bill, S. 1322, providing a Federal Charter for the Commodity Credit Corporation. Under section 12 of the bill as reported by the Committee emphasis is put only upon committees, associations of producers and producer-owned and producer-controlled cooperative associations in the utilization of facilities to conduct the business of the Corporation. I have prepared an amendment, which would not detract in any manner from the language now used in section 12, providing for the utilization of these facilities. I have, however, added additional language which would spell out in greater detail and with more emphasis that the Corporation shall, wherever feasible, utilize the facilities of private enterprise.

Those who believe in the free enterprise system will, I am certain, join with me in the adoption of this amendment.

I understand that the Senator from Vermont is willing to accept this amendment.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes, the amendment is in line with the method now being used by the Commodity Credit Corporation. The Corporation seems to be operating as satisfactorily now as it has at any time in its existence, and I have no objection to the amendment.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that the two amendments to be offered by the Senator from Delaware are in line with the present practice of the Commodity Credit Corporation. Generally and consistently the Commodity Credit Corporation has followed the practices called for by the two amendments. But since the proposal now is the granting of a Federal charter over a period of years, the Corporation will be operating with rather extended and extensive powers, and it was deemed advisable that it be made abundantly clear in the act itself granting the charter, or chartering the Corporation, that the present practices were to be adhered to with respect to its commodity transactions.

I am pleased to cooperate with the Senator from Delaware. Both of us seem to have drawn amendments in substantially, though not identically, the same language.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I do not wish to discuss at any length the issue now before the Senate. I ask simply to have published in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a statement by H. E. Sanford, of Portland, Oreg., dealing with the problem. I think Mr. Sanford's statement commends itself to the consideration of the Senate.

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

STATEMENT OF H. E. SANFORD, PORTLAND, OREG.,
BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON BANKING
AND CURRENCY

I appear before you as chairman of the National Grain Trade Council, an organization comprising all organized grain exchanges within the United States, plus six national grain and feed associations.

We come before this committee to present the views of the grain industry on H. R. 6214, cited as the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act. This bill seems improved in several respects as compared with the Senate bill, S. 1322, reported recently by the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. There are a few points, however, upon which we would like to comment.

The basic foundation of our price policy for agriculture rests in the crop-loan and price-support programs. For these programs an instrument like Commodity Credit Corporation is needed. We prefer that the resulting activities in grain be handled by a corporate agency rather than by a governmental bureau. We should dislike to see these activities transferred away from the present experienced personnel to some other Government agency. For these reasons we favor the granting of a Federal charter to Commodity Credit Corporation.

We ask, however, that the proposed Federal charter be reasonably definite in its assignment of powers and authority to the Corporation. While the charter must be flexible enough to permit the Corporation to operate, it should by its terms limit the activities to the functions and objectives intended by Congress.

We ask the committee to bear in mind that it is dealing with a Corporation with a combined capital and borrowing power of nearly \$5,000,000,000. Secretary Dodd has testified recently that the annual turnover has been between eight and nine billion dollars. This volume of business in itself constitutes a terrific bestowal of power. Increasing numbers of individuals and firms throughout the United States are dependent on the good will of Commodity Credit Corporation for a large part of their business existence. Satisfactory as the business may be, they fear the power of any single agency to grant them those favors or to take them away.

For these reasons we ask that certain safeguards be erected for the purpose of insuring adequate control of the Corporation by Congress. While it is true that this is only a charter, and that the authorities come specifically from other legislation, we remind the committee that these separate authorities are strewn through a maze of statutes, appropriation bills, directives, and executive orders dating back for many years. It is almost impossible to know what can or cannot be done. It is likely that somewhere in the statutes, justification can be found for almost any action.

The rewriting of this charter, we believe, provides Congress with a simple means of limiting the powers to those which Congress intends.

To assist in this, we have prepared a draft of a substitute bill to H. R. 6214. We hope this may be useful to your committee in comparing some of the provisions, and we offer it herewith as part of the record.

The substitute bill follows the more usual form for corporate charters in that the pur-

poses and objects of the Corporation are set forth at the outset. This has proved more desirable than to have the various duties and powers scattered throughout the charter, where they may be ambiguous and are not readily determined without careful study.

I do not intend to take the committee's time discussing all the details of either bill, but will mention only the principal differences as follows:

1. We recommend that the Corporation shall have corporate succession only until July 1, 1950, rather than be granted a perpetual charter as provided in section 4 (a) of H. R. 6214.

Two compelling reasons favor this:

(a) The Agriculture Committees of both Houses are considering long-range agricultural legislation. This is so vast a problem that it seems possible no major change may be made this year. Secretary Anderson was asked at the hearing before the Senate Agriculture Committee on Monday last, to prepare stand-by legislation for use in case permanent legislation required further study. If Commodity Credit's charter is limited to 2 years, its authority may, in the interim, be tailored to fit the requirements of new legislation. If at the end of 2 years, it is still a necessary and satisfactory instrument, it will be a simple matter to extend its life.

(b) The act of July 7, 1947, Public Law 162, established a bipartisan Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch. This Commission is to study and investigate the present organization and methods of operation of all departments, bureaus, agencies, boards, commissions, offices, independent establishments, and instrumentalities of the executive branch and to determine what is necessary to limit expenditures; to eliminate duplication and overlapping of services, activities, and functions; and to consolidate, abolish, and define services, functions, and activities. Former President Hoover has been named Chairman of the Commission. Congressmen CLARENCE BROWN and MANASCO are members of the Commission. A committee has been appointed to study the organization of the Department of Agriculture. That committee has, it is our understanding, commenced its investigation. If Congress were, prior to receiving the recommendations of this special study group, to establish within the Department of Agriculture a corporate agency with perpetual existence and broad powers, the agency, so established, would stand as a huge Gibraltar about which recommended eliminations, consolidations, and cost-saving operations would need to flow. The accomplishment of recommended changes might be impossible.

As a matter of fact, Secretary Anderson used this same argument in testifying last Monday before the Senate Agriculture Committee on the suggested National Agricultural Council established in the proposed Agricultural Act of 1948. He said, "I would certainly raise the question as to whether we want to go into this general field before the report of the President's Commission on Organization which as you all know is now at work under the chairmanship of Mr. Herbert Hoover."

2. Section 4 (g), to the first sentence: "May enter into and carry out such contracts or agreements as it deems necessary or desirable in the conduct of its business," we would add, "to the extent authorized by law and as provided for in budgets submitted to Congress under the Government Corporation Control Act, and approved by Congress."

This paragraph should be further amended to permit the Corporation to consent to the modification of contracts or agreements, in their terms and conditions.

3. Section 4 (h): We urge that the Corporation be denied authority to acquire real property or any interest therein, or to acquire or lease warehouses, elevators, mills, gins, processing plants, railroads or other

transportation facilities, barges, boats, or wharves; except that this shall not prevent the Corporation from contracting for the use of any of the foregoing in accordance with the usual customs of trade and commerce, or preventing the Corporation from renting or leasing office space.

Our reason for the above is obvious. All of those facilities are available in this country to handle the flow of grain and other commodities in commerce. We consider it a threat to business—and even to farmers—to give any governmental agency the power to acquire commercial facilities. Private individuals cannot compete with what amounts virtually to a \$5,000,000,000 Government corporation, clothed with broad powers and not under any necessity of making a profit, and they should not be exposed to this risk.

4. Section 4 (1): This reads: "May make such loans and advances of its funds as it deems necessary or desirable in the conduct of its business."

We think this power is broader than is required for accomplishing the purposes and objectives of the Corporation and recommend that it be amended to read: "May make loans and advances of its funds on agricultural commodities to the extent authorized by law."

5. Section 5. Specific powers: We recommend that the opening paragraph be amended by inserting in line 12, after the word "purposes", the following language: "as specifically authorized by law."

6. Section 5 (a) might be broadened by reading: "Support the prices of agricultural commodities through loans, purchases, payments, guaranties, and purchase and guaranty agreements."

7. Section 5 (b): This reads: "Make available materials and facilities required in connection with the production and marketing of agricultural commodities."

We recommend the addition of the following language: "but nothing herein is to be construed as authority to acquire, own, rent, or lease real property or transportation facilities."

8. Section 5: We respectfully urge that this section be amended by adding a new paragraph (h), or that a new section be added reading as follows:

"In the Corporation's purchasing and selling operations with respect to agricultural commodities (except sales to other Government agencies), and in the warehousing, transporting, processing, or handling of agricultural commodities, the Corporation shall utilize the usual and customary channels, facilities, and arrangements of private trade and commerce."

We believe that this principle of government is in keeping with the thinking of the present Congress as indicated by the provision in section 112 (h) of the Foreign Assistance Act recently passed, as follows:

"In providing for the performance of any of the functions described in subsection (a) of section 111, the Administrator shall, to the maximum extent consistent with the accomplishment of the purposes of this title, utilize private channels of trade."

It is inconsistent, for example, that we, as a nation, should be preaching democracy and private enterprise throughout the world, while at the same time foreign buyers of wheat can procure supplies only from the United States Government.

Our export houses for many years have had their own offices or business connections in foreign countries. With a few minor exceptions of short duration, they have not been permitted to handle United States wheat exports for about 7 years. We do not believe it is the policy of this committee or of the Congress to expand or maintain the role of Government in business, or to bar private firms from their normal business for so long a period. This matter will be discussed in detail by witnesses for the exporters at a later date.

9. Section 8, capital stock, and section 9, funds. The substitute bill which we have offered includes the following provisions in its section 6 (e), which the committee might wish to consider:

"There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of the Treasury, to be paid over to the Corporation from time to time as may be necessary to cover losses of the Corporation, such sums as are estimated in advance for such purpose in the Corporation's budgets submitted in accordance with the Government Corporation Control Act and approved by the Congress."

In closing let me remind the committee that the original purpose of Commodity Credit Corporation was to protect farm income. The laws passed for this purpose give the Secretary of Agriculture the power to take all business away from private firms. We merely ask that you give it back to us.

Our industry today exists by the kindness of the administrative policy of Commodity Credit Corporation. When individuals and firms depend increasingly for their business upon a single powerful customer, they are in an exceedingly precarious position. There is a growing fear of offending the customer by any criticism or complaint. This is the basic philosophy behind the democratic objection to government in business. State trading carries with it such vast economic power that inevitably the time comes when private citizens are frightened into political submission; no longer do they dare to criticize or to raise their voices.

We believe this is the reason that Congress has started writing "private handling" clauses into legislation involving government in business. We respectfully petition the committee to provide this common safeguard in the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to amendment B offered by the Senator from Delaware on behalf of himself and other Senators.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WILLIAMS. On behalf of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], and myself I offer amendment lettered "C" and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 8, beginning after the period in line 22, it is proposed to strike out down through line 4 on page 9, and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

The Board shall consist of four members (in addition to the Secretary), who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Each appointed member of the Board shall hold office for a term of 4 years, except that (a) any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term, and (b) the terms of office of members first taking office after the date of enactment of this act shall expire, as designated by the President at the time of appointment, one at the end of 1 year, one at the end of 2 years, one at the end of 3 years, and one at the end of 4 years, after the date of enactment of this act. In addition to their duties as members of the Board, such appointed members shall perform such other duties as may be prescribed by the Secretary. Each appointed member of the Board shall receive compensation at the rate of \$10,000 per annum, except that any such member who holds another office or position in the Department of Agriculture the compensation for which exceeds such rate

may elect to receive compensation at the rate provided for such other office or position in lieu of the compensation provided by this section.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, as an explanation of the reason why I think it is essential that we should confirm these members, I have prepared a brief review of the operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation for the past 15 years, and I should like to present it at this time for the RECORD.

The Commodity Credit Corporation was incorporated under the laws of the State of Delaware on October 17, 1933, with capitalization of \$3,000,000, subscribed for in the name of the United States Government by the Secretary of Agriculture and the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration under the authorization of section 220 of the National Industrial Recovery Act. On April 10, 1936, the Corporation's capitalization was increased to \$100,000,000, the additional \$97,000,000 of the Corporation's stock being acquired by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in the name of the United States Government. The act of March 8 1938 (52 Stat. 108) authorized the Corporation, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, to issue and have outstanding bonds, notes, debentures, and similar obligations in an aggregate amount not to exceed \$500,000,000, fully guaranteed as to principal and interest by the United States Government. The borrowing power of the Corporation was increased by successive amendments to the act of March 8, 1938, until now the Corporation is authorized to borrow \$4,750,000,000 on the credit of the United States. On February 18, 1946, the Corporation was granted an additional \$500,000,000

to be held as a reserve for postwar support of agriculture, bringing the total capitalization of this Corporation, exclusive of borrowing capacity, as of June 30, 1947, to \$600,000,000.

In addition to this paid-in capitalization of \$600,000,000, there has been appropriated to this Corporation between the years 1933 and 1946, inclusive, either as direct appropriations by Congress or cancellation of notes by the Treasury Department, \$1,964,004,046.28.

As an additional source of capital, on August 24, 1935, under Public Law 320, Seventy-fourth Congress (49 Stat., p. 750), Congress authorized that 30 percent of the customs receipts should be turned over to the Secretary of Agriculture to be used to subsidize the export or domestic consumption of agricultural products. During the years 1936 to 1946, inclusive, the revenues derived from this source, known as section 32 funds, have amounted to \$1,133,726,295. Thus, the combined total of the funds available for these programs equaled \$3,697,730,341.28.

A review of the annual report of the Commodity Credit Corporation as of June 30, 1947, discloses that the Secretary of Agriculture, in the combined operations of these two funds, has sustained a loss between the years 1933 and 1946, inclusive, of \$3,139,785,495 and that the Commodity Credit Corporation itself, as of that date, had a balance or a net worth of \$557,944,847.

These combined losses are summarized by years in a table which I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

TABLE NO. 1.—Statement of financial operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation, including sec. 32 funds

End of fiscal year	Capitalization	Restoration of capital impairment by U. S. Treasury	Sec. 32 funds	Cumulative total capital (columns (a), (b) and (c))	Cumulative gain or loss
	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)
1933.....	¹ \$3,000,000	0	0	\$3,000,000.00	0
1934.....	0	0	0	3,000,000.00	\$730,367
1935.....	0	0	0	3,000,000.00	1,644,875
1936.....	² 97,000,000	0	\$16,958,085	116,958,085.00	33,031,078
1937.....	0	0	15,451,587	132,409,672.00	55,092,520
1938.....	0	⁴ \$94,285,404.73	55,650,977	282,346,053.73	110,691,738
1939.....	0	⁵ 119,599,918.05	81,326,615	483,272,586.78	190,982,641
1940.....	0	⁶ 43,756,731.01	189,642,890	629,158,745.77	394,190,287
1941.....	0	⁷ 1,637,445.51	219,365,779	850,161,970.28	647,254,409
1942.....	0	⁸ 27,815,513.68	188,880,813	1,041,227,269.60	766,599,715
1943.....	0	0	93,368,302	1,104,595,571.60	964,603,919
1944.....	0	⁹ 256,764,881.04	52,516,889	1,413,877,341.64	1,397,772,469
1945.....	0	¹⁰ 921,456,561.00	58,377,445	2,393,711,347.64	2,280,984,088
1946.....	⁷ 500,000,000	⁶ 641,832,080.64	86,647,936	3,622,191,364.28	3,208,022,837
1947.....	0	0	75,538,977	3,697,730,341.28	3,079,834,799
Total.....	600,000,000	1,964,004,046.28	1,133,726,295	3,697,730,341.28	3,079,834,799
Reserve for postwar price support of agriculture.....					59,950,695
Total.....					³ 3,139,785,494

Capitalization and appropriations..... \$3,697,730,341

Cumulative loss sustained, 1933 through 1947—Sec. 32 funds and the Commodity Credit Corporation (column (e))..... 3,139,785,494

Net worth as of June 30, 1947..... 557,944,847

¹ Original capitalization. Subscribed by the Secretary of Agriculture and the Governor of Farm Credit Administration. The funds for such subscription were derived from the appropriation authorized by sec. 220 of the National Industrial Recovery Act (48 Stat. 210), and made by the Fourth Deficiency Act, fiscal year 1933 (48 Stat. 274).

² In accordance with the act of Apr. 10, 1936 (15 U. S. C., 1940 ed., 713a), the Corporation's capitalization was increased to \$100,000,000, the additional \$97,000,000 of the Corporation's stock being acquired by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

³ Loss.

⁴ Appropriation.

⁵ Payment to U. S. Treasury.

⁶ Restoration by note cancellation.

⁷ Paid to the Corporation to be held as a reserve for postwar price support of agriculture in accordance with the act of Feb. 18, 1946 (60 Stat. 6).

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have two additional tables, the first of which shows a break-down by commodities and years of that portion of the loss which was sustained by the Commodity Credit Corpo-

ration itself, amounting to \$1,831,498,139; the second shows a break-down as to commodities and the expenditures of section 32 funds during the same period. I ask unanimous consent that these

tables be incorporated in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

TABLE NO. 2.—Program results from Oct. 17, 1933, through June 30, 1947

Program	Cumulative, Oct. 17, 1933, to June 30, 1941	Fiscal year ended June 30—						Cumulative, Oct. 17, 1933, to June 30, 1947
		1942	1943	1944	1945	1946	1947	
Subsidy programs:								
Apple freight equalization				\$3,047,115	\$182,603			\$3,229,718
Beef production					5,000,156	\$33,204,163	\$1,299,861	36,904,458
Barley for feed						6,994		6,994
Beans, dry edible				4,235,607	3,676,691	5,224,155	170,920	12,965,533
Cheese, Cheddar		\$11,437,554	26,101,634	18,472,810	11,674,918		52,132	67,634,784
Cocoa		100,903	1,036					101,939
Coffee		2,606,725	4,227,886	476,558		99,271	5,630	7,217,523
Corn ceiling price adjustment		359,755	1,166,751	19,252		79		1,535,679
Corn for alcohol ²		\$1,600,000	2,800,000					4,400,000
Corn purchase and shelling				1,697,048	11,920,359	2,257		13,619,664
Corn importation					2,106,398	1,026		2,405,371
Dairy production				153,136,335	532,253,665	519,390,647	1,462,810	1,206,243,457
Flaxseed						503,374	109,670	393,704
Fruits for processing			18,811,060	23,579,833	32,036,548	341,455		74,768,896
Hay for dairymen			2,697,103	198,161				2,498,942
Milk, fluid			2,719,720	8,897,342	12,902,735	13,143,008	1,463,283	38,126,088
Millfeed price support			163,062	24,944				138,118
Oilseeds and products:								
Peanut butter				5,563,880	9,051,802	4,972,949	31,043	19,557,588
Peanuts				10,356,565	9,119,557	6,477,244	1,965,213	26,905,449
Shortening				391,808	1,007,560	522,588	5,672	1,916,284
Soybeans		5,153,893	15,978,998	43,413,901	34,781,641	316,406		99,012,027
Vegetable oils and meals		8,919,376	2,054,403	36,386	2,465			6,903,824
Pear freight equalization				142,237				142,237
Phosphate fertilizer				89,344				89,344
Pork purchase				330				330
Sheep and lamb production						41,427,240	1,810,912	43,238,152
Sugar			8,194,706	39,007,814	9,641,613	69,710,147	8,435,112	118,119,168
Vegetables for processing				20,938,233	14,476,131	63,093,441	12,138,179	96,369,626
Vegetables, frozen					498,283	7,996,688	4,834,755	3,660,216
Wheat for alcohol ²		800,000	21,900,000					22,700,000
Wheat for feed		5,900,000	81,100,000	96,600,000	53,800,000	1,032,023	19,713	238,412,310
Total subsidy programs		8,300,000	145,455,694	390,064,068	741,659,713	845,102,114	22,364,160	1,208,217,429
Other programs:								
Ammonium nitrate					45,958	174,148	11,857	208,249
Barley		4,606	10,590	143,440	16,943	464,482	694,627	371,838
Beans and peas, dry edible				160,665	2,538	19,562	803	181,962
Castor beans			3,521		167,555	3,373		167,703
Corn	\$20,078,488	9,478,707	14,461,707	810,976	7,268,333	7,236,315	6,013,354	27,226,590
Cotton	27,401,798	63,334,939	25,525,792	27,373,731	22,940,882	79,152,962	46,536,525	237,463,033
Cotton, Puerto Rican					12,130	113,881	4,187	130,198
Cotton, American-Egyptian, Sea Is- land				156,121	151,153	533,605	37,023	501,550
Cotton, Egyptian					4,548,868	869,325	457,029	5,875,222
Cotton, export					2,951,507	31,798,547	19,225,915	53,975,969
Cotton, rubber barter		11,090,907		35,456				11,055,451
Cotton, burlap, and jute fabrics			2,769		3,586	147,959		141,604
Cotton, linters				1,283,411	158,344	150,796	237	1,592,788
Cotton, supply							24,628	24,628
Dairy animals			115,672	537,168	2,856	112	104	655,688
Eggs						224,002	423,602	199,600
Feed for Government facilities					460	1,283	1,284	461
Flax, fibers							122,636	122,636
Flaxseed		140		257	21,712	1,200	2,727	19,482
Foreign commodities			1,152,771	23,856,582	4,201,934	8,421,457	20,414,919	47,338,253
General commodities purchases							161,915,684	161,915,684
General supply							26,438,161	26,438,161
Grain bins				13,148,494	4,782,843	7,843,899	721,069	9,365,369
Grain sorghums			2,555	1,424	61,138	706,593	24,614	624,820
Hemp and milkweed floss				329,072	11,865,448	8,125,482	1,257,169	21,577,171
Hops	162,036	799,011			6,847			954,200
Idle farm machinery						16		16
Livestock procurement						22,186	92,821	115,007
Milk, dried							12,487	12,487
Molasses							23,674	23,674
Naval stores	4,435,579	27,014	430,747	3,962,806	1,084,011	493,283	1,460	1,561,822
Oats				26,512	9,212	740,224	532,030	1,289,554
Peanuts					386,055		727,481	341,423
Peanut equipment							376,110	376,110
Peanut seed notes							39,816	39,816
Pecans			3,751					3,751
Potatoes, white				3,467,589	12,958,355	8,771,278	60,091,288	85,288,510
Potatoes, sweet							95	95
Raisins		111,337			1,848			109,489
Rye	4,575	29,489	51,582	251,395	139,824	113,897	24,958	223,758
Seeds, miscellaneous			597,945	944	263,966	129,163	23,061	1,313,191
Sorgho			59,399	6,615				66,014
Soybeans							2,741,090	2,741,090
Soybean oil					31,179	10,406	67,494	88,267
Spruce logs, Alaska			22,522		2,368,961	270,255	21,865	2,143,093
Tobacco	2,107,589	12,099	96,895	7,395,210	2,349,554	1,617,865	596,186	9,742,232
Vegetables, canned						6,888	12,831	5,745
Wheat	6,199,400	5,089,029	28,505,494	28,412,822	16,947,002	23,157,655	17,517,267	22,710,161
Wheat, export					216,361	993,084		1,210,063
Women's land army						41,323		41,323
Wool	176			569,225	1,086,068	14,178,870	33,484,609	49,319,008
Unallocated						11,134	470,532	459,398
Total other programs	60,389,701	69,174,830	47,912,142	18,282,947	35,184,774	66,002,203	170,929,643	276,727,290
Total gains and losses from program operations	60,389,701	60,874,830	197,543,552	371,781,121	776,844,487	779,099,911	193,293,803	1,831,490,139

¹ Loss

² Estimated.

³ Included gain of \$794,100 reported by Office of Foreign Contract Settlement in 1946.

⁴ Includes gain of \$178,697,602 carried as Special Reserves—General Commodities Purchase Program as of June 30, 1946, and transferred to income in May of 1947.

TABLE NO. 3.—Exportation and domestic consumption of agricultural commodities—expenditures by commodity groups and projects, fiscal years 1936-47

	1936	1937	1938	1939	1940	1941	1942	1943	1944	1945	1946 ¹	1947 ¹	Total
Cotton:													
Stamp plan.....					\$40,000	\$2,725,000	\$3,450,000						\$6,215,000
Supplemental plan.....						17,802,000							17,802,000
Purchases.....	\$3,331,325		\$926,837	\$1,347,039	33,563,350	26,902,710	1,346,020		\$140				47,417,421
Export.....				17,335	35,636,762	6,186,712	6,363,091			\$15,840,377	\$33,370,868		97,409,246
Diversion.....	728,633	\$6,836	133,829	530,057	232,290	398,518	1,078,933	\$6,475,499	1,319,496	\$273,764	3,264,724	1,688,645	16,131,244
Total.....	4,059,978	6,836	1,060,666	1,894,431	49,472,402	54,008,941	12,238,044	6,475,499	1,319,636	273,764	19,105,101	35,059,613	184,974,911
Dairy:													
Stamp plan.....				39,453	3,010,000	10,272,000	10,323,000	2,544,000					26,188,453
Purchases.....		368,386	5,876,612	38,932,498	14,060,014	2,472,891	15,187,386	1,265,537	3,610,624				81,773,948
Export.....				23,955	121,179								145,134
Diversion.....				693,027	2,110,829	3,869,232	6,573,436						13,246,524
Total.....		368,386	5,876,612	38,995,906	17,884,220	14,855,720	29,379,618	10,382,973	3,610,624				121,354,059
Fruits:													
Stamp plan.....				35,926	2,453,000	11,026,000	17,657,000	6,330,000					37,501,926
Purchases.....	2,182,843	6,110,183	16,739,000	10,910,314	22,757,863	21,741,880	12,216,226	5,509,079	1,242,780	3,069,212	787,496	28,295	103,295,171
Export.....		514	19,151	39,377	59,475								118,517
Diversion.....	256,438	179,525	571,894	866,182	286,759	232,938	93,898						2,487,634
Total.....	2,439,281	6,290,222	17,330,045	11,851,799	25,557,097	33,000,818	29,967,124	11,839,079	1,242,780	3,069,212	787,496	28,295	143,403,248
Grain:													
Stamp plan.....				12,670	2,916,000	13,800,000	21,896,000	10,939,000					49,563,670
Purchases.....	5,610,046	422,178	13,734,061	9,107,360	30,263,103	4,213,088	3,042,279	1,541,825	945				67,934,825
Export.....	154,261	231,112	78,961	9,116,007	11,115,141	4,465,971	4,217,037	6,656,673	1,313,993	4,154,712	3,740,075		45,243,943
Diversion.....					8,034								8,034
Total.....	5,764,307	653,290	13,812,962	18,236,037	44,302,278	22,479,059	29,155,316	19,137,498	1,314,938	4,154,712	3,740,075		162,750,472
Meats:													
Stamp plan.....					4,715,000	26,602,000	11,786,000						43,103,000
Purchases.....		107,229			20,969,768	4,123,363	2,435,175	440,000	367,194				28,442,729
Export.....					141,620								141,620
Total.....		107,229			25,826,388	30,725,363	14,221,175	440,000	367,194				71,687,349
Nuts:													
Purchases.....		139,682	180		206,827	311,605	977,393	1,450,014					3,085,701
Export.....	697,715	645,625	753,861	544,371	158,221								2,799,793
Diversion.....	898,023	759,053	3,113,265	653,876	1,742,938	8,895,202	1,315,709	279,837					17,657,933
Total.....	1,595,738	1,544,360	3,867,336	1,198,247	2,107,986	9,206,807	2,293,102	1,729,851					23,543,427
Poultry:													
Stamp plan.....				38,415	2,655,000	11,534,000	20,327,000	9,014,000					43,568,415
Purchases.....	198,604	2,136,766	1,726,868	532,134	12,834,520	3,213,263	5,650,967	2,881,850	5,883,402	3,072,033		10,700,000	48,830,407
Total.....	198,604	2,136,766	1,726,868	570,549	15,489,520	14,747,263	25,977,967	11,895,850	5,883,402	3,072,033		10,700,000	92,398,822
Tobacco:													
Export.....		3,881											3,881
Diversion.....	1,090,213	1,716,756	1,555,838	400,897									9,533,540
Total.....	1,090,213	1,720,637	1,555,838	400,897									9,537,421
Vegetables:													
Stamp plan.....				3,843	861,000	10,332,000	30,418,000	20,415,187					62,030,030
Purchases.....	1,707,599	1,365,684	6,632,906	5,429,351	2,769,886	12,496,852	4,609,489	1,268,944	3,688,430	2,961,179	6,732,268	20,613,935	70,276,523
Export.....											909,570	954,091	1,863,661
Diversion.....			1,309,768	33,164	54,577	1,895,744	366,956	213,932	2,715,394	233,489	857,708	4,714,231	12,394,963
Total.....	1,707,599	1,365,684	7,942,674	5,466,358	3,685,463	24,724,596	35,394,445	21,898,063	6,403,824	3,194,668	8,499,546	26,282,257	146,565,177
Miscellaneous:													
Purchases.....	6,517	983,970	570,928	1,089,743	758,072	8,896,903	3,503,456	626,453	239,269	19,599	66,614		16,761,524
Diversion.....	33,945	274,207	594,916	107,861	125,045	99,291	241,664						1,476,929
Total.....	40,462	1,258,177	1,165,844	1,197,604	883,117	8,996,194	3,745,120	626,453	239,269	19,599	66,614		18,238,453
School lunch²:								975,334	25,777,837	41,067,410	50,474,990		118,295,571
Total.....	16,896,182	15,451,587	54,338,845	79,811,828	185,208,471	212,744,761	182,739,272	87,094,600	48,867,979	54,851,398	82,673,822	72,070,165	1,092,748,910

¹ Obligations.² Cash payments only. Commodities purchased for school milk and lunch program shown under appropriate commodity head and not segregated as to distribution to school lunch or other authorized agencies.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Senate bill 1322, a bill to provide a Federal charter for the Commodity Credit Corporation, which is now before the Senate, requires, in section 9, that "the Board of Directors shall consist of not less than 3 or more than 11 persons employed in the Department of Agriculture who shall be appointed by and hold office at the pleasure of the Secretary," in addition to the Secretary himself, who is designated to serve as Chairman of the Board.

I have prepared an amendment, a copy of which is on the desks of Senators. This amendment requires that in addition to the Secretary of Agriculture being designated as Chairman of the Board, the Board of Directors of the

Corporation shall consist of four members who shall be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. It is my contention that the nominations of members of the Board of Directors of this Corporation, upon whom such broad powers of administration are being conferred by Congress, should require Senate confirmation. I particularly urge that we incorporate this requirement in the bill in view of the fact that it is proposed under this legislation to confer upon this unknown Board of Directors the power to borrow money and pledge the security of the United States Government itself in the amount of \$4,750,000,000 in addition to transferring to their control the net

worth of the Corporation, which in itself exceeds \$500,000,000. There is nothing unusual in this procedure, since it is only a continuation of the same principles under which the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and other Government corporations operate. The laws with respect to all of them require that the Board of Directors must be confirmed by the Senate.

Perhaps the paramount reason for requiring Senate confirmation in appointments of trust is that the President of the United States, in selecting men to occupy such positions, will have greater regard for their character and fitness than he would otherwise have if no Senate confirmation were required.

Since under the Reorganization Act which the Congress passed during the Seventy-ninth Congress all corporations of this character are required to be chartered by the Congress, I believe that it would be dangerous to establish a precedent here today by making an exception to the rule that members of Boards of Directors of Government corporations be required to be confirmed by the United States Senate.

Another reason why I would require confirmation by the Senate of the Board of Directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation is to prevent a recurrence of recent unpleasant developments. Senators will recall that a few months ago the Commodity Credit Corporation and other Government procurement agencies, through their haphazard buying methods, intentionally or otherwise, had been charged with manipulating our commodity markets. At that time it was difficult or impossible for the investigators to determine who in the Commodity Credit Corporation was responsible for the leaks on buying schedules which occurred or which official was charged with the responsibility of conducting their buying programs. My amendment would place a greater responsibility upon the President and upon the United States Senate to see to it that men of the highest character and ability are appointed to these offices. I know of no other way under the functions of our Government whereby we can insure that this will be done other than by the power of confirmation by the Senate, with instructions that these men must make an annual report to Congress of their operations.

Mr. President, I ask that this amendment be accepted.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware on behalf of himself and his colleagues leaves the way clear for the Board of the Commodity Credit Corporation to be chosen from among officials of the Department of Agriculture, although requiring them to be designated by the President and confirmed by the Senate. I do not believe that this will hamper the work of the Commodity Corporation. I believe that most, if not all, the members of the Board should be chosen from the Department of Agriculture, because the very nature of their work requires them to be familiar with practically all the work of the Department of Agriculture. Furthermore, members of the Board are under the direction of the Secretary, according to this amendment, at such times as they are not employed in Commodity Credit Corporation work. I see no seriously harmful effects upon the Commodity Credit Corporation work through the adoption of this amendment. However, I ask the Senator from Delaware if he would agree to a six-member Board besides the Secretary of Agriculture, rather than a four-member Board. The reason is that the Board members must be familiar with so many different branches of work. They must have full knowledge of the price-support program, of surpluses, and of shortages. They must know about the production goals

which have been laid down. They must be familiar with the marketing quotas. They must deal with the school-lunch program. They must decide how to spend section 32 funds, and also must be familiar with both domestic and foreign requirements. It seems to me that a little larger Board than a four-member Board and the Secretary could perform these functions much better. I wonder if the Senator would be willing to modify his amendment to that extent. At the present time the Board consists of nine members, all officers or employees of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I am not free to accept the suggestion of the Senator from Vermont, because some of the Senators who joined me in this amendment and who were most insistent that the Board consist of five members are not in the Chamber at this time. Therefore I could not agree to the modification of the amendment. The bill will have to go to the House. Perhaps some change could be made there. We could even let the bill go through with a five-member Board, and if we found that it did not work, the law could be amended later.

The Senator from Vermont raised this same question a short time ago. I asked the Library of Congress to check back and see how many members had been on the previous boards. While it is true that there are now nine members of the Board, it is also true that during 1940, 1941, 1942, 1943, 1944, and 1945 this Corporation operated with a membership of only five Directors. If the Board could operate with five members during that 6-year period, four of which were war years, when the Secretary of Agriculture had the power to enlarge the Board if he had seen fit, I do not see any reason why, in postwar years, the Board cannot operate with the same sized membership.

I should like to see the Senator from Vermont withhold his request and accept this amendment, which provides for a membership of four in addition to the Chairman, making a total of five, giving the Department of Agriculture the same number of directors with which the Board operated during the 6-year period mentioned. It is only recently that the membership has been raised to nine. I think we could at least try to operate on that basis.

Mr. AIKEN. The reason I made the suggestion was that I believe that the duties of the Commodity Credit Corporation are rather more diverse now, with the various relief programs in effect, than they were even during the war years.

I agree with the Senator that the Commodity Credit Corporation probably could function with either a five-man or a seven-man Board of Directors. However, realizing that this bill is likely to go to conference with the House of Representatives, I wish to make sure that the Senate provides for a sufficient number of Directors so that if the bill goes to conference and if the conferees on the part of the House insist upon having only three Directors, the Senate conferees will still have some grounds on which to reach a satisfactory agreement.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, if we in the Senate wish to have five members

of the Board of Directors, I hardly see any necessity for providing for a greater number in the bill as we pass it, so that later we shall be able to split the difference with the House of Representatives. If we wish to have five Directors, I think we should provide for five. During the War, the Commodity Credit Corporation surely had more duties than it has now. If it could operate during the war period with five Directors, certainly there is no reason in the world why it cannot operate with five Directors today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Vermont desire to offer an amendment to the modified amendment?

Mr. AIKEN. I think we should obtain the consensus of opinion of the Senators now present. Certainly I would not suggest the absence of a quorum or call for a yea-and-nay vote, but I move to modify the amendment by having it provide for six Directors, instead of four. I ask for a rising vote on that question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The appropriate terms of the amendment would also have to be changed in order to conform with the Senator's motion.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes; I include in my motion any changes in the amendment which may be appropriate and necessary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Vermont for the further modification of amendment C of the Senator from Delaware. [Putting the question.]

The "noes" appear to have it.

Mr. MORSE. I ask for a division.

On a division, the motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now occurs on agreeing to the modified amendment C, as offered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]. The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there further amendments to be proposed?

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] and myself, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, in line 18, after the word "name", it is proposed to insert "until June 30, 1960."

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I should like to state the purpose of the amendment.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, may the amendment be restated?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be restated.

The Chief Clerk again read the amendment.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, that amendment will be all right. As I understand it, it will extend the life of the corporation for 12 years, which will correspond to the length of life given the RFC in its charter.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment is, instead of making the charter a perpetual one, as the pending bill now provides, to give the charter a life of 12 years, and to put it in the same class as the charter of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia for himself and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] and myself, I offer the amendment which I now send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. Beginning with line 3 on page 6, it is proposed to strike out all down to and including line 11 on page 7, and insert the following:

SEC. 5. Limitations on authority: (a) The Corporation shall be limited in the exercise of the powers conferred upon it by this act to—

(1) Supporting the prices of agricultural commodities through loans, purchases, payments, and other operations.

(2) Making available materials and facilities required in connection with the production and marketing of agricultural commodities.

(3) Procuring agricultural commodities for sale to other Government agencies, foreign governments, and domestic, foreign, or international relief or rehabilitation agencies, and to meet domestic requirements.

(4) Removing and disposing of or aiding in the removal or disposition of surplus agricultural commodities.

(5) Increasing the domestic consumption of agricultural commodities by expanding or aiding in the expansion of domestic markets or by developing or aiding in the development of new and additional markets, marketing facilities, and uses for such commodities.

(6) Exporting or causing to be exported, or aiding in the development of foreign markets for, agricultural commodities.

(7) Carrying out such other operations as the Congress may specifically authorize or provide for.

(b) The Corporation shall not exercise any of the powers conferred upon it by this act to carry out any program unless such program is provided for in its annual budget program submitted to Congress pursuant to the Government Corporation Control Act.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the purpose of this amendment is to make it clear that this charter does not increase in any way the authority or power of the Commodity Credit Corporation and, furthermore, that it does not conflict with the provisions of the so-called Byrd-Butler Reorganization Act of the Corporation.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the amendment simply revises the language of the first paragraph of section 6, which specifically defines the powers of the Commodity Credit Corporation. The amendment is in line with what the committee intended. If there is doubt about the intent of the committee language in the first paragraph of section 6, the language proposed by the Senator from Virginia is acceptable to me, although I cannot speak for the full committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia for himself and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] and myself, I offer the amend-

ment which I now send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 14, it is proposed to strike out lines 7 to 20, inclusive; and in the committee amendment on page 14, in line 21, it is proposed to change the section number from 19 to 18.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, this amendment would strike out section 18 on page 14. Section 18 permits the pooling of the administrative expenses of the Department of Agriculture and the Commodity Credit Corporation. I do not think a charter is any place in which to write legislation of that character. Furthermore, if that provision of the bill were adopted, it would deprive the Appropriations Committee of the power to allocate expenses as between the Department of Agriculture and the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I cannot vote for the amendment proposed by the Senator from Virginia. The purpose of section 18, as written into the bill, is to provide a certain degree of latitude for the Commodity Credit Corporation in handling its accounts. It would obviate the necessity of setting up different bookkeeping accounts for the particular hours of the day different men work on the affairs of the Commodity Credit Corporation or on the affairs of some division of the Department of Agriculture. I agree that the amendment, if adopted, probably would not terribly cripple the work of the Commodity Credit Corporation, unless at some future time there might be an interpretation by some other agency of the Government as to how these books should be set up and carried. If the amendment then were in force, it would deprive the Commodity Credit Corporation of the latitude it would need in carrying on its work to the best advantage. I do not say that that ever would happen or that the Commodity Credit Corporation ever would require such latitude in respect to carrying on its activities in such a way.

The Treasury Department has no objection to the provisions of the amendment.

As I have said, I cannot vote for the amendment; but I should like to have the Members of the Senate who are present at this time vote on the question of its adoption. On that question, I shall vote "no."

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that section 18 is opposed by the General Accounting Office, which often does give the power to pool such expenses. In many instances the General Accounting Office has given that authority, and it has authority to approve it. But I do not think such power should be provided in this way.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Virginia for himself and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there further amendments to be proposed?

If there are no further amendments, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act."

SEC. 2. Creation and purposes: For the purpose of stabilizing, supporting, and protecting farm income and prices, assisting in the maintenance of balanced and adequate supplies of agricultural commodities, products thereof, foods, feeds, and fibers (hereinafter collectively referred to as "agricultural commodities"), and facilitating the orderly distribution of agricultural commodities, there is hereby created a body corporate to be known as the Commodity Credit Corporation (hereinafter referred to as the "Corporation"), which shall be an agency and instrumentality of the United States, within the Department of Agriculture, subject to the general direction and control of the Secretary of Agriculture (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary").

SEC. 3. Offices: The Corporation may establish offices in such place or places as it may deem necessary or desirable in the conduct of its business.

SEC. 4. General powers: The Corporation—

(a) Shall have succession in its corporate name until June 30, 1960.

(b) May adopt, alter, and use a corporate seal, which shall be judicially noticed.

(c) May sue and be sued, but no attachment, injunction, garnishment, or other similar process, mesne or final, shall be issued against the Corporation or its property. The district courts of the United States, including the district court of the District of Columbia and of any Territory or possession, shall have exclusive original jurisdiction of all suits brought by or against the Corporation: *Provided*, That the Corporation may intervene in any court in any suit, action, or proceeding in which it has an interest. Any suit against the Corporation shall be brought in the District of Columbia, or in the district wherein the plaintiff resides or is engaged in business. No suit against the Corporation shall be allowed unless it shall have been brought within two years after the right accrued on which suit is brought. All suits against the Corporation shall be tried by the court without a jury. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the Federal Tort Claims Act (Public Law 601, 79th Cong.) shall be applicable to the Corporation.

(d) May adopt, amend, and repeal bylaws, rules, and regulations governing the manner in which its business may be conducted and the powers vested in it may be exercised.

(e) Shall have all the rights, privileges and immunities of the United States, including, but not limited to, the right to priority of payment with respect to debts due from insolvent, deceased, or bankrupt debtors, and immunity from the imposition of court costs, fees, and charges, from the allowance of interest on claims and judgments, and from State and local statutes of limitations on suits, actions, or proceedings. The Corporation may assert such rights, privileges, and immunities in any suit, action, or proceeding.

(f) Shall be entitled to the use of the United States mails in the same manner and upon the same conditions as the executive departments of the Federal Government.

(g) May enter into and carry out such contracts or agreements as it deems necessary or desirable in the conduct of its business. The Corporation may, whenever it deems it necessary or desirable in the conduct of its business, consent to the modification of any term or condition of any contract or agreement of any kind to which it is a party. State and local regulatory laws or rules shall not be

applicable with respect to contracts or agreements of the Corporation or the parties thereto to the extent that such contracts or agreements provide that such laws or rules shall not be applicable, or to the extent that such laws or rules are inconsistent with such contracts or agreements.

(h) May in any manner acquire, hold, and dispose of such real and personal property or any interest therein as it deems necessary or desirable in the conduct of its business.

(i) May borrow money subject to any provision of law applicable to the Corporation. The Corporation shall at all times reserve a sufficient amount of its authorized borrowing power under the act of March 8, 1938 (U. S. C., title 15, sec. 713a-4), which, together with other funds available to the Corporation, will enable it to purchase, in accordance with its contracts with lending agencies, notes, or other obligations evidencing loans made by such agencies under the Corporation's programs.

(j) Shall determine the character of and the necessity for its obligations and expenditures and the manner in which they shall be incurred, allowed, and paid.

(k) Shall have authority to make final and conclusive settlement and adjustment of any claims by or against the Corporation or the accounts of its fiscal officers.

(l) May make such loans and advances of its funds as it deems necessary or desirable in the conduct of its business.

(m) Shall have such powers as may be necessary or appropriate for the exercise of the powers specifically vested in the Corporation, and all such incidental powers as are customary in corporations generally; but any research financed by the Corporation shall relate to the conservation or disposal of commodities owned or controlled by the Corporation and shall be conducted in collaboration with research agencies of the Department of Agriculture.

Beginning with line 3 on page 6, strike out all down to and including line 11 on page 7 and insert the following:

Sec. 5. Limitations on authority: (a) The Corporation shall be limited in the exercise of the powers conferred upon it by this act to—

(1) Supporting the prices of agricultural commodities through loans, purchases, payments, and other operations.

(2) Making available materials and facilities required in connection with the production and marketing of agricultural commodities.

(3) Procuring agricultural commodities for sale to other Government agencies, foreign governments, and domestic, foreign, or international relief or rehabilitation agencies, and to meet domestic requirements.

(4) Removing and disposing of or aiding in the removal or disposition of surplus agricultural commodities.

(5) Increasing the domestic consumption of agricultural commodities by expanding or aiding in the expansion of domestic markets or by developing or aiding in the development of new and additional markets, marketing facilities, and uses for such commodities.

(6) Exporting or causing to be exported, or aiding in the development of foreign markets for, agricultural commodities.

(7) Carrying out such other operations as the Congress may specifically authorize or provide for.

(b) The Corporation shall not exercise any of the powers conferred upon it by this act to carry out any program unless such program is provided for in its annual budget program submitted to Congress pursuant to the Government Corporation Control Act.

Sec. 6. Existing statutes applicable to the Corporation: The Federal statutes applicable to Commodity Credit Corporation, a Delaware corporation, shall be applicable to the Corporation. Commodity Credit Corporation, a Delaware corporation, shall cease to be an agency of the United States as provided in

section 7 (a) of the act of January 31, 1935, as amended (15 U. S. C., 1940 ed., Supp. V, 713 (a)).

Sec. 7. Capital stock: The Corporation shall have a capital stock of \$100,000,000, which shall be subscribed by the United States. Such subscription shall be deemed to be fully paid by the transfer of assets to the Corporation pursuant to section 16 of this act. The Secretary is hereby authorized and directed to receive such stock and to exercise, on behalf of the United States, any and all rights of the United States arising out of the ownership of such stock. The Corporation shall pay interest to the United States Treasury on the amount of its capital stock, and on the amount of the obligations of the Corporation purchased by the Secretary of the Treasury pursuant to the act of March 8, 1938 (U. S. C., title 15, sec. 713a-4), at such rates as may be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury to be appropriate in view of the terms for which such amounts are made available to the Corporation.

Sec. 8. Funds: The Corporation is authorized to use in the conduct of its business all its funds and other assets, including capital and net earnings therefrom, and all funds and other assets which have been or may hereafter be transferred or allocated to, borrowed by, or otherwise acquired by it.

Sec. 9. Directors: The management of the Corporation shall be vested in a board of directors (hereinafter referred to as the "Board"), subject to the general direction and control of the Secretary who shall be a director and serve as Chairman of the Board. The Board shall consist of four members (in addition to the Secretary), who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Each appointed member of the Board shall receive compensation at the rate of \$10,000 per annum and shall hold office for a term of 4 years, except that (a) any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed, shall be appointed for the remainder of such term, and (b) the terms of office of members first taking office after the date of enactment of this act shall expire, as designated by the President at the time of appointment, one at the end of 1 year, and one at the end of 2 years, one at the end of 3 years, and one at the end of 4 years, after the date of enactment of this act. In addition to their duties as members of the Board, such appointed members shall perform such other duties as may be prescribed by the Secretary. Each appointed member of the Board shall receive compensation at the rate of \$10,000 per annum, except that any such member who holds another office or position under the Department of Agriculture the compensation for which exceeds such rate may elect to receive compensation at the rate provided for such other office or position in lieu of the compensation provided by this section.

Sec. 10. Personnel of Corporation: The Secretary shall appoint such officers and employees as may be necessary for the conduct of the business of the Corporation, define their authority and duties, delegate to them such of the powers vested in the Corporation as he may determine, require that such of them as he may designate be bonded and fix the penalties therefor. The Corporation may pay the premium of any bond or bonds. With the exception of experts, appointments shall be made pursuant to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended (5 U. S. C., 1940 ed., 661).

Sec. 11. Cooperation with other governmental agencies: The Corporation may, with the consent of the agency concerned, accept and utilize, on a compensated or uncompensated basis, the officers, employees, services, facilities, and information of any agency of the Federal Government, including any bureau, office, administration, or

other agency of the Department of Agriculture, and of any State, the District of Columbia, any Territory or possession, or any political subdivision thereof. The Corporation may allot to any bureau, office, administration, or other agency of the Department of Agriculture or transfer to such other agencies as it may request to assist it in the conduct of its business any of the funds available to it for administrative expenses. The personnel and facilities of the Corporation may, with the consent of the Corporation, be utilized on a reimbursable basis by any agency of the Federal Government, including any bureau, office, administration, or other agency of the Department of Agriculture, in the performance of any part or all of the functions of such agency.

Sec. 12. Utilization of associations and trade facilities: The Corporation may, in the conduct of its business, utilize on a contract or fee basis, privately owned and operated plants and facilities, committees or associations of producers, producer-owned and producer-controlled cooperative associations, shall to the fullest extent practicable utilize existing trade channels for the marketing, sale, and distribution of such agricultural commodities.

Sec. 13. Records; annual report: The Corporation shall at all times maintain complete and accurate books of account and shall file annually with the Secretary a complete report as to the business of the Corporation, a copy of which shall be forwarded by the Secretary to the President for transmission to the Congress.

Sec. 14. Interest of Members of the Congress: The provisions of section 1 of the act of February 27, 1877, as amended (41 U. S. C., 1940 ed., 22), shall apply to all contracts or agreements of the Corporation, except contracts or agreements of a kind which the Corporation may enter into with farmers participating in a program of the Corporation.

Sec. 15. Crimes and offenses—

FALSE STATEMENTS; OVERVALUATION OF SECURITIES

(a) Whoever makes any statement knowing it to be false, or whoever willfully overvalues any security, for the purpose of influencing in any way the action of the Corporation, or for the purpose of obtaining for himself or another, money, property, or anything of value, under this act, or under any other act applicable to the Corporation, shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than \$10,000 or by imprisonment by not more than 5 years, or both.

EMBEZZLEMENT, AND SO FORTH; FALSE ENTRIES; FRAUDULENT ISSUE OF OBLIGATIONS OF CORPORATION

(b) Whoever, being connected in any capacity with the Corporation or any of its programs, (i) embezzles, abstracts, purloins, or willfully misapplies any money, funds, securities, or other things of value, whether belonging to the Corporation or pledged or otherwise entrusted to it; or (ii) with intent to defraud the Corporation, or any other body, politic or corporate, or any individual, or to deceive any officer, auditor, or examiner of the Corporation, makes any false entry in any book, report, or statement of, or to, the Corporation, or draws any order, or issues, puts forth or assigns any note or other obligation or draft, mortgage, judgment, or decree thereof; or (iii) with intent to defraud the Corporation, participates or shares in, or receives directly or indirectly any money, profit, property, or benefits through any transaction, loan, commission, contract, or any other act of the Corporation, shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than \$10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 5 years, or both.

LARCENY; CONVERSION OF PROPERTY

(c) Whoever shall willfully steal, conceal, remove, dispose of, or convert to his own use

or to that of another any property owned or held by, or mortgaged or pledged to, the Corporation, shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than \$10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 5 years, or both.

CONSPIRACY TO COMMIT OFFENSE

(d) Whoever conspires with another to accomplish any of the acts made unlawful by the preceding provisions of this section shall, upon conviction thereof, be subject to the same fine or imprisonment, or both, as is applicable in the case of conviction for doing such unlawful acts.

GENERAL STATUTES APPLICABLE

(e) All the general penal statutes relating to crimes and offenses against the United States shall apply with respect to the Corporation, its property, money, contracts and agreements, employees, and operations: *Provided*, That such general penal statutes shall not apply to the extent that they relate to crimes and offenses punishable under subsections (a), (b), (c), and (d) of this section: *Provided further*, That sections 114 and 115 of the act of March 4, 1909, as amended (18 U. S. C., 1940 ed., 204, 205) shall not apply to contracts or agreements of a kind which the Corporation may enter into with farmers participating in a program of the Corporation.

Sec. 16. Transfer of assets of Commodity Credit Corporation, a Delaware Corporation: The assets, funds, property, and records of Commodity Credit Corporation, a Delaware corporation, are hereby transferred to the Corporation. The rights, privileges, and powers, and the duties and liabilities of Commodity Credit Corporation, a Delaware corporation, in respect to any contract, agreement, loan, account, or other obligation shall become the rights, privileges, and powers, and the duties and liabilities, respectively, of the Corporation. The enforceable claims of or against Commodity Credit Corporation, a Delaware corporation, shall become the claims of or against, and may be enforced by or against, the Corporation.

Sec. 17. Dissolution of Delaware corporation: The Secretary, representing the United States as the sole owner of the capital stock of Commodity Credit Corporation, a Delaware corporation, is hereby authorized and directed to institute or cause to be instituted such proceedings as are required for the dissolution of said Corporation under the laws of the State of Delaware. The costs of such dissolution of said Corporation shall be borne by the Corporation.

Sec. 18. Effective date: This act shall take effect on July 1, 1948.

PATENT IN FEE TO GROWING FOUR TIMES

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Ives in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 608) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Growing Four Times, which was, in line 10, after "meridian" to insert "*Provided*, That when the land herein described is offered for sale, the Fort Peck Tribe or any Indian who is a member of said tribe shall have 90 days in which to execute preferential rights to purchase said tract at a price offered to the seller by a prospective buyer willing and able to purchase."

Mr. BUTLER. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

PATENT IN FEE TO CLAUDE E. MILLIKEN

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill

(S. 714) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Claude E. Milliken, which were, in line 11, to strike out "half, northwest half" and insert "half of the northwest quarter"; and in line 13, after "acres", to insert "*Provided*, That when the land herein described is offered for sale, the Crow Tribe or any Indian who is a member of said tribe shall have 90 days in which to execute preferential rights to purchase said tract at a price offered to the seller by a prospective buyer willing and able to purchase."

Mr. BUTLER. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF TARIFF ACT OF 1930 RELATING TO FIREWOOD AND OTHER WOODS—AUTHORIZATION TO MAKE CERTAIN CORRECTIONS IN ENROLLMENT OF BILL

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 188, which was read, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, requested to return to the House of Representatives the enrolled bill (H. R. 5328) to amend paragraph 1803 (2), of the Tariff Act of 1930, relating to firewood and other woods; that if and when the said bill is returned by the President, the action of the Presiding Officers of the two Houses in signing the said bill be deemed to be rescinded; and that the Clerk of the House be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed in the reenrollment of the said bill, to make the following correction, namely, strike out "handled bolts" and insert in lieu thereof "handle bolts."

Mr. WHERRY. I move that the Senate concur in the concurrent resolution.

The motion was agreed to.

THE PRESIDENT'S CIVIL-RIGHTS PROGRAM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the body of the RECORD the proceedings of a meeting on the question, "Are Civil Rights a Reality in America?" The proceedings consist for the most part of a transcript of an extemporaneous speech which I delivered at a Brotherhood meeting held in East Orange, N. J., February 20, 1948.

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

THE PROGRAM ON CIVIL RIGHTS, HELD IN TEMPLE SHAREY TEFILO, EAST ORANGE, N. J., FEBRUARY 20, 1948

(Speech by Hon. WAYNE MORSE, United States Senator from Oregon. Chairman of meeting, Mr. George Stringfellow, vice president, Thomas A. Edison, Inc., West Orange, N. J.)

PROCEEDINGS

The meeting on civil rights convened at 9 o'clock p. m., February 20, 1948, in the Temple Sharey Tefilo, 57 Prospect Street, East Orange, N. J.; George E. Stringfellow, presiding.

Rabbi RANSON. I believe that we Jews and you Christians were doubly blessed in that we participated in this service in the spirit of brotherhood. A brotherhood program has been prepared for this evening, the nature of which you are all acquainted with.

The chairman of this program is Mr. George E. Stringfellow, a neighbor of ours,

and the man who is a very good friend of many in this congregation this evening. It is with a great sense of personal honor that I present him because we have always known George Stringfellow as a man of God and we are happy to have him in our pulpit to be in charge of our program.

But if it has always seemed to us that he is a man of God, it has seemed to me even more so in the last 10 years during which time he has come increasingly to spend his life in the works of charity. He has been giving himself for the holy work of aiding crippled children and in the holy work of fighting that dread enemy of mankind which we call "cancer."

And so, George, this congregation is turned over to you as the chairman of our brotherhood program. [Applause.]

Chairman STRINGFELLOW. Thank you, Rabbi Ranson, distinguished guests, friends, and neighbors; I am delighted to have a part in this very inspiring meeting. It has been my privilege to work or to have worked with your distinguished rabbi for a great many years. I have come to believe that he means as much to us Christians as he means to you Jews. Sometimes I think a little more.

He is a great citizen and he makes a great contribution to the welfare of our community. I don't know how we would get along without him. No one ever has any trouble getting along with him.

I now have the pleasure of presenting the Honorable Spencer Miller, Jr., New Jersey chairman of the National Conference of Christians and Jews. The Honorable Spencer Miller. [Applause.]

And now, Mr. Donald Garachas, honorary chairman of this meeting last year. Most of you recall that last year's meeting was blizzarded out. We did a lot of work, and especially your honorary chairman, but we had such bad weather we wisely decided to postpone the meeting for a year. [Laughter.] The difference is that you have another chairman but the same speaker. [Laughter.]

I should now like to invite representatives of the following veterans' organizations to the pulpit: Mr. Robert Bain, he is ex-county vice commander of the American Legion; Mr. John Bill, national service officer for the Disabled American Veterans; Mr. Albert Friedman, commander of the Oranges and Maplewood Post of the American Veterans Committee; Mr. William Langer, secretary of the American Veterans Committee; Mr. Angus MacNutt, he is ex-county commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars; Mr. George Macalllis—I hope that is correct—he is ex-county commander of the Jewish War Veterans; and Mr. George W. Millican, State commander of the Spanish American War Veterans.

Will you gentlemen please seat yourselves in the front of the pulpit?

If you are comfortably seated, and I trust that you are, we will now open this meeting by singing our national anthem.

(The national anthem was sung.)

Chairman STRINGFELLOW. We in this brotherhood movement are united without regard to personal kinship, rank, profession, or religious belief. We are animated by the desire to live together in harmony.

The need of such a movement as ours, such a movement as we represent here tonight, was never more acute than now. Our movement is designed to produce good will. While there are many deficits in the world today, the greatest deficit in my opinion is good will.

Our movement is designed, at least in a small measure, to underwrite that deficit. Most of us in the good-will movement believe that our civilization can escape suicide by returning to the practice of faith in God and in man.

Belief in the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man is the basic foundation upon which the brotherhood movement has its origin. It is this belief that brings us together tonight in this house of worship.

If the spirit permeating the minds and hearts of those of us here assembled could be duplicated throughout the world, there would be no need to fear a third world war. In fact, there would be no wars or rumors of wars.

Tonight we are fortunate, I think extremely fortunate, in having with us as our speaker a philosopher, a man who is endowed with great wisdom and the rare ability to say what he wishes to say in such a manner as to create understanding of mutual problems and to suggest sound and reasonable solutions therefor.

He is a farmer, author, editor, authority on criminal law. During his 2 years as a member of the War Labor Board he wrote more than half of the Board's opinions. He is a member of two of the most important committees of the United States Senate and takes an active and vigorous part in the debate of important legislation before the Congress.

The conservatives in and out of Congress call him a reactionary or a radical. Henry Wallace, that darling of the Communists, has characterized our Speaker as a liberal who has gone reactionary. [Laughter.]

After you have listened to his nuggets of knowledge tonight, I suspect that you will conclude that WAYNE MORSE, junior United States Senator from Oregon, is neither a radical nor a reactionary. To me it is a rare privilege and a great honor to present to you now the junior United States Senator from the great State of Oregon, WAYNE MORSE. [Applause.]

Senator MORSE. Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, and ladies and gentlemen, it is always a great pleasure to appear on the same program with George Stringfellow, but it is a great honor to be introduced by him. He is always very charitable, very kind, and inspires you to try to rise to the qualifications he lays down in his introduction. I mean it as no politician's flattery when I tell you that George Stringfellow is a great inspiration to me because I think he has demonstrated so clearly in his public service in the State of New Jersey that he is a great humanitarian. He recognizes that after all the subject of our discussion tonight is a subject that involves a problem that cuts across all groups in America because it is a common problem.

Because he is a humanitarian, a great patriot, a man who recognizes that if we are going to make this great system of ours based upon a constitutional government supported by a private-property economy work, then we must find the answers to the questions on civil rights that I seek to raise in my talk tonight.

It is because he is a humanitarian that I am always so happy to be associated with him in every movement that brings us together. I have been greatly impressed by the spiritual meeting tonight in which we all participated preceding this discussion of civil rights.

Certainly we not only have demonstrated here the universality of the spiritual basis of the brotherhood of man but I think we have also demonstrated democracy in action. People of all faiths are gathered here tonight to pay tribute to the importance of civil rights in maintaining a strong democracy.

It is important, it seems to me, that we approach the problem of civil rights from the standpoint of the spiritual basis of democracy. If you will reflect for a moment, you cannot escape the fact that democracy itself has a deep-rooted spiritual and religious base and our rights, our political rights, stem from those spiritual foundations.

On other occasions I have pointed out that the essence of democracy is to be found in the spiritual values on which are based our recognition of a free people of the dignity of the individual and all those inalienable human rights to which the people of our

Nation dedicated themselves when both the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution were written. It is the spiritual values of democracy which distinguishes us from totalitarian nations which subordinated the rights of the individual to a materialistic philosophy.

At another time I said:

"I think there is a tendency on the part of the American people in these days to overlook the fact that it was our war as well as the war of Great Britain and the other allies. I think it is important for the American people to reflect anew on the fact that, except for the costly loss of life which we suffered, which, of course, cannot be evaluated in a material sense at all, the major burden of the war was borne by our allies insofar as destruction was concerned. We have no bombed cities. We have no vast areas of devastation. We suffered no such losses as were suffered in England, France, and other parts of war-torn Europe. We cannot in the eyes of history, evade those moral obligations—because they are very real. It seems to me it will not reflect well on the pages of history for us at this hour to take an overemphasized mercenary position, a dollar position, in relation to our moral obligations resulting from our participation in the war, irrespective of the importance of the Marshall plan to the establishment of our first line of economic defense in Europe, even if I did not believe it essential for that purpose.

"I should still argue for the plan on the basis that I think we should pass it in carrying out the moral obligations which we incurred in a war which was also ours. The American people cannot look on that war as a football game, and, now that it is over, sit around in America in what, after all, is an environment of reasonable material comfort, and talk about the plays of the war. There are moral obligations still to be paid by this country in connection with that war. There are many people who do not like to hear such language spoken these days. But I say it is essential to call attention to those obligations in view of the many comments made in regard to Great Britain and other war-torn countries. I have no hesitancy in saying, and I make no apologies for saying, that we have not yet fulfilled our moral obligations to Great Britain and the other allies that helped us fight the war.

"I also suggest that closely related to our moral obligations in connection with the war there are some great spiritual values of democracy which I think are being overlooked these days. I know that to talk about spiritual values makes it an intangible argument and I know that there is danger that an argument such as the one I am now making may be charged as being one which is placed on an emotional level. I offer it not as such; I offer it as an argument which supports a great truth, namely, that when we take away or fail to live up to the spiritual basis of democracy we lose democracy itself. When we look upon democracy only from the standpoint of materialism and selfish economic values we have lost sight of the spirit of democracy. We can start with the spiritual values of the Declaration of Independence, we can trace them through the constitutional debates, the Constitution itself; we can follow them through the preamble of the United Nations Charter and the other sections of that Charter. What do we find? We find an unbroken thread of great spiritual values as the basis for the ideals of American democracy.

"Our form of government as contrasted with totalitarian systems of government, rests largely on the spiritual principle that we recognize the individual as the creature of a divine power; we recognize that, after all, Government should exist to serve the interests and the welfare of the individual. The primary purpose of a democracy such as ours is to promote the dignity and the welfare of the individual, to carry out the

principle that the State truly is his servant and not his master. It is a spiritual value which represents a great universal religious truth the sacredness of the human individual as a child of God. This spiritual truth has no relationship to creed or dogma, but rather it rests on the fact that, after all, we are our brother's keeper. After all, basic in democracy is that great spiritual truth that we should do unto others as we would have them do unto us. I say that is a universal spiritual value which, through the ages, has crossed all religious lines and is not limited to Christianity itself. I say that in this hour the American people can well afford to consider, at least to some extent, our international obligations from the standpoint of the question, Are we carrying out an international policy which does justice to the spiritual values that form the basis of democracy itself?

"I say, most kindly, and I also say it most sincerely, that I think there are great forces at play in America today which are so motivated by a materialism, so driven by a money conception, so overpowered by selfish greed, that they are losing sight of the spiritual idealism of democracy itself. We had better bring the spiritual idealism of democracy into play in molding our international policies, or I think we shall lose our democracy itself."

If I were to select a text for my remarks I would turn to a passage we read in unison earlier tonight when we together rededicated ourselves to one of the basic principles of civil rights. We said, "Thou shalt not hate thy brother in thy heart but thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

I attended another great meeting of democracy in action in Washington a few days ago where men of all faiths came together to do reverent honor to the memory of a great world citizen, Ghandi. I think it is quite appropriate that on an occasion such as this when we are to discuss the facets of civil rights, such as the dignity of the individual, personal freedom, the guaranty that we shall not be crushed under the heel of bigotry and intolerance, we at least pay passing appreciation to what I think, in my reading of Ghandi, is the epitome of his belief in a Divine Being.

Yes, we people of many faiths here tonight can entertain our reservations, even our differences as to some of the concepts to be found in his notion of a Supreme Being, but in his discussion of God, I think there is a clear enunciation of a great universal principle, namely, a spiritual faith in the existence of a power greater than man.

Let me read just a paragraph or two out of a great writing of Ghandi's setting forth his views concerning God. He wrote: "To me God is truth and love; God is ethics and morality; God is fearlessness; God is the source of light and life, and yet He is above and beyond all these.

"God is conscience. He is even the atheism of the atheist. For in His boundless love God permits the atheist to live. He is the searcher of hearts. He transcends speech and reason. He knows us and our hearts better than we do ourselves. He does not take us at our words, for He knows that we often do not mean it, some knowingly and others unknowingly.

"God is personal to those who need His personal presence. He is embodied to those who need His touch. He is all things to all men. He is in us and yet above and beyond us. Man may banish the word 'God' in taking an oath, but he has no power to banish the thing itself."

Then Ghandi made a point which I think is so universal in its truth when he wrote: "Withal He is ever-forgiving, for He always gives us the chance to repent. He is the greatest democrat the world knows, for He leaves us unfettered to make our own choice between good and evil."

I think that is a rich statement on the universality of God, and I would use it as a premise for discussing our rights as the children of God. I would call your attention in answer to the question, "Are civil rights a reality?" that we need to take into account, the fact that we enjoy civil rights to a remarkable degree in America in spite of the great need for a complete granting of civil rights.

Civil rights in America are greater in quality and in quantity than in any other nation of the world, bar none, and there are many places in the world where they hardly exist at all to any degree whatsoever. Every totalitarian State knows not civil rights.

I have some liberal friends who are laboring under a great delusion and illusion that civil rights exist in Soviet Russia. The inescapable fact is that a communistic society is a police state because it is premised upon the proposition that the State is the master and not the servant of the people.

Democratic phrases do not make democracy. Propaganda about individual rights does not make democracy. Democracy lives only to the extent that practices of democracy are put to work—and in Soviet Russia there is no democracy.

I would have those in this country who in this critical period in our history are being so misguided in regard to Russian policies keep in mind the fact that in our dealings with her we are confronted by a police state. Yes; one that hides its denials of civil rights behind an iron curtain. Certainly as an American liberal, I take the position that we must seek to cooperate with Russia; we must exercise the greatest of patience in an endeavor to understand why Russia behaves as she does.

However, Russia too has obligations of cooperation resting on her. If she wants to demonstrate that she really believes in the principles of universal democracy based upon a recognition of the dignity of the individual and the civil rights of the person she need only lift the iron curtain as her first step at cooperation and let the light of international observation shed itself upon her doings.

But until she does, then I say to liberals, conservatives, and Americans all, our responsibility to those liberties and freedoms that we hold so dear under our form of government is to keep ourselves so strong that at all times of the day and the night we can demonstrate to Russia and all other nations our willingness and our ability and our determination to keep and enforce the peace.

I want to stress that point tonight because I think it has such a direct bearing upon the question "Are civil rights a reality in America?" As a liberal I want to caution you as to the difference between progress toward an ideal of making civil rights a reality in this country and an attempt at progress through a social avalanche. Some leftist groups in America would seek to bring about a social avalanche over the issue of civil rights in order to accomplish, not a protection of civil rights, but a state economy which once established will destroy civil rights.

I want to point out also that as good an example as anybody can give you as to the degree to which we have traveled down the road of putting into practice the civil rights set out in both the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution is this very meeting here tonight. This is civil rights put to practice. Thus I could give example after example showing that civil rights in America are to a very large degree in fact a reality.

But I am also conscious of the fact that in a great many respects they are not a reality. I am one who thinks it so important that we constantly carry on the

fight for constant progress in this country on the issue of civil rights and attaining the full benefits of the freedom given to us by our form of government that I shall raise my voice from time to time in pointing out some of the ways and some of the incidents which show that we have not yet accomplished the goal of full civil rights for everyone in America.

In doing so, I want to base my remarks for the most part on what I think is the greatest document, as far as a discourse on civil rights is concerned, that has yet been written in our country. That is the report of the President's Committee on Civil Rights entitled "To secure these rights," which was prepared under the direction of the chairman, Charles E. Wilson.

I know many of you have not read it but all of you must. I would have it as required reading in every high school and college of America because I think it marks out the problem. It raises the challenge, it points to the goal. Not one of us are going to accomplish overnight, not one that we are going to accomplish in this session of Congress or the next or the next or the next, but certainly a goal toward which each session of Congress should take some very definite steps. I know how some of you may become impatient with that suggestion. I sit down and criticize the politicians, too. [Laughter.] I grow impatient, too.

I ask the question: "But if it is right to have a civil-rights legislative program why can't we do it now?" But don't forget democracy is also composed of people, people with a variety of points of view, great differences in social conditioning.

You know we liberals, we who deplore and resent intolerance and bigotry, must guard against being intolerant ourselves of those who are intolerant, because liberalism can turn itself into intolerance if one does not watch out. That can happen when liberalism seeks to follow a course of action which is impossible of accomplishment at the moment.

Hence, impatient as we are so frequently, we liberals have to answer the question: what can we accomplish at this point in advancing the cause of making civil rights a complete reality? In this great document of the President's Commission on Civil Rights you will find on page 4 a few paragraphs which I would like to read:

"The central theme," says the report, "in our American heritage is the importance of the individual person. From the earliest moment of our history we have believed that every human being has an essential dignity and integrity which must be respected and safeguarded."

"Moreover, we believe that the welfare of the individual is the final goal of group life. Our American heritage further teaches that to be secure in the rights he wishes for himself, each man must be willing to respect the rights of other men."

"This is the conscious recognition of a basic moral principle: All men are created equal as well as free. Stemming from this principle is the obligation to build social institutions that will guarantee equality of opportunity to all men. Without this equality freedom becomes an illusion."

"Thus the only aristocracy that is consistent with the free way of life is an aristocracy of talent and achievement. The grounds on which our society accords respect, influence, or reward to each of its citizens must be limited to the quality of his personal character and of his social contribution."

I think that is such a beautiful preface to the committee's discussion of the four great freedoms or civil rights which it thinks we should seek to accomplish in a variety of ways of which the legislative process is one. Those four basic civil rights as set out by the committee are: The right to safety and security of the person, and, of course, the right that is encompassed in all the legal

guaranties of civil rights under our Constitution and its judicial system.

Constantly we must maintain a vigilance in regard to that right. I am going to have a little something further to say about that in a moment but in passing let me point out that we must constantly be on guard to see to it that our courts, including the greatest court in the land, protect the right to safety and the security of the person.

It was because of what I sincerely believed was a great violation of that right by the United States Supreme Court in the Harris case that I addressed the American Bar Association criminal law section this year setting forth my views as to why I thought the Supreme Court in that decision failed to protect our right to freedom from illegal search and seizure.

So long as I am in the Senate of the United States I intend to work for legislation which will correct the great wrong I think was done by the court in the recent Harris case, unless the Court reverses itself. I care not how serious the emergency of the moment is, we cannot justify meeting a particular emergency by any illegal method, any police method, that violates the guaranty of our system of government of freedom from illegal search and seizure.

One cannot reconcile the decision in the Harris case with the great history of the courts of this country in protecting us from illegal search and seizure.

The second right, the right to citizenship and its privileges, is stressed by the Commission and I will comment on that in a moment.

Third, the right to freedom of conscience and expression; and fourth, the right to equality of opportunity.

Those four fundamental civil rights outline quite a legislative program if you will look at them from that angle for a moment.

I think we are making some progress on the legislative front. Certainly some States are making great progress. I am very happy to speak tonight on this subject in the State of New Jersey because I think you have pointed the way in your new constitution as to how we can guarantee civil rights and make them a reality to a greater extent than they exist in many other States.

You would be surprised at the number of letters I have received, not only from my home State but from many sections of this country, commenting upon the great decision that the Governor of this State made concerning the militia and the right to freedom from segregation as far as the New Jersey militia is concerned.

As a member of the Armed Services Committee of the United States Senate, I want, on this occasion, to express my compliments to the Governor of New Jersey because I think he performed a great public service when he drew the issue with the United States Department of the Army on the question of whether or not the Department of the Army, as a matter of Federal policy, would follow the course of withdrawing Federal funds from New Jersey because under your constitution you made civil rights in respect to segregation a reality.

I congratulate him and the people of the State for drawing that issue. It must be drawn in some other States. I am interested to see from my mail that many people in other States are asking that the issue be raised in respect to their militia, too.

I predict not the outcome of the controversy. I only point out that if nonsegregation is a sound principle of civil rights in New Jersey, then it is a principle which ought to be uniform in the armed services, State and National.

Let me say a word about the right to citizenship and its privileges in relation to legislation. That, of course, raises the question as to the elimination of barriers upon the

right to cast a Federal ballot. We have made great strides toward that reform.

There are a great many southern States that are entitled to sincere commendation for the steps which they have taken in recent years in removing the barriers to the great free franchise that ought to be enjoyed by every citizen irrespective of the color of his skin. There are still a few States that maintain the barriers.

I happen to be of the opinion as a lawyer that, under our Constitution, a duty rests upon the Federal Government, when the States maintain those barriers and refuse to remove them, to guarantee equality of citizenship privileges to all citizens of the country as far as Federal elections are concerned. That is why I am one of the sponsors of the anti-poll-tax law.

Do you know what some of the critics in my State say? (We don't have a poll tax in Oregon.) Those critics write and say, "Can't you keep out of just one fight? [Laughter.] Do you have to be in every one? What are you fighting about an anti-poll-tax bill for? Why don't you spend all your energy helping us with our western problems?"

My answer is: "I know of no proposal of any greater concern to the people of Oregon, New Jersey, Massachusetts, and every other State than a proposal which seeks to remove barriers that prevent people at the present time from exercising the freedom of franchise in this country. I say that because you cannot keep democracy secure unless the ballot box is free to all."

After all, I do not sit in the Senate of the United States as a Senator from Oregon for Oregon alone. That is not the type of Senate that the fathers of the Constitution set up in the Constitution. One has to read only the constitutional debates to understand that.

Under our system of representative government, the Members of the Senate come from their States for the Nation. There is quite a difference in that theory from the sectional attitude that has come to characterize public thinking in many sections of this country in regard to the responsibilities of a Member of the Senate.

We have to reinform ourselves, it seems to me in this country, as we are facing these great national issues which involve the whole country as to the responsibilities of the Members of the Senate of the United States to the welfare of the entire Nation.

Just last week—and I do not ask for agreement on the merits of this particular point or of this particular legislation that I am going to suggest as I have an idea that it is a very unpopular piece of legislation in New Jersey—I announced my support of the St. Lawrence seaway. Once I reach a conclusion on the facts as I see them, I do not hesitate to vote in accordance with those facts irrespective of sectional claims. Therefore on the St. Lawrence issue I addressed the Senate in about these words—"I have listened to this debate. I have come to the conclusion that on the merits, on the evidence that has been put into the record of this debate, the seaway should be built in the interests of transportation and in the interests of the maximum development of the power resources of the country."

"I want to comment on the speeches of Senators who have pointed out that the issue is not a matter of any sectional interest. Although the speakers have protested the sectional idea as they have given their speeches and have prefaced most of their speeches by assuring us that they speak out of no sectional interest, it is interesting to note that most of the speeches against the seaway have come from those sections of the country which feel they would suffer some economic loss to their harbors and their transportation systems if the seaway were built."

"But," I said, "I feel that those of us who have no sectional interest should rise on this

occasion and vote for the national interest." That attitude, if you are going to be true to the job in the Senate, ought to be applied even to one's home State. I have done that on occasion and I know how difficult it is to do.

I know what political pressure means when one so votes but you cannot be true to your trust in the Senate on problems that do not affect your State and then be false to it out of a sectional motivation. A similar challenge goes to this whole question of civil rights.

Therefore, I make no apologies to anyone for my endorsement and sponsorship of the anti-poll-tax bill.

Let us move to the next civil-right issue, the right to freedom of conscience and expression. In my judgment, we have done pretty well on that. It seems to me for the most part that is a reality in America.

There are exceptions, and we must meet them incident by incident when there are transgressions upon the right of the freedom of speech. We must protect this right when hoods march again, as they will from time to time as hysteria sweeps the country. We must rise then to defend the civil right that is involved in this issue and protect it from intolerance and bigotry.

But I think we ought to be proud tonight that for the most part we have made freedom of speech a reality in America and for the most part freedom of worship, too. Here again there are those incidents, temporary in nature, in which there is a violation of these great civil rights. But man being what he is, we are never going to have perfection in the protection of these rights. We must, however, keep ourselves ready to rise to protect them whenever they are transgressed.

It is in the field of the right to equality of opportunity that I would address my major remarks as far as legislation is concerned because I think it is going to be in that field of civil rights in which the greatest battle is going to have to be fought in the next decade.

Yes, we have before the Senate now what has become known as an antidiscrimination bill. In the last session of Congress it was a fair employment practice bill, and that bill plus the President's message on civil rights is arousing a storm of intolerant reaction in America these days.

Now I want to say that I hope I shall always be nonpartisan enough never to welcome a political gain of my party on the basis of that gain being made because the opposition party is suffering from a split caused by a fight over civil rights. I do not welcome whatever gain the Republican Party is making these days over the split in the Democratic Party because some congressional representatives of some Southern States are threatening to take a walk from their party. I do not think that is healthy for American democracy.

Further may I say now, with some partisanship, that I have enough confidence in American republicanism to feel that we do not need that sort of a handicap in order to win. [Applause.] I do not want to win on the basis of that advantage because that victory will have some very empty values connected with it. It will only mean then that we will have to face the civil rights issue, too. I want my party to always stand for the principles of tolerance in opposition to bigotry and in opposition to discrimination based upon race, color, sex, or creed, just as the President of the United States is standing on that premise both in the civil-rights report and in that great message on civil rights which he sent to the Congress of the United States a few days ago. It was that message which gave rise to this tremendous political storm over civil rights.

As one Republican, I want to say here, as I have said elsewhere, I intend to support the hand of the President of the United States on this issue, be he Democrat or Republican. [Applause.]

Now there are those in this field of legislation, which deals with the subject of the equality of opportunity, who are making the mistake that I alluded to earlier in my remarks. They hope to accomplish a civil-rights program overnight. It cannot be done.

Oh, yes, there is a responsibility resting upon those of us who are making this fight for civil rights to do everything in our power to put the legislation through. But I would point out there are going to be compromises in that legislation. I shall vote against some of those compromises because I think many of them will be unnecessary. But I am going to vote for some of them because some of them will be necessary if we are to make progress in this field.

We got through the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare the other day, but only after a fight, the Ives bill, of which a good many of us are cosponsors. What happened in the committee?

I think you may be interested in a little look behind the scenes. Thorough hearings were held on that bill, a beautiful record was made, and the evidence, I think, is crystal clear. The hearings clearly support that section of this great report of the President's Committee on Equality of Opportunity.

But when we met in our final session to determine the question as to whether we should report the bill to the floor, with what were we confronted? First, a motion to recommit to the subcommittee. We defeated that by a majority out of a 13-man committee, as I recall, of 3 votes—and that is not many.

When you have a majority of only three votes in a committee on a motion such as that, I can assure you that you will have even greater trouble on the floor of the Senate because the men on the floor of the Senate are not going to be so well versed on the subject matter as the members of the committee. When you report out to the floor of the Senate, as it will be reported out, the closeness of the vote in committee, that fact is going to have very definite effects on the floor.

Then there was a motion made to revise the bill so as to eliminate any language whatsoever that would carry any enforcement provision. We squeezed through on that one, I think, with a majority of either two or three.

Then finally the motion to report the bill to the Senate was made; again by a small majority we carried that motion.

But do not be fooled about that. Getting the bill on the calendar gives you no assurance of a vote on the bill this session because many bills die on the calendar. Under the rules of the Senate you cannot get it up for a vote until you can get the leadership of the Senate to agree to make it the pending business on some occasion by motion.

So now our fight, before this session of Congress is over, is to make that bill at some time the pending business of the Senate. I am not too discouraged. I think it is very unfortunate in so many respects that this is a Presidential year. I say that because of the great issues that confront the Nation which should be considered at this session of Congress.

I think though that before the political conventions take place the parties may want to make a record on this bill, at least in one House of Congress. [Laughter.] I hope that I am not more pessimistic than subsequent events will justify.

We are going to be confronted, I think, with a historic debate on this matter of civil rights and we are going to be confronted again with a filibuster.

Let me say just a word by way of digression on the filibuster. I am opposed to them [laughter], that is right. Yes, it is true that I participated in one, and given the same

circumstances in the future I will participate in another as long as God gives me breath to talk on the floor of the Senate.

You say: What sort of a paradox of inconsistency is that position? There is nothing inconsistent about it at all. As the author of the antifilibuster resolution pending before the Senate of the United States I want to point out that it is important from the standpoint of protecting minority points of view in the Senate on any issue that ample time be guaranteed for full debate on the merits of a given issue. It is one thing to use time for debating the merits of the issue. It is another thing to use time in a filibuster to prevent an issue from ever coming to a vote. My filibuster on the Taft-Hartley veto message was necessary in order to secure sufficient time for a full consideration of the merits of the President's veto message. I was not seeking to prevent a vote from ever taking place on that message. I only sought to postpone the vote from Saturday afternoon to the following Monday afternoon in order to have sufficient time to discuss the veto message in detail.

In the resolution which I have introduced in the Senate I have provided for the protection of minority rights. If a motion to close debate is signed by 16 Senators and presented to the Senate it will bring before the full Senate the question of whether it is the sense of that body that the debate shall be brought to a close. If this question is decided in the affirmative by a majority vote of those voting, then the issue before the Senate shall be the unfinished business to the exclusion of all other business until disposed of.

My resolution provides that each Senator shall be entitled to speak in his own right on the pending measure and its amendments and motions affecting it for 3 hours. I am willing to compromise on 2 hours if that is the wish of the majority. Any Senator is privileged to "farm out" his time in whole or in part if he does not wish to speak himself. With the date to vote fixed, definite, and certain, the usefulness of a filibuster ceases to exist.

That is very important to your civil rights because it is not safe in a representative government to permit to exist in your highest parliamentary body rules which permit a tyrannical majority to override the rights of a minority. That is what was attempted in the case of the Taft-Hartley debate.

We were not seeking to prevent a vote. We were seeking only to delay a vote until the merits of the case could be heard and the people could reply. It is quite a different thing.

But in the case of this legislation on civil rights we are going to be confronted with a filibuster. It is my intention to use it as an opportunity to raise anew the question of a resolution that will prevent filibusters in the Senate of the United States but, at the same time, give to the minority and to the people of the country adequate time to make their case on the merits.

Well, there are many other pieces of legislation dealing with civil rights that are pending. The Wagner-Morse bill on anti-lynching is one. That is another one that is causing the political revolt in various sections of the United States. But of course you cannot have equality of justice for all if you have people in various sections of the country living in fear when either rightly or falsely accused they may not get a fair trial before the law because of government by mob instead of government by law.

As long as that fear exists, and there is cause in support of it, then civil rights are not truly a reality in America. If time permitted I would comment on other legislation pending before the Senate.

I think I have spoken at sufficient length to illustrate to you that if we are going to be our brother's keeper, if we are going to

recognize the spiritual basis of democracy, then we must make civil rights a reality in America. I think also we must live up to the lines in that great poem of Louis Untermeyer which I like to quote so often because from it I receive an inspiration and stimulation every time I read it as to the meaning of liberalism. I pass it on to you tonight.

We must live up to the principles of liberalism which, I think, Untermeyer so beautifully and richly penned when he said or wrote these words: "Ever insurgent let me be, make me more daring than devout; from sleek contentment, keep me free, and fill me with a buoyant doubt."

"Open my eyes to visions girt with beauty, and with wonder lit. But let me always see the dirt, and all that spawn and die in it."

"Open my ears to music; let me thrill with spring's first flutes and drums. But never let me dare forget the bitter ballads of the slums."

"From compromise and things half done keep me with stern and stubborn pride, and when, at last, the fight is won, God keep me still unsatisfied." [Applause.]

Chairman STRINGFELLOW. Senator MORSE, your address is so profound, I would do nothing or say nothing to throw it out of focus except to thank you. [Applause.]

CIVIL-DISOBEDIENCE PROGRAM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask to have published in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks certain correspondence which has passed between Mr. Walter White, secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, and myself, and a letter which I have received from Mr. Grant Reynolds, who was one of the two witnesses before the Armed Services Committee, and who testified in support of the suggested civil-disobedience program.

In his letter, Mr. President, Mr. Reynolds shows that he has taken offense because I have expressed myself on the floor of the Senate in opposition to the proposed program for civil disobedience. He challenges me to a radio debate on the subject. I want also to have the RECORD include at this point a copy of my reply to Mr. Reynolds, which is to the effect that I do not propose to dignify, by way of a public debate, the position taken by men who are proposing a civil disobedience program. I am satisfied that such a program, in time of war, would constitute treason. Nor do I have any intention of giving Mr. Reynolds or his followers who in my opinion are guilty of a disservice to the welfare of our country, an opportunity to spread their propaganda by having a Member of the Senate indulge in public debate with them. Their course of action is not a course of action subject to debate, Mr. President. It would be in time of national emergency a course of action which should be prosecuted by all the processes of law under our Constitution. I repeat that their program in time of war would be treason. I do not propose to debate with one who proposes such an illegal course of action.

The correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMITTEE AGAINST JIM CROW IN
MILITARY SERVICE AND TRAINING,
New York, N. Y., April 17, 1948.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MORSE: I find very disturbing your comments of April 12 on the Senate floor in

regard to the civil disobedience proposal—particularly your raising of the question of patriotism. I intend to answer the latter point on Monday morning in testimony before the House Armed Services Committee. As a person with a long and active NAACP background, I also disapprove strongly of your efforts to pressure a repudiation from Walter White under threat of resignation.

Because you are using your senatorial immunity to continue this running attack and because we as an organization do not have access to a free public sounding board to answer your remarks, I should like to propose a radio debate on a national hook-up at an early date.

Mr. Randolph is now in Texas and is not expected back in the East until about May 4. In his absence, if radio time should be made available, either I or some other representative of this organization would stand ready to discuss this on a broadcast. After his return, Mr. Randolph would be the logical person to debate with you, inasmuch as most of your comments are directed at him. Regardless of the person who would speak in opposition to you, I regard it as essential, in the interest of fair play, to have the opportunity to present our case to the public with the proper and accurate interpretation. Your Senate remarks have been on newscasts this week as far west as Los Angeles.

May I ask, therefore, that you use the prestige of your office to approach some appropriate radio forum or a national network in an effort to arrange such a program. I believe that public interest, among whites as well as Negroes, would be very great.

Very truly yours,

GRANT REYNOLDS,
National Chairman.

APRIL 22, 1948.

Mr. GRANT REYNOLDS,
National Chairman, Committee Against
Jim Crow in Military Service
and Training, New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. REYNOLDS: I have received your letter of April 17, in which you suggest that I engage in a radio debate on your proposed plan for civil disobedience whereby you advocate that Negroes refuse to obey a draft law in time of national emergency unless your demand for nonsegregation in the Army is granted.

As you know, I favor granting complete civil rights to minority groups, including Negroes; and that covers the right to non-segregation in the military forces. However, I completely disagree with and disapprove of your proposal to attempt to secure those rights through a program of civil disobedience. Further, I have no intention of dignifying such a proposal of civil disobedience, which amounts to an advocacy of treason, by engaging in a radio debate with the proponents of such an unpatriotic proposal.

Your proposal is not even a debatable subject, but rather it constitutes an advocacy of endangering the security of your Nation in time of national crisis. If such a crisis should arise, and if you attempt to put into effect such a program of civil disobedience, I think it would be imperative that a court test of the legality of your proposal under our Constitution be made as quickly as possible.

I believe I know you and Mr. Randolph well enough to know that you have no intention or desire to endanger the security of your country in time of national emergency, but that is exactly what you would do if you were successful in carrying out the type of conspiracy which is called for by your proposed program of civil disobedience. I pray that some way, somehow, you will come to realize before it is too late that the civil rights to which minority groups are entitled and which they are being denied in so many re-

spects today, cannot be attained by the approach you propose to make to this problem.

In my opinion, you are performing a great disservice to the cause of civil rights by following the course of action you are suggesting. As a Member of the United States Senate sworn to uphold the Constitution, and as one who advocates and who will continue to fight for a civil-rights legislative program, I want you to know that as long as you pursue your present ill-advised policy I shall continue to express my disapproval of your course of action.

Sincerely yours,

WAYNE MORSE.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE
ADVANCEMENT OF COLORED PEOPLE,
New York N. Y., April 14, 1948.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: In accordance with your telegram of April 7, I have waited to read the full discussion which you and Mr. Randolph had at the recent hearings before the Senate Armed Services Committee with respect to racial segregation in the armed services. I have also read your speech on the subject of civil rights and civil disobedience in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 12.

Let me repeat with utmost sincerity that we do not feel that even so sympathetic and courageous a fighter for civil rights as yourself fully comprehends all that is involved in this question. Let me also repeat that the NAACP neither advocates nor believes in civil disobedience as an effective technique for solving the race problem here in America. We have not counseled Negroes to refuse to serve their country. But we would be less than honest and grossly derelict to the membership of the NAACP and to America itself if we did not say bluntly that the Negro is totally fed up with segregation in the armed services and will oppose in every legitimate and legal fashion such segregation.

Again I urge you and other Members of the Senate to put yourselves intellectually, as much as is humanly possible, in the position of the American Negro. Imagine being called upon by your country to fight, and die if need be, to preserve human freedom. Let me cite some of the experiences of Negroes when they either volunteered or were drafted.

They were separated on the basis of race at draft-induction centers. They rode Jim Crow trains to training camps in the South. Their barracks were in Negro locations when they trained with white troops. They had to buy at the Negro PX only. They were segregated in the "roost" in post theaters. At one camp in Tennessee, Negro commissioned officers with rank as high as major were ordered out of a post theater at the point of submachine guns because they sat in the section reserved for officers instead of the one for Negroes.

They were beaten, shot, and killed by white civilian bus drivers, county constables, and city police, and not one civilian was ever punished for such cold-blooded murder. Isaac Woodard had his eyes gouged by the chief of police of a South Carolina town 3 hours after he had been honorably discharged from the United States Army after 3 years of service, 18 months of which was service in the South Pacific.

Negro soldiers who dared protest in proper fashion through channels against abuse by prejudiced officers were court-martialed, which in part accounts for the allegedly higher crime rate which Senator RUSSELL inveigled General Eisenhower into admitting before the committee. I myself encountered as a war correspondent in both the European and Pacific theaters of war numerous instances of Negroes convicted in court martial for alleged offenses which, even if true,

would not have brought official action had they been white. In one instance in Guam I served as defense counsel for 69 colored Navy personnel when they rebelled against being made the target of constant abuse, including the throwing of live hand grenades at them.

I, myself, saw numerous instances where segregated Negro units were used as escalators to promotion by young white officers while more experienced and better trained Negro officers remained in their same status.

But, over and above these galling injustices which are the inevitable product of segregation in a supposedly democratic Army and Navy, is the fact that the unnecessary and dangerous emphasis on racial separation broadens the chasm of antagonism between Negro and white Americans because the Army and Navy lack the courage to abolish segregation. This practice has caused the United States to be ridiculed throughout the world, particularly among the two-thirds of the people of the earth who are colored, at the gross negation of all of our protestations of democracy.

Negroes in the armed services and in civilian life loyally supported their Government during the late war because they believed that when the war was won America would keep at least some of its promises to make democracy more of a reality. And what is their reward? They see the rampaging Southern politicians threatening virtually everything up to and including mob violence to prevent any Federal action against mob violence, disfranchisement, and job discrimination. They see the overwhelming majority of Members of the Congress apparently cowed by the Southern bluster. In any event, few Members of the Congress have dared speak up for the clear-cut remedial measures of the report of the President's Committee on Civil Rights.

The cheapest of politics is being played with even a minimum civil-rights program. It is openly reported that the Republicans are debating how little they can do on the civil-rights program and still attract Negro support. They are reported to favor an emasculated antilynching bill, overlooking the demand for abolition of the poll tax and freedom to secure jobs on merit through a Federal fair employment practice law, believing that the Negro vote can be purchased by passage of one emasculated bill. Even within recent weeks it has become manifest that the Republicans believe that the Southern revolt and the Wallace candidacy so assure a Republican victory that the party can be cavalier in its treatment of the Negro. On the other side of the wire there is little difference of attitude.

It is against this kind of background, Senator MORSE, that thoughtful and sincere leaders of American public opinion like yourself need desperately to weigh the present cynicism of Negroes and a good many other Americans with respect to civil rights and especially segregation in the armed services. It is profoundly to be hoped that sufficient courage can be mustered by the Government to do the simple thing which will make unnecessary and unthinkable any campaign of civil disobedience. This simple act is to wipe out segregation forthwith and to abolish the opportunism, prejudice, and cowardice with which this entire question has been shrouded for too long.

Ever sincerely,

WALTER WHITE,
Secretary.

APRIL 20, 1948.

MR. WALTER WHITE,
Secretary, National Association for the
Advancement of Colored People,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR WALTER: I appreciate very much receiving your fine letter of April 14. It certainly clarifies to my complete satisfaction your telegram of April 1.

It is understandable that one in your position is naturally inclined to assume that one in my position doesn't appreciate the serious significance of the failure of the Congress to date to adopt a civil-rights program giving to all groups in the country, including Negroes, full opportunity to enjoy the civil-rights guarantees under the Constitution which should be considered as much theirs as any other citizen's. However, I know there are many of us in the Congress who are doing everything that can be done within the true meaning of the definition of politics—as a science of the possible—to advance the cause of civil rights.

It is my intention to keep right on doing what can be done within the realm of possibility in trying to secure action on adequate civil-rights legislative proposals. Your disappointment in the decision of the Republican conference to restrict itself this year to antilynch legislation is no greater than mine. However, I am satisfied we were making considerable progress on a civil-rights program until the proposal for a civil-disobedience program was dropped into our midst as a bomb. That proposal gave some people in Congress a rationalization escape from standing up to be counted in favor of a civil-rights program, and there is no doubt about the fact that the civil-disobedience suggestion has greatly weakened the position of those of us in Congress who are sincerely trying to secure favorable consideration of civil-rights legislation.

I recognize that many Negroes do not appreciate that fact because I have talked to a good many of them during the last 2 weeks and they have indicated to me that they think those of us who are fighting for civil-rights legislation have in fact been strengthened in our position by the civil-disobedience proposal.

However, I can assure you, as I have assured them, that just the opposite is true. At the same time, I am satisfied that neither Randolph nor his supporters meant to produce that effect; and I am also convinced that Randolph has put into words the secret and subjective feelings of a great many Negroes who have become understandably embittered because of the cruelties and discriminations which have been heaped upon them.

Still that does not change the political situation confronting us in the Congress so far as civil rights legislation is concerned. Rather it makes the problem more difficult of solution.

With kindest regards,

Sincerely yours,

WAYNE MORSE.

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION,
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA BRANCH,
Los Angeles, Calif., April 15, 1948.
Senator WAYNE B. MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Last night's dispatches indicating that you are attempting to pressure Walter White into opposition to the proposal of Philip Randolph must come as a shock to all liberals of the country who have been counting on you as a real leader.

A sufficient time has elapsed since the hatred-creating days of the northern carpet-baggers so that pleas for gradualism in the settling of our race relationships have an exceedingly hollow sound. And, certainly, our Negro population could not be blamed if, after all these years of denial of their constitutional rights, they attempt to secure those rights by nonviolent civil disobedience.

As a Methodist minister for 40 years, I can only hope that if Congress passes a peacetime draft law, that our churches will follow in the same line. If we really believe that conscience, with its loyalty to God rather than to man, is an essential element in a democracy that is to endure, citizens may be compelled to use as unusual means to resist

the unmoral, undemocratic, and un-American program as the present administration has to put over its demand for universal military training and a peacetime draft. In spite of the police-state atmosphere which is reported prevalent in Washington, it still ought to be possible to see that following the failure to put over the militarization program, even by the use of Government funds and the best organized propaganda in our memory, the administration has now built up a synthetic war scare as the climax of a foreign policy which ought to have aroused far more opposition than has thus far developed in America.

My guess is that Philip Randolph's proposal, when understood in relation to the whole American and world situation, will receive surprising support over the country. I need not remind you that by this means Ghandi secured much more than rights guaranteed by our Constitution. It is the one answer to militarism.

Sincerely yours,

A. A. HEIST,
Director, Private Correspondence.
P. S.—I agree with the Nation editorial.

APRIL 22, 1948.

Mr. A. A. HEIST,
Director, Private Correspondence,
American Civil Liberties Union,
Los Angeles, Calif.

DEAR MR. HEIST: In response to your letter of April 14, I am sending you copies of the correspondence I have had with Walter White. Also enclosed are tear sheets from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 12 containing a speech I gave in the Senate on the civil disobedience proposal of Messrs. Randolph and Reynolds.

I am at a complete loss to understand your failure to recognize how ill-advised Randolph's proposal is, or to see how great a disservice a program of civil disobedience would be to attaining the goal of a sound civil rights legislative program.

Very truly yours,

WAYNE MORSE.
(Enclosure: Copy of April 6 telegram to Mr. White.)

APRIL 6, 1948.

Mr. WALTER WHITE,
National Association for the
Advancement of Colored People,
New York, N. Y.

Appreciate your wire of April 1. However, I think you should read discussion which Randolph and I had at the hearing before you give any encouragement whatsoever to Randolph's proposal. I think you perform great disservice to those who are making as good a fight as we can for a sound civil-rights program if you give any encouragement to Randolph proposal. I agree with those parts of your wire which point out injustices which Negroes have been receiving in this country but I totally disagree with the other implications of your wire which I think give comfort to the Randolph approach to this problem. If you give any such encouragement to Randolph's point of view it will set back several years our fight for civil-rights program. Regards.

WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senator.

ORDER FOR CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR ON MONDAY

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate convenes on Monday next at noon it proceed to the consideration of unobjectioned-to bills on the Senate Calendar, commencing with Order No. 1155, House bill 4571, which is the point at which the Senate concluded the call of the calendar on the last occasion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the work of the Senate having apparently been completed for today, I move that the Senate stand in recess until Monday next at noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 51 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, April 26, 1948, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 22, 1948:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

W. Averell Harriman, of New York, to be the United States Special Representative in Europe, with the rank of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Charles Sawyer, of Ohio, to be Secretary of Commerce.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named midshipmen (Naval Academy) to be ensigns in the Navy from the 4th day of June 1948:

Paul F. Abel	James H. H. Carrington
William Abromitis, Jr.	Charles C. Carter, Jr.
Richard C. Adams	Ernest C. Castle
Augustine A. Albanese	Nicholas A. Castruccio
Thomas E. Alexander	John D. Caylor
Benjamin G. Allen	William D. Chandler
Hoyt E. Allen	Edwin MacM. Chapline
Robert C. Allen	Roger A. Chapman
Walter L. Alt	Thomas P. Cheesman
Gordon A. Anderson	Robert S. Chew, Jr.
Roy C. Anderson	Matthew A. Chiara
William S. MacL. Arnold	Michael L. Childress
Edward M. Axtell, Jr.	William T. Chipman, Jr.
William R. Ayers	Robert G. Claiborne
Robert P. Barber	Wyndham S. Clark, Jr.
William H. Barnes III	Richard J. Clas
Russell Bartmes, Jr.	John D. Clithero
William H. Barton, Jr.	Richard A. Cochran
William R. Bartow	James N. Comerford
Jack Baruch	Jack H. Conable
George M. Bates	Robert C. Conolly II
Richard W. Bates	Albert E. Conord
Joseph R. Bavle	Charles P. Coulter
David A. Beadling	Jack Cowden
Richard L. Beatty	Howard S. Crosby
Jerry T. Becker	James S. Crosby, Jr.
Donald R. Behrens	John R. Crumpton, Jr.
Harry E. Belflower, Jr.	John R. Cuddy
Gregory McC. Bell, Jr.	Thomas W. Cuddy
Herbert P. Benton III	Daniel W. Cullivan
Levon Berberian, Jr.	Bradley L. Daley
Floyd E. Bergeaux	Bennie V. Damberg
Robert E. Berggren	James E. Davenport, Jr.
Benjamin W. Bevis	John M. Davis
Oral J. Bilderback	John DeGoede
Patrick P. Billingsley	Daniel T. Deibler
Walter T. Blakney	Leonard V. Delling
Floyd H. Blizard	Dean D. DeWitt
Richard V. Bodmer	George W. Dittmann
Louis J. Boland	William D. Dittmar
Philip H. Bolger	Claude E. Dorris
Eugene S. Bowers	Laurens Dorsey
Franklin L. Bowersox	Benjamin S. Dowd, Jr.
Clalborne S. Bradley	Charles R. Braley, Jr.
Charles R. Braley, Jr.	Norman L. Duncan
Ralph W. Brown, Jr.	Robert D. Duncan
James S. Brunson	Richard T. Duncan, Jr.
Paul G. Bryant	James W. Dupree, Jr.
Douglas G. Buchanan	William F. Easterlin, Jr.
Beaumont M. Buck	Rex C. Eaton, Jr.
Robert G. Buechler	Dewey A. Ellis, Jr.
Norwood W. Bullington, Jr.	Gordon R. Engel
Ronald S. Burton	Leland F. Estes
James E. Callahan, Jr.	John Evasovich

John L. Everngam, Jr.	Edgar S. Levy, Jr.
Emil M. Eyley	William W. Lewis, Jr.
William R. Fisher, Jr.	Aubrey L. Loeffler
Edward B. Fleming	Hubert B. Loheed
John A. Fletcher II	John R. Lowdenslager
Francis C. Fogarty	Robert B. Lyle
Donald D. Foulds	Arthur L. Markel
Andrew L. Frahier	Marvin D. Marsh
Ian N. Fraser	George W. Marshall
Edward Frothingham, Jr.	Paul V. Martenson
Wallace S. Gabriel	Thomas E. Matia
Stanton B. Garner	Frank E. Matthews
Herbert K. Gates, Jr.	Elmer A. McCallum, Jr.
Sidney W. Gaylord, Jr.	William L. McClure
George E. Goodwin	John K. McConeghy, Jr.
Hugh H. Goodwin, Jr.	John W. McCord
Ralph T. Goodwin, Jr.	Milton C. McFarland
Raymond I. Gornik	Robert S. McGihon
Jack L. Gracey	Andrew McIntyre
Morris R. Grady	Donald A. McIver
Warren C. Graham, Jr.	Russell R. McKechnie
Frederick H. Gralow	Murvin "M" McKinley, Jr.
Ernest J. Gray	Edward F. McLaughlin, Jr.
Harold Gurman	John R. McMahon, Jr.
Donald B. Hall	Robert H. Meenan
Norman L. Halladay	Robert E. Melhorn
Albert B. Hallman	James I. Melencamp
David R. Hamlin	Murray Menkes
Robert W. Hanby, Jr.	Charles Mertz, 3d
Kevin Hanlon	Edward W. Meyers
Harley S. Harris, Jr.	Howard B. Moore
Wade H. Harris	James R. Moore, Jr.
David L. Hartshorn	Roderick B. Moore
Charles E. Hathaway	Sumner K. Moore
Douglas B. Hatmaker	William V. Moore
Stanley R. Hawe	Donald R. Morris
Edward B. Hebden II	Eugene C. Moss
Leonard M. Hendrix	Peter R. Moureau
Albert G. Henry, Jr.	Leonard W. Mulbry
John D. Herlihy, Jr.	James E. Myrick
Lawrence C. Hernandez, Jr.	Robert R. Neely, Jr.
Charles W. Hines	Frederick L. Nelson
William R. Hintz	Richard E. Nicholson
Richard B. Hodson	Eugene J. Noblet
Hugh S. Holder	Dan R. Nolen
Tennyson J. Hull III	Robert P. Nottingham
Harvey R. Humphrey	Thomas H. Nugent, Jr.
Robert D. Huntington, Jr.	John L. Oberrieder
David A. Hurt, Jr.	Mark J. O'Friel
Karl H. Huss, Jr.	Robert W. O'Reilly
William G. Ikard II	Frank W. Orr, Jr.
James M. Ivey, Jr.	Edward J. Ortlieb
Frederick D. Jackson, Jr.	Gerald L. Palmer, Jr.
John W. James	Benjamin H. Pester
Alan L. Jansen	John D. Peterson
Leonard A. Jay, Jr.	James E. Peterson, Jr.
John L. Jensen, Jr.	William C. Pierson
Francis C. Johnson	Ray C. Pittman
Henry B. Johnson	Alonzo M. Poteet, Jr.
William E. Johnston	Delton B. Pruner
Harry L. Jones	Robert O. Pyle, Jr.
William A. Kanakanui, Jr.	Paul L. Quinn
Jack C. Kays	Charles E. Ransom, Jr.
William H. Keen	Hugh B. Rardin
Kenneth Kely	Walter L. Rees
Robert E. Kenyon	Harvey E. Rennacker
Harry N. Key, Jr.	Earl F. Resch
Thomas F. Kilduff, Jr.	Edwin C. Rice
Robert E. King	Ward P. Riggins, Jr.
Burton H. Kleinman	Guy W. Riggs
Herbert S. Kline	Knight M. Robbins
John W. Klinefelter	Harold L. Robiner
Edward L. Korb	Rufus W. Robinson
Seymour L. Kunin	Edward B. Rogers, Jr.
Frederick R. Lafferty, Jr.	Joseph P. Rogers, Jr.
Arthur Landis, Jr.	William A. Rogers, Jr.
Charles M. Lane	Donald S. Ross
Charles H. Langton	Ernest H. Ross, Jr.
William J. Laubendorfer	Terry A. Ross
Jason P. Law	Andrew T. Roulston
Paul D. Lawler	Richard B. Rubenstein
Hugh O. Lea	John A. Russell
Robert L. Lee, Jr.	William F. Sallada
William W. Lee, Jr.	

William G. Sawyer
Albert R. Schofield, Jr.
Robert A. Schultz
Robert E. Schwoeffermann
Richard U. Scott
Robert H. Searle
Ruell A. Searson
Henry T. Settle, Jr.
Charles A. Sheehan
Peter N. Sherrill
Jack N. Sherwood
Albert F. Shimmel
Richard E. Shimshak
Jack R. Silvey
William N. Small
Harold F. Smith, Jr.
Robert C. Smith, Jr.
Nicholas W. Smusyn
Thomas C. Spalding
Wilburn A. Speer, Jr.
Richard H. Sprince
Richard J. Springe
Edward F. Stacy
Thomas E. Stanley
Don R. Stephens
Charles G. Strahley
Hart R. Stringfellow, Jr.
Richard Struyk
Robert T. Styer
George H. Sullivan, Jr.
Edward P. Supancic
Francis J. Suttill, Jr.
Joseph P. Tagliente
Robert McE. Tatum

Boone C. Taylor
Karl R. Thiele
Albert J. Thompson
David R. Thornhill
Frank S. Tiernan
Herbert N. Townsend
Kenneth M. Treadwell
Howard A. True
John C. Tsiknas
Robert W. Van Kirk, Jr.
Carlos C. Villarreal
John E. Vinsel
Quentin W. Wagenfield
Robert E. Wainwright
Daniel P. Walchko
James F. Ward II
William Wegner
Elbert N. Wells
James K. Welsh, Jr.
Richard O. Wheeler
John F. White, Jr.
Joseph P. White
Warren P. White
Charles A. Whitmore, Jr.
Gilbert Wilkes III
Stanwix M. Williams
Joseph A. Wilson
Thomas B. Wilson, Jr.
Thomas Woods II
David L. Wright
George S. Wright
Robert E. Wurritzer
Ellis M. Zacharias, Jr.
Jack P. Zimmerman

The following-named midshipmen (Naval Academy) to be ensigns in the Supply Corps of the Navy from the 4th day of June 1948:

Edmund S. Armstrong
William H. Borchert
William G. Brendle
John W. Bruner
Donald H. Corson, Jr.
James A. Cox
William F. Duddy
Kenneth W. Dunwoody
Jr.
William H. Evans, Jr.
John P. Gaffigan
Robert L. Ghormley, Jr.
Lewis E. Gleason
Richard I. Henderson

Dudley Holstein
Howard N. Kay
William N. Langone
Charles L. Lewis
Harold B. Lipschutz
Edward A. McManus
Kennedy Niland
James H. Smeds
David M. Smith
Edgar N. Smith
Morris M. Smith
Charles L. Suit III
Robert C. Vance
Kenneth B. Webster
Marvin A. Weir

The following-named midshipmen (Naval Academy) to be ensigns in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy from the 4th day of June 1948:

Robert G. Carroll
James C. Day, Jr.
Sydney W. Dunn, Jr.
Richard M. Fluss
George L. Hoffman

Charles B. Hogan
Robert S. Lee, Jr.
George A. Leighton, Jr.
Henry Remsen
Colonel J. Shook, Jr.

The following-named (Naval ROTC) to be ensigns in the Navy:

Robert W. Corey, June 4, 1948.
Robert J. Cutler, June 4, 1948.
Raymond R. Demrick, June 4, 1948.
James H. Foxgrover, June 4, 1948.
Robert J. Harlow, June 4, 1948.
Romeo D. Hinkston, June 4, 1948.
Leslie C. Hofto, June 4, 1948.
Frederick W. Holler, Jr., June 4, 1948.
James P. Kilgariff, June 4, 1948.
Justus A. Mueller, June 4, 1948.
Franklin C. Paschal, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Clyde A. Reaves, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Harlan C. Snyder, June 4, 1948.
Thomas C. Trafzer, June 4, 1948.
Philip A. Amidon (Naval ROTC) to be an ensign in the Supply Corps of the Navy from the 4th day of June 1948.

The following-named (Naval ROTC) to be ensigns in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy:

Ray W. Foreaker, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Charles W. Gulick, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Nicholas F. Truong, June 4, 1948.

Francis W. Day (Naval ROTC) to be an ensign in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy, in lieu of ensign in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy as previously nominated, to correct spelling of name.

The following-named to be ensigns in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

Betty J. Alexander
Virginia M. Cardillo
Josephine A. Franks
Lois W. Gass
Mary E. Hagan
Lois C. McCuller

Charlotte R. Pierce
Gloria V. Rapp
Dorothy M. Riotte
Anita J. Smith
Mary F. Sullivan
Bernice Szostak

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

COMMANDER

Greydon G. Boyd

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER

Donald G. MacKinnon

LIEUTENANT

Arvin T. Henderson

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

Kenneth S. Axelsen
John J. Carroll
Donald E. Lloyd
Wallace S. Sekul

Ernest F. Wallner, Jr.
James H. Watts, Jr.
John H. Young

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Dental Corps of the Navy:

COMMANDERS

James R. Justice
Niels H. Martin

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER

Norman D. Himes

LIEUTENANTS

Wallace S. Andrews
Hewitt J. Beauvais, Jr.
Joseph J. Bonello

George E. Dudley
Martin R. Hamilton

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

Anthony P. Giam-musso
Walter J. Krumbeck

Giam-James A. Mitchell
Daniel M. Roach

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, APRIL 22, 1948

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.
Rev. Albert E. Kirk, superintendent of the Methodist Churches of the Independence district, Kansas, offered the following prayer:

O God, our gracious Heavenly Father, we stand reverently lifting our thoughts to Thee, the source of all good. Our earnest prayer this morning is that goodness, righteousness may more and more prevail in the earth. To that end Thou hast ordained government among men as an agency of righteousness and "an avenger to execute punishment upon him that doeth evil," and hast declared that rulers, if they be not usurpers, are "ministers of Thine for good to all the people." We thank Thee this morning for government, "government of the people, by the people, and for the people," and we pray that it may not perish from the earth.

Grant each Member of this great legislative body, this House of Representatives of our Nation, to realize the honor and greatness of his position, and in that consciousness to find strength and courage for his arduous work.

Help all of us as American citizens intelligently to love our country, to honor and uphold our leaders, and to supply that righteousness that exalteth a

nation, that righteousness that is the lifeblood of effective government.

"America, America, God mend thine every flaw.

Confirm Thy soul in self-control, Thy liberty in law."

Thy kingdom, O God, is "righteousness, peace, and joy": "righteousness," the foundation of peace—help us further to establish righteousness; "peace" built upon righteousness, the foundation of joy, of human well-being—help us further to achieve peace and human well-being.

Our prayer is "Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done on earth"—hear this, our prayer, and help us daily to help Thee to answer it. Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2195) entitled "An act to amend and extend the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, approved December 2, 1941, as amended," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BUCK, Mr. CAIN, Mr. KEM, Mr. HOLLAND, and Mr. UMSTEAD to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

JAMES WOLFENDEN AND ROLAND KINZER

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, the Republican delegation of Pennsylvania is honored today by having again with us two men who served long and faithfully in this House. I refer to the Honorable James Wolfenden, of Upper Darby, and the Honorable Roland Kinzer, of Lancaster. When we came here 10 years ago these two men were among the leaders and mentors of this House. They were both instrumental in seeing that the present Speaker was named the minority leader at that time. I know that all the older Members share with us today the pleasure and satisfaction we have in greeting these two men who have contributed so much to the honor of not only the great State of Pennsylvania but this Nation as well.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAHAM. I am very glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALLECK. I join with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM] in the nice things that he has said about these two gentlemen from Pennsylvania. In my service here, I do not believe I have ever served with anyone for whom I have had greater affection or higher regard than the two gentlemen from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GRAHAM. I thank our distinguished majority leader for his gracious remarks.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAHAM. Gladly.

Mr. RANKIN. I wish to say for our side of the House that no two Members who ever served in Congress, at least since I have been here, enjoyed more of the respect and confidence and affection of the Members, regardless of party, than did the two distinguished gentlemen from Pennsylvania, Mr. Wolfenden and Mr. Kinzer.

Mr. GRAHAM. I thank the gentleman from Mississippi.

ARBOR DAY—A NEBRASKA GIFT

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, the world knows that the institution of Arbor Day is one of Nebraska's many outstanding gifts to this Nation.

A Nebraskan—J. Sterling Morton, who later became the third United States Secretary of Agriculture—was the man who gave Arbor Day its name, a name now admired and respected by 145,000,000 Americans. The State Legislature of Nebraska, in a resolution approved on January 4, 1872, was the first legislature of any State in this country to give its unanimous stamp of acceptance to the one day of the year dedicated to the progressive purpose of planting trees. Nebraska attained another "first" by being the initial State to hold Arbor Day observances on April 10, 1872.

It is significant to note that Nebraska's gift to the Nation has not been a mere flash in the pan, something which was of a temporary nature, to be abandoned when enthusiasms cooled. It is a matter of record that approximately 350,000,000 trees and shrubs were set out by Nebraskans—in Nebraska—during the 12 years between April 10, 1872, and April 10, 1884. There has not been a single year since the origin of Arbor Day when Nebraska children and grown-ups turned away from this commendable tradition.

My greatest inspiration from Arbor Day has been that it was, and is, an all-American event. Farmer and townsman, railroader and merchant, men and women, old and young—everyone turns out, fired with a single purpose, to make the day a success. Civic organizations encourage it. Agricultural societies get behind it. Schools foster it. Churches back it.

In Nebraska, Arbor Day is truly people's day.

Our countrymen know all this. We Nebraskans are proud to have them know it.

But, in spite of this widespread knowledge of Nebraska's gift day, there are still some facts about it that are not generally known. These facts belong to our American heritage as much as those which are already common property.

Let us dare to look back. Let us pay tribute now, not only to the Nebraskan father of Arbor Day but to the unheralded and unsung Nebraskans who

were the grandfathers and great-grandfathers of this enduring tribute to the soil.

Indians were the first Nebraskans. Growth, planting, was the very core of their existence. The legend of Mondamin, a permanent star on the horizon of American literature, was made famous by the poet, Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, in his epic work *Hiawatha*. Every school child knows the story of Mondamin. Yet, it never loses its force with each retelling. You remember it, how the strange warrior youth challenged Hiawatha to a battle to the death. Mondamin made only one condition: that if he should die, Hiawatha was to bury him, tend his grave, and keep it green. The result is equally familiar to all of you. Mondamin did die. Hiawatha kept his pledge. And out of Mondamin's well-tended grave came the first stalk of corn, a vital contribution to the Indians and to all who came after the Indians.

That legend had a place of respect in Indian folk lore long before the first white man staked his claim on Nebraska's fertile prairies.

The early Nebraska Indians planted to live. Their descendants, real and spiritual, live to plant. Each passing generation of Nebraskans, in an unbroken line since before recorded history—by planting—have added to the productiveness of our land.

In this respect it must be recalled that Omaha's first settler was a planter. Manuel Lisa came up the Missouri River on a raft, only 3 years after Jefferson had purchased the Louisiana Territory. We know that he originally intended to be a fur trader. He actually turned out to be a farmer. He had brought lima beans, potatoes, turnips, squash, and young trees. He came to plant these things for his own food. He remained to show the Indians how to plant and what to plant.

Manuel Lisa was only one among the many. Great as he was, J. Sterling Morton, father of Arbor Day, was also one among the many. You will look in vain on history's pages for the names and records of the real "unknown soldiers" of the army of agriculture. These heroes of hardship lived and served, planted and passed on. Others enjoyed the fruits of their labors. They were content that this should be so. Indian and white, they have vanished from Nebraska soil. But the work they have done will never perish. It will endure as long as fertile Nebraska endures.

The white pine sent to me by Sterling Morton, Jr., and which I planted on the Capitol Grounds, is a monument to Arbor Day and for the men and women and children whose devotion, understanding, and sacrifice has given such a powerful meaning to this observance. Little people, who in the ultimate analysis are the only great people, have literally watered this tree with their blood, sweat, and tears to make possible the continuing growth of the State of Nebraska.

With this knowledge before us, the meaning of our State motto, "Equality before the law," becomes all the more clear. All of us are equal before the law of nature.

We are all as humble as those first planters of Nebraska. We are all as great as those who gave Arbor Day from Nebraska to the Nation.

That is the message of Arbor Day, 1948.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. POTTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio broadcast.

Mr. CANFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include some editorials.

STEEL SHORTAGES PLAGUE NATION

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks and include two news items and a table.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege yesterday to attend a conference sponsored by the Office of Industry Cooperation, in the Department of Commerce, between representatives of the steel jobbing industry, the steel warehousemen, and representatives of Government, including the Select Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives.

At the conference the steel warehousemen pointed out that their stocks were low, that the demand was high, and that average orders are for quantities less than 1 ton.

The steel warehouses and the wholesale hardware firms of the Nation who supply more than 10,000 items of steel to the farmers and smaller business firms of America have a real problem on their hands.

For many years these distributors have been getting about 19 percent of our total steel production. And they in turn have been servicing millions of users, who, by virtue of their small purchases, could not be economically served direct by the great steel mills.

Since VJ-day, there has been a marked increase in the domestic demand for steels of all kinds. More steel is needed to rehabilitate railway rolling stocks. More steel is needed in the petroleum industry to expand capacities to meet the highest demand in history.

Mr. Speaker, in the face of this greatly increased domestic demand, there has also arisen a greater demand for steel exports.

And so our steel producers and distributors are confronted with the problem of trying to take care of our domestic needs, and at the same time supplying steel for export purchasers.

Under the European recovery program, as first presented to the Congress, the 16 European nations asked for a total of \$441,000,000 in steel and steel-making materials during 1948. This together with the demands of other nations not in the European recovery program, makes the export demand approximately 10 percent of our total steel production.

Our Office of International Trade only yesterday announced that the steel export quotas for the second quarter of 1948 had been reduced 2 percent from the

January-March period, to a total of 846,000 tons. Now, over and above this 846,000 tons allocated for export, the Office of International Trade announces that 125,000 short tons of tin plate has also been allocated for export during the second quarter of 1948. Thus more than 971,000 tons of steel and tin plate will leave our country at a time when many firms, large and small, are laying off employees and curtailing production because of serious shortages right here at home.

Last Friday, General Motors Corp. announced they would have to close several of their foundries, their machine and metal stamping shops for at least a week on account of the interruption in their steel supplies due to the work stoppage in the coal mines. K. T. Keller, president of Chrysler, told his stockholders only yesterday that his firm would have to reduce their output of automobiles because the work stoppage in the coal fields had seriously affected their supply of steel, pig iron, and coke.

Mr. Speaker, our present steel capacity is estimated to be around 93,000,000 tons per year. The steel companies are presently adding 5,000,000 tons of new capacity. But this new capacity, will not be sufficient to supply the domestic demand and take care of all the export demand at the same time.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, our committee suggested to the conference, that consideration be given to our domestic demand first of all, and that an additional 2 to 3 percent of our production be allocated to the warehouses and distributors, so that the hardship cases might be given a modicum of relief at once. The chief use of this additional percentage should be to users in the category of requirement of 100 tons per year. This class user is too small to obtain mill orders and too large to be supplied ordinarily by steel warehouses.

It will be a tragedy, indeed, Mr. Speaker, and a travesty on justice, if our taxpayers, who are going to provide the funds for the European recovery program, are to have their needs come secondary to the needs of people in other lands.

Mr. Speaker, I recommend to each of the Members of this House a study of section 112 (a) of the act of April 3, 1948, known as the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, which provides:

The Administrator shall provide for the procurement in the United States of commodities under this title in such a way as to (1) minimize the drain upon the resources of the United States and the impact of such procurement upon the domestic economy, and (2) avoid impairing the fulfillment of vital needs of the people of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that steel is a vital need of the people of the United States, and that further large exports of steel and steel products will immeasurably damage the domestic economy, and serve as a drain upon our resources.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSIONER CLIFFORD DURR

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I place here in the RECORD an Associated Press description of a statement made yesterday by the distinguished American journalist, Frank C. Waldrop, on a ruling made by the Federal Communications Commission. Mr. Waldrop, long a recognized authority on matters pertaining to free speech in our Nation, I feel, speaks for all of those Americans who are concerned over any attempt to abridge the right of expression here in America. I feel, Mr. Speaker, that his objections to the Federal Communications Commission ruling should be made a part of the permanent RECORD:

The Federal Communications Commission yesterday heard itself called "the principal enemy of free speech now operating within the Government of the United States."

Frank C. Waldrop, Washington Times-Herald editorial writer, applied the description in an appearance before the Commission to protest the 7-year-old FCC ban against radio stations "editorializing" on public questions.

Waldrop asked for revocation of the ban and "a general correction of past policies" relating to supervision of broadcasting.

"The law did not appoint you America's nursemaid, school ma'am, or censor," Waldrop said.

The no-editorializing rule was as staunchly championed by Norman Matthews, chairman of the UAW-CIO international radio committee.

He said the wording of the ban itself—"a truly free radio cannot be used to advocate the cause of the licensee"—stated the case for retention.

Matthews contended that both the letter and the spirit of the rule is frequently violated by radio stations. He said that "the licensing of broadcasters to editorialize will be a move toward a monopoly of opinion channels in the country."

FCC yesterday concluded a series of public hearings on the question of amending or revoking the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I noted in today's paper two news items of particular interest. One was that Mrs. Virginia Foster Durr, the wife of Federal Communications Commissioner Clifford Durr, had accepted the chairmanship of the Northern Virginia Committee for Henry Wallace. The second item listed Commissioner Durr as being scheduled to call upon President Truman at the White House this morning. I feel that I express the fervent hope of 95 percent of the American people that Commissioner Durr tendered his resignation to the President of the United States.

EMERGENCY RENT CONTROL, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 2195) to amend and extend the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, approved December 2, 1941, as amended, with House amendments, insist on the amendments of the House, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indi-

ana [Mr. HALLECK]? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Mr. O'HARA, Mr. McMAHON, Mr. ALLEN of California, Mr. HARRIS, and Mr. ABERNETHY.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at noon on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK]?

There was no objection.

OLEOMARGARINE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to announce that Governor Driscoll, of the great State of New Jersey, at 11 o'clock today signed a bill which will permit the housewives of New Jersey to buy oleomargarine, colored, free from State restrictions.

This bill went through the assembly of the great State of New Jersey 63 to 3, and through the State senate 16 to 0. My compliments to the great State of New Jersey.

I hope coming events are casting their shadows before.

SEVENTY-GROUP AIR FORCE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, according to the morning press, the administration is still opposed to the achievement and maintenance of the 70-group air force program and is offering a compromise. This attitude is amazing in view of the fact that even with 70 groups of planes the United States will not possess air supremacy but will only have the basis on which to build air supremacy.

The House last week displayed admirable foresight and leadership in voting overwhelmingly the funds to begin the construction of the 70-group program. I hope that we will unflinchingly insist upon the position we have taken.

This administration must be told what we want for planes and not asked. The Congress should inform the administration and the armed services that the United States must have air supremacy. All the money necessary to give the United States the mightiest Air Force in the world should be appropriated and then having done this the Congress should demand that the armed services efficiently and effectively move to an early and full realization of the proposed goal. I hope the Congress will disregard this latest administration proposal for a compromise on our air strength and emphatically insist that the 70-group plane

program for the Air Force be realized at the earliest possible moment.

OLEOMARGARINE

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROSS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, if I were the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MITCHELL] I would not rejoice too much over the fact that all the homes in New Jersey are going to have colored oleo-margarine right soon, because I have in my possession an Associated Press report saying that an oleo factory blew up the other day injuring 26 people. I do not know what they were making it out of. But it must have been high powered. God help the people of Jersey if they get that kind of stuff.

REPORTS FROM THE COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the District of Columbia may have until midnight, Friday, April 23, to file reports on H. R. 5808, H. R. 6071, H. R. 6087, H. R. 6203, H. R. 6209, and S. 2409.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SIMPSON]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. NODAR asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Saturday Evening Post.

CONGRESSIONAL VISIT TO NEW YORK CITY

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Speaker, a number of Members of the House and their wives are going to make a visit a week from this week end to New York City. We desire very much to have them in New York City. As a matter of fact, one of the places they will visit is Radio City. I am particularly anxious that democracy come to Radio City in the persons of this delegation. I say that because of that same place you will find Russian propaganda, which is attempting to influence the minds of our students in the public schools. In that area you will find that pamphlets are distributed to the school children with pictures of Stalin on them, and a return postage-paid envelope also distributed, from which they can get further information from the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics so-called Information Bulletin, but actually propaganda.

I am sure that the propaganda which the congressional group will find up there

emanating from Communist sources will have as much effect on our delegation as water rolling off a duck's back.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POTTS. I yield.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. While they are in Radio City I wish they would take a peek at the world's tallest building, built from Indiana limestone.

Mr. POTTS. And we take great pride in it.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. POULSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a paper entitled "Southern California's Future in the Colorado River."

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a short article.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

CONFUSION REGARDING THE MARSHALL PLAN

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, today in the New York Herald Tribune there is an article written by Elmo Roper concerning a survey made by Time magazine with respect to the Marshall plan. The last paragraph of this article by Mr. Roper states that the people have shown more statesmanship than Congress has in its debate upon the subject. But the article starts off by saying that the public is confused about the Marshall plan. That is proved by an analysis in Time magazine's report, which shows that 15 percent of the people never heard of the plan, 46 percent are either unfavorable or have not had enough information to make a decision, and only 39 percent are generally favorable to the plan. It shows also that out of 13 questions only 3 went over 50 percent in affirmative answers. In reply to one question, 70 percent thought the people in the European countries who were sick and hungry were getting the relief directly, and 51 percent who believed it was going to secure us allies in the event of war. Sixty-two percent thought that the plan will make Europe self-supporting. Forty-six percent felt that the plan will promote American prosperity, and but 40 percent said it will make prices at home higher. I say they are confused; but in view of the fact that Congress passed the Marshall plan by a vote of 4 to 1, I think Mr. Roper must be more confused than Congress, because that body was not uncertain in its action. I believe the Appropriations Committee will show statesmanship in deciding how much money is going to be sent over there on this relief plan. We must depend upon that reliable committee to keep the expenditures within the reach of the American people. We desire to be charitable, but

we are hardly going to be an example to the nations of Europe if we spend our money wildly, and demonstrate to the people of those countries that the peoples' representatives here act in appropriating their money without their knowledge, their consent, or without giving them any information with respect to the subject matter. We can hardly recommend our form of government to those nations when we fail to follow the mandates of our own Constitution. I repeat what I have said before, "Let us be just to our own people before we are too generous to others."

FEDERAL FINANCES

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I was very much astonished, looking at the RECORD today, to find that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] yesterday asked "Where are you going to get the money?" and especially after I find that this Nation is now in debt \$252,000,000,000. If he had thought of that before the debt was so large—I mean all the Democrats should have voted for economy in Government.

I have received a letter from Mr. Duck, vice president of the Lee Rubber & Tire Corp., in which he says:

We are only kidding ourselves if we think we can cut taxes by \$4,800,000,000, and make it stick, without at the same time putting the brakes on spending.

Some clearly defined evidence that our Republican Congress intends to cut expenditures and that they are going to start cutting soon is important if you hope to regain public confidence for the party.

I want to say that since the Democrats have awakened to the realization that they have created this great debt, we should take advantage of their desire to help cut down expenses. I hope now they vote for some economy in Government. The Republican organization ought to study every bill that comes up and demand greater care and economy if we are going to keep this country solvent. Many bills are on their road into this Chamber, every one should have the utmost scrutiny, they may be worthy. We must ask ourselves the questions, Can the country stand any more obligations? Can we run the country in debt any further? If not, vote them down until we can consider them. We must be wise and economize.

UNCOLORED OLEOMARGARINE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, 5 weeks ago, during the week of March 8, the Committee on Agriculture held hearings on margarine taxes. I very much regret that printed records of these hearings are not yet available.

I imagine that all Members received the April 20 margarine letter from Cudahy Packing Co. extolling the desirability of uncolored margarine. I today wired the president of that company as follows:

Referring your margarine letter 20th, please consult with sales manager and wire me effect on your margarine sales of failing to include coloring matter in each package.

If I am favored with a reply you will hear about it on Monday or Tuesday.

THE COMMUNIST LINE IN EUROPE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, the decisive defeat of the Communists in Italy is the most significant victory of American foreign policy since the conclusion of World War II. It represents a major achievement for the new realism in the State Department which holds the key to peace. The westward march of communism has been halted for the moment.

As a result of the victory for democracy, it is not impossible or improbable that the ever-devilish Communist party line will now suddenly make a complete about face, and we might soon hear expressions from Moscow advocating co-operation with the western democracies. The expression of yesterday by the Italian Communist leader is a straw in the wind. The 1948 American apostle of holy Soviet Russia, Mr. Henry Wallace, might very well be "Browderized," which would certainly cause no grief in America.

Americans must be on guard against such a change of policy. It is at last seeping through the minds of the Kremlin that America is determined to assist free men everywhere; that we are going ahead with our program of reestablishing our military strength on land, on the sea, and in the air. We must not be lulled into a new sleep. If the change in party line comes and we hear words of sweetness from the inner sanctum of the Soviets, let us not be again deceived. Let us realize that this is only another tack and another brand of Soviet intrigue, but it could happen, and it may happen. Have any of you forgotten the issue of the Daily Worker which in its inner pages gave reports on the imperialistic war, and on page 1 called for an American expeditionary force to immediately go to the aid of Soviet Russia?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a speech by former Commander Raymond M. Bottom, of the city of Newport News on the port of Hampton Roads, Va. I am informed by the Public Printer that this will exceed two pages of the RECORD and will cost \$159.75, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. FORAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include two editorials and in the other to include an address by Norman Burns, of the Department of State, before the Rhode Island World Affairs Week.

Mr. SADOWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include newspaper excerpts.

Mr. EBERHARTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include two newspaper editorials and one newspaper article.

Mr. HOLIFIELD asked and was given permission to include in the remarks which he expects to make today on House Resolution 562 certain extraneous material.

GOVERNMENT ECONOMY

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] has properly called attention to the excessive appropriations and spending that have recently been sanctioned by the Congress. However, it does occur to me that his remarks should be principally addressed to his colleagues on the Republican side. Thus far this session five appropriation bills have been passed but the reductions under the budget estimates have amounted to a mere 2 percent. Meanwhile, the Republican majority are bringing in bills every other day, other than regular appropriation bills, calling for the expenditures of large sums of money which will cost the taxpayers millions and millions of dollars.

I called attention to this situation yesterday and I repeated the gentleman's question: "Where are you going to get the money?" Now, I feel that something should be done to limit expenditures and to stop the reckless spending of Government funds. Day in and day out you Republicans charge that the administration is careless in its spending, but the fact is that you have a majority in both the House and Senate and are in position to reduce expenditures, yet you endeavor to make the people believe that you are not responsible for these large monetary outlays. Despite your promises to economize and reduce expenditures, you have failed absolutely to do so.

Mr. RICH. I objected to the Democrats spending money and I object to the Republicans spending money just the same.

Mr. SABATH. But, again, I state: You Republicans have a majority and can stop reckless spending, but you have not seen fit to do it.

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

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in two instances; to include in one an article appearing in the Lynn (Mass.) Telegram-News, and in the other to include a resolution adopted by the Executive Governor's Council of Massachusetts.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. HULL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include certain letters.

THE ITALIAN ELECTION

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, all Americans, all the liberty-loving people of the world, rejoice over the outcome of the recent elections in Italy.

In the results of that plebiscite that great people announce in no uncertain terms to an anxiously awaiting world that they have taken their stand on the side of liberty and justice, and turned their back upon all forms of soul-withering totalitarianism, including that which today holds Red Russia in chains.

And in the achievement of that glorious result great credit must go to our fellow American citizens of Italian descent. The avalanche of mail that they dispatched to their Old World friends and relatives, bespeaking their faith in our democratic institutions, did much to turn the tide in favor of the enlightened system of human relations which has been so long our cherished possession.

All honor to our fellow citizens of Italian descent. Their service to the cause of liberty, justice, and human dignity cannot be overestimated.

TREASONABLE PROPAGANDA

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the

House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, we have seen a good deal in the press lately about the Negro, A. Philip Randolph, head of the pullman porters union, advising the Negroes of this country to resist military service.

We are still at war. Peace has not been declared. This Negro, Randolph, would be committing a criminal offense if we were not at war, but under the circumstances he is perpetrating treason. If we had the right kind of an Attorney General, he would find himself in jail before the sun goes down.

He is following the Communist line of stirring up trouble among the Negroes of this country. I see that one Negro bishop down in the Southern States has taken it upon himself to advise the Negroes against it—saying that Randolph is merely trying to lead them into trouble. I say Randolph is simply following the Communist line, and every one of the rest of them that takes that kind of an attitude and advocates resistance to this Government is perpetrating treason, and the Attorney General ought to do his duty and prosecute them at once.

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

ANTI-MILITARY-SERVICE PROPAGANDA

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, in connection with what the gentleman from Mississippi has just said with reference to these highfaluting race hate agitators and troublemakers who are attempting to stir up resistance among the Negroes to the draft by demanding that they refuse to serve their country, I want to read to you section 4 of the Criminal Code:

Whoever incites, sets on foot, assists, or engages in any rebellion or insurrection against the authority of the United States or the laws thereof, or gives aid and comfort thereto, shall be imprisoned not more than 10 years or fined not more than \$10,000, or both; and shall, moreover, be incapable of holding any office under the United States.

Mr. Speaker, there is, I believe, the Attorney General's authority, and I want to suggest to him that he take his nose out of the internal affairs of Mississippi and South Carolina long enough to take care of putting these real traitors where they belong.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PHILLIPS of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech by Dr. Norborg.

PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House

for 1 minute in order to announce the program for next week.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, the discharge petition on H. R. 2345, the bill dealing with taxes on oleomargarine, having been signed by the required number of Members under the discharge rule probably will be called on Monday next. By reason of certain circumstances a number of Members have asked me to try to postpone the consideration of this matter. I have explored that possibility but have been informed that objection would be made to any effort to postpone it, so of course, it would be useless to make that effort. As far as I know now, therefore, it will be called up on next Monday.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Is it hoped that that measure will be finished on Monday?

Mr. HALLECK. From what I have heard, I do not know. I would seriously question that it could be finished on Monday. I understand the concern in the gentleman's mind, since I know that next Tuesday is the day fixed for the primaries in the great State of Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. HALLECK. Necessarily the Members from Pennsylvania want to be home to participate in those primary elections on that day. That is one of the considerations that I think motivated many of the Members who asked me to try to make some arrangement to postpone the consideration of the bill. Of course, if the consideration of the bill is not concluded on Monday, under the rules it would carry over on Tuesday.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Is it not quite true that under circumstances similar to this, as a matter of precedent, where a committee is discharged it is generally the rule that there is an agreement between both sides that some debate is required, and the chances are the consideration of the bill might continue not only until Tuesday but until Wednesday?

Mr. HALLECK. I cannot say what may be done in that regard; I do not know.

Monday is also District day. I understand from the Committee on the District of Columbia that there are a number of matters that should be disposed of, if at all possible. Also, if a rule is granted, it is hoped that we can call up for disposition on Tuesday the bill (H. R. 5963) to authorize the construction of a courthouse to accommodate the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia and the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

On Wednesday it is hoped that the supplemental Labor-Federal Security appropriation bill will be ready for con-

sideration. In connection with that, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the rules of the House it may be in order to call up that appropriation bill for consideration on Wednesday.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I further ask unanimous consent that the call of the committees in order on Calendar Wednesday next may be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. On Thursday we will continue the consideration of that appropriation bill, if it is not previously concluded. It is hoped that on Thursday we may call up, if a rule is granted on it, the bill (H. R. 5992) to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and natural resources within such lands and waters and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources.

It is also hoped that the legislative appropriation bill may be reported by the Committee on Appropriations next week. If it is so reported, we should like to call it up on Friday and dispose of it.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

CALL OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, we are about to consider one of the most important cases that has ever come before the Congress. I think the Members ought to be here to hear the discussion. I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 46]

Abbott	Domengeaux	Kearns
Andrews, Ala.	Dondero	Kefauver
Battle	Dorn	Kennedy
Beall	Eaton	Keogh
Bell	Elliott	Kilburn
Bloom	Fogarty	Larcade
Bolton	Gallagher	Ludlow
Boykin	Gavin	Lusk
Buckley	Gillette	Lyle
Bulwinkle	Gossett	Lynch
Byrne, N. Y.	Grant, Ala.	McCormack
Chadwick	Harless, Ariz.	McCown
Chapman	Harrison	Macy
Clark	Hart	Manasco
Clippinger	Hartley	Mansfield
Cole, Kans.	Hendricks	Mathews
Cole, N. Y.	Hobbs	Meade, Md.
Colmer	Hoeven	Miller, Calif.
Cotton	Jackson, Calif.	Monroney
Courtney	Jarman	Morgan
Crosser	Javits	Multer
Dawson, Ill.	Jenison	Mundt
Delaney	Jenkins, Ohio	Norrell
Dingell	Jenkins, Pa.	Norton
Dirksen	Johnson, Okla.	O'Hara
Dolliver	Kearney	O'Konski

Pace	Regan	Smith, Wis.
Pfeiffer	Rizley	Stratton
Phillips, Tenn.	Rogers, Mass.	Taylor
Plumley	Sarbacher	Towe
Powell	Scoblick	West
Price, Fla.	Scott, Hardle	Worley
Rains	Sikes	
Redden	Simpson, Pa.	

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

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

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SUNDSTROM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by Gov. Alfred E. Driscoll.

Mr. RICHARDS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Columbia Record.

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

Mr. DONOHUE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution.

Mr. LODGE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, to include in one an editorial and in the other an article by Anne O'Hare McCormick.

EUROPEAN RECOVERY PROGRAM

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I brought to the attention of the House the disturbing fact that, in spite of our well-known critical oil shortage, we are about to let the ERP export from this country 2,700,000 metric tons of petroleum products of the value of \$500,000,000.

Today I want to point out that the outstanding study on the Economic Situation and Prospects of Europe, released on March 30, by the UN Economic Commission for Europe, points out that the 16 participating ERP countries expect by 1951 to double their oil consumption of 1938—in fact, the increase in the case of some countries is more than threefold as compared with 1938 consumption.

These UN economic experts who really know the problems of European economy warn that the huge ERP oil program will actually make Europe depend forever upon dollar oil. In this manner it seems to me that generous and dangerous American oil deliveries by way of the ERP program will prove to be a means by which this country not only will rob itself of her strategic oil but will forever burden and break European econ-

omy and trade with dollar countries—in fact, within a period of from 6 to 8 years, demands on the oil account alone will call for at least \$4,000,000,000. This is not the way to recovery.

DR. EDWARD U. CONDON

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I call up House Resolution 522 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of Commerce is hereby directed to transmit forthwith to the House of Representatives the full text of a letter dated May 15, 1947, written by J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and addressed to W. Averell Harriman, Secretary of Commerce, relating to Dr. Edward U. Condon, Director of the National Bureau of Standards.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, in making allotments of time in the consideration of this resolution, I grant the time on the basis of debate, and for no other purpose.

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has reported House Resolution 522 favorably, without a dissenting vote, with one member voting "Present."

The committee recognizes that the resolution creates an issue of extreme importance as between the executive and legislative branches of our Government. The committee has accordingly given very careful consideration to the matter. Furthermore, the committee has prepared and filed a voluminous report to the end that the membership may have the fullest information on every phase of the issue.

The resolution as reported by the committee directs the Secretary of Commerce to transmit forthwith to the House of Representatives the full text of a letter dated May 15, 1947, written by J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and addressed to W. Averell Harriman, Secretary of Commerce, relating to Dr. Edward U. Condon, Director of the National Bureau of Standards.

The necessity of adopting the present procedure, by resolution of the House, arises from the fact that the Secretary of Commerce has refused to submit the letter to the Committee on Un-American Activities. This action was taken by the Secretary of Commerce even though a subpoena had been issued to produce the same. Members of the Committee on Un-American Activities testified that the letter was desired for the benefit of their committee in its study and inquiry concerning un-American and subversive activities, and to determine what legislation should be adopted to curtail or eliminate all activities that are contrary to our Government and subversive to its best interests.

The Secretary of Commerce in his letter of March 4, 1948, addressed to Hon. J. PARNELL THOMAS, chairman, Committee on Un-American Activities, takes the position, based on an opinion of the Attorney General that—

Under traditional concepts of the separation of powers and responsibilities of the

executive and legislative branches of our Government, the executive branch is not, as a matter of law, required to furnish information of this kind to a congressional committee, but on the contrary has the duty to exercise its own judgment in determining whether the furnishing of the information would be in the public interest.

The Secretary then proceeds to say at a later point in his letter to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMAS]:

I have, after careful consideration reached the conclusion that the release of the documents and information called for in this case would, in fact, be prejudicial to the public interest.

Such a reply on a matter of this kind is not only surprising, but, in my opinion, rather startling.

On April 9, 1948, as chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, being the committee to which House Resolution 522 had been referred, I addressed a letter to the Honorable Tom Clark, Attorney General of the United States, informing him that the committee expected to consider House Resolution 522 on April 13. I also stated in my letter to him that if he wished to submit a brief expressing his views with respect to the resolution, the committee would be pleased to receive it. Mr. Peyton Ford, Assistant to the Attorney General, replied by letter of April 12, in which he recommended that House Resolution 522 be not favorably reported, for reason stated therein. The letter in full has been made a part of the committee report. It expressed the view that the refusal of the Secretary of Commerce to produce the letter and other documents was "in keeping with the well-established principle that it is in the public interest to maintain on a confidential basis reports rendered by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and other investigative agencies of the executive branch of the Government."

On March 13, 1948, President Truman in dealing with this matter and others of a similar character, issued a directive in the form of a memorandum to all officers and employees of the executive branch of the Government, reading as follows:

MEMORANDUM TO ALL OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES IN THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF THE GOVERNMENT

The efficient and just administration of the employee loyalty program, under Executive Order No. 9835 of March 21, 1947, requires that reports, records, and files relative to the program be preserved in strict confidence. This is necessary in the interest of our national security and welfare, to preserve the confidential character and sources of information furnished, and to protect Government personnel against the dissemination of unfounded or disproved allegations. It is necessary also in order to insure the fair and just disposition of loyalty cases.

For these reasons, and in accordance with the long-established policy that reports rendered by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and other investigative agencies of the executive branch are to be regarded as confidential, all reports, records, and files relative to the loyalty of employees or prospective employees (including reports of such investigative agencies), shall be maintained in confidence, and shall not be transmitted or disclosed except as required in the efficient conduct of business.

Any subpoena or demand or request for information, reports, or files of the nature described, received from sources other than those persons in the executive branch of the Government who are entitled thereto by reason of their official duties, shall be respectfully declined, on the basis of this directive, and the subpoena or demand or other request shall be referred to the Office of the President for such response as the President may determine to be in the public interest in the particular case. There shall be no relaxation of the provisions of this directive except with my express authority.

This directive shall be published in the Federal Register.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

The communications in the form of letters to which I have already referred, refusing to make available the letter of J. Edgar Hoover relating to Dr. Condon and the broad scope of the President's directive of March 13, 1948, freezing all such information, indicate the adoption in the executive branch of the Government of a policy of denying to the legislative branch of the Government information which it is essential for the legislative branch to have in order to discharge its functions in relation to the safeguarding of the national security.

In order that the House may readily see the importance and the necessity of the Committee on Un-American Activities having the benefit of the entire contents of the letter written by J. Edgar Hoover to Secretary of Commerce Harri-man, I wish to read to the House that small portion of the letter which has been obtained by the Committee through one of its investigators. It is as follows:

The files of the Bureau reflect that Dr. Edward U. Condon has been in contact as late as 1947 with an individual alleged by a self-confessed Soviet espionage agent, to have engaged in espionage activities with the Russians in Washington, D. C., from 1941 to 1944.

Mr. and Mrs. Condon associated with several individuals connected with the Polish Embassy in Washington, D. C. Among those are Mrs. Joseph Winiewicz, wife of the Polish Ambassador, Virginia Woerk, a clerk employee of the Polish Embassy, Helen M. Harris, secretary of the Polish Embassy, and Ignace Zlotowski, former counselor of the Polish Embassy and presently a Polish delegate to the United States.

Helen Harris is identified as a former secretary to the American-Soviet Science Society during the time it was known as science committee of the National American Soviet Friendship Society. She went to work for the Polish Embassy in the fall of 1946.

Zlotowski is identified as a nuclear scientist who studied under Joliet Curie, known member of the Communist Party. He was ex-secretary of the American-Soviet Society. It is known that in February 1947 Zlotowski purchased 270 books on atomic energy which had been published by the Department of Commerce.

It is also known that Mr. and Mrs. Condon were in contact with several other persons closely associated with this alleged Soviet espionage agent. It is also reliably reported that, in March 1947, Zlotowski offered the use of the Polish diplomatic pouch to scientific groups as a means of transmitting scientific material outside the United States, dissemination of which had to be restricted because of security reasons by military authorities.

Zlotowski was in contact with Anatole Cromov, first secretary of the Soviet Embassy, who has since returned to Russia. Condon applied for passport June 4, 1946, to Russia, which was issued but was later canceled by the Army.

As further background to the information contained in the letter of J. Edgar Hoover, and which makes it highly necessary for the Committee on Un-American Activities to have possession of the full contents of the letter, is the allegation that Dr. Condon has made a number of speeches indicating an interest in Russia, one of which was made on the occasion of the Fifth Annual Science Institute on March 5, 1946, in Washington, D. C., from which I quote. Condon, speaking of Russia, said:

We must welcome their scientists to our laboratories, as they have welcomed us to theirs, and extend the base of scientific cooperation with this great people. Of course, we must behave this way toward the scientists of all nations. I only mention Russia because she is right now the target of attack by those irresponsibles who think she would be a suitable adversary in the next world war.

In the same address Condon made the statement:

We must regain for all scientists that freedom from military domination if science is to be used for peaceful ends.

Condon's belief in the free exchange of information among world scientists is indicated by the following quotation from his article, *Is War Research Science?* which appeared in the *Saturday Review of Literature* of January 15, 1945:

The restoration of freedom to science is one of the elements in the civilization we have been fighting for—freedom from secrecy and freedom from national barriers.

The facts contained in the portion of the letter of J. Edgar Hoover that I have read, together with the statements of Dr. Condon in his speech and article also referred to, are sufficient, in my judgment, to create an obligation upon the part of the Committee on Un-American Activities to pursue the inquiry concerning Dr. Condon to a conclusion. The action of the Secretary of Commerce in refusing to give to the committee the full text of the letter of J. Edgar Hoover concerning Dr. Condon handicaps and prevents the committee in making this inquiry as fully as the importance of the matter requires. It is my further opinion that this refusal upon the part of the Secretary of Commerce is unjustified and contrary to the public interest.

The claim that is made by the Secretary of Commerce, and supported by the opinion of the Attorney General, "that under traditional concepts of the separation of powers and responsibilities of the executive and legislative branches of our Government, the executive branch is not, as a matter of law, required to furnish information of this kind to a congressional committee," and so forth, is without foundation in law. To the contrary, it may be said that there is no provision of the Constitution, nor any law of the United States that precludes the giving of such information as is here requested, by an executive department to the Congress or one of its duly appointed committees, in the furtherance of its legislative functions, nor is there any division between the executive and legislative branches of our Government provided for in the Constitution that prevents, precludes, or contemplates the

refusal of any executive department to give necessary information to the legislative branch of the Government.

The constitutional authority of any congressional committee to demand or require information deemed essential to the legislative process is found in an early act of Congress of May 3, 1798 (1 Stat. 554, ch. XXXVI), which reads:

CHAP. XXXVI. An Act To Authorize Certain Officers and Other Persons To Administer Oaths

SECTION 1. *Be it enacted, etc.,* That the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, a chairman of a committee of the whole, or a chairman of a select committee of either House, shall be empowered to administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses, in any case under their examination.

SEC. 2. *And be it further enacted,* That if any person shall willfully, absolutely, and falsely swear or affirm, touching any matter or thing material to the point in question, whereto he or she shall be thus examined, every person so offending, and being thereof duly convicted, shall be subjected to the pains, penalties, and disabilities which by law are prescribed for the punishment of the crime of wilful and corrupt perjury.

Approved, May 3, 1798.

It is also important to note that the protection and the enforcement of these attributes of the power to legislate are the subject matter of Revised Statute 102 (U. S. C. 2:192), which applies to every person. This provision reads:

Every person who having been summoned as a witness by the authority of either House of Congress to give testimony or to produce papers upon any matter under inquiry before either House, or any joint committee established by a joint or concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress, or any committee of either House of Congress, willfully makes default, or who, having appeared, refuses to answer any question pertinent to the question under inquiry, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, punishable by a fine of not more than \$1,000 nor less than \$100 and imprisonment in a common jail for not less than 1 month nor more than 12 months.

In these days when communism is working by devious methods to advance its ideology, in this and other countries, using secret agents, and practicing all the tricks inherent in a well-organized espionage system operating throughout the world, it is incumbent upon the Congress to leave no stone unturned in its effort to ferret out every subversive agency and every person affiliated with any such activity. Whether Dr. Condon is disloyal, a security risk, indiscreet, or innocent is not the issue before the House today. The only issue, and it is an important one, is whether Congress in the due performance of its functions of legislation can require the executive branch to submit to the duly authorized committees of Congress information that is necessary to properly and fully perform the duties assigned to the Congress and its committees.

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

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON] chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, con-

cluded his speech by citing paragraphs of an old law which applies to individuals and not to executive departments. I cannot see how it could be interpreted to apply to a department and therefore feel that the proposed legislation is purely for political effect to create embarrassment for a public servant who has served the Nation well and in a manner as very few persons in responsible places have been able to do.

I have received many letters and resolutions from scientists throughout the United States, all of whom I know are patriotic, sincere, honest and law abiding. These gentlemen state positively that they have known Dr. Condon favorably for many years and vouch for his patriotism and loyalty. Besides, I feel that the Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Harriman, who happens to be a Republican, is just as patriotic and has the interest of the country at heart in this respect as any member of any committee of the Congress. I do not agree with Mr. Harriman on some matters, but in any event he is of good American stock and patriotic. I know that if there were anything in the letter that is sought by the committee that was against the interests of our country, he would gladly furnish it notwithstanding the fact that what we are proposing to do today has not been done for 175 years.

We have been able to get along nicely during that period with the executive and even with the judicial branch of our Government, although we might have differed and the judiciary may have sometimes ruled that our action was not in accordance with the Constitution; nevertheless, the founding fathers established these three branches of government, and I think it is unfair at this time to deviate from the precedents and interfere with the long-established rights and powers to obtain evidence by this method—evidence that the President, Secretary of Commerce, and the Attorney General say is not consistent to furnish in accordance with the best policy of the Government.

I may say, however, Mr. Speaker, that if there is anything in the letter to show that Condon is unpatriotic, I feel that he would have been separated from the important position that he holds. I wish to say that I would oppose with all the power at my command any individual or any organization whose activities would endanger the interests of our country. But from the evidence that I have been able to obtain from outstanding and patriotic persons who have worked and associated with Dr. Condon and who have known him for many years, I am compelled to believe that he is a loyal, patriotic American and is deserving of the privileges and rights of any other citizen of our land.

Mr. HEBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. HEBERT. Does not the distinguished gentleman from Illinois believe that the best answer to any charges against Dr. Condon would be found in the letter, and I ask the gentleman a further question: I do not know whether Dr. Condon is guilty or not of the charges

being made against him. But I want to give him a fair trial, and I think in justice to Dr. Condon he himself should ask that the letter be released.

Mr. SABATH. If I am not mistaken, the doctor has asked for a hearing before the committee. I agree with the gentleman he is entitled to a fair trial, just as any other man, but can he obtain a fair hearing from the committee that has conducted some of its hearings unfairly?

Mr. HEBERT. I disagree with the gentleman.

Mr. SABATH. I regret that I cannot yield to the gentleman any further.

Mr. HEBERT. Obviously, the gentleman will not yield any further.

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman knows that I have served for many years. I was instrumental in passing the first resolution as well as the second one to investigate any and all un-American activities. Consequently, I am interested in the work of the committee, but have at all times insisted on fair play and that the investigation be carried on whether it applied to un-American or Fascist activities.

Mr. Speaker, I fully realize that this resolution will pass and notwithstanding that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] appeared before the Committee on Rules for a rule on his resolution, House Joint Resolution 342, which is more comprehensive than the resolution before us in that it would require all agencies of the Government to open their files or to submit any evidence requested by any committees of the House or Senate, I feel that if we are to deviate from our established policies at this time, we should give consideration to the resolution of the gentleman from Michigan, not that I approve of it, but that it should have received prior consideration.

I repeat, I am satisfied that notwithstanding the denials that have been made, this matter is being taken up purely for political purposes. It is amazing to me that no one in opposition to this resolution was permitted to appear before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Such denial of hearing opponents to a measure is unfair and unjustifiable and, saying the least, is a lopsided procedure. The gentlemen urging this legislation ignore the fact that the Constitution provides for the duties and functions of the executive, judicial, and legislative branches of our Government. Each branch with its definite powers and rights should suffer no interference at the hands of any other branch of the Government. This constitutional direction the proponents of this legislation today are ignoring, despite the weight of opinions of the Supreme Court that tend to uphold the powers and rights of the executive branch against infringement by the legislative branch. However, despite these Supreme Court precedents, I know that every Republican will vote for the passage of this resolution which, as I stated, was reported without giving any opponents the opportunity of being heard.

Mr. Speaker, under the permission given me, I shall not encumber the RECORD with some of the letters which I have received, but shall insert a résumé of the

Condon case which appeared in the New York Times of March 7, 1948, giving a history of the happenings in the matter since July 11, 1946, when an unidentified person communicated with the congressional Joint Committee on Atomic Energy to check the Federal Bureau of Investigation's record of Dr. Condon, as follows:

CASE OF DR. CONDON

Dr. Edward U. Condon, 46, is a physicist who has made several fundamental contributions to nuclear physics. He was associated with the Manhattan district project, which developed the atomic bomb. He later was a scientific adviser to the Senate committee that created the United States Atomic Energy Commission. In 1945 he was appointed by the Secretary of Commerce, Henry A. Wallace, to be Director of the National Bureau of Standards, a Federal agency for scientific research. Last week a House Subcommittee on Un-American Activities called Dr. Condon "one of the weakest links in our atomic security."

This was the background of the allegation:

July 11, 1946: An unidentified man, described as a person who formerly held a security position in the Manhattan district project, wrote the Congressional Joint Committee on Atomic Energy suggesting that the committee have a look at the Federal Bureau of Investigation's record of Dr. Condon (the FBI had made a routine security investigation). Representative J. PARNELL THOMAS, head of the Un-American Activities Committee, was then a member of the joint committee.

March 23 and 25, 1947: Two articles appeared in a Washington newspaper—said to be "leaks" from the Thomas committee—accusing Dr. Condon of disloyalty.

April 8, 1947: At the request of Dr. Condon, the Loyalty Board of the Department of Commerce started to investigate him.

June 1947: Two magazine articles by Representative THOMAS contained brief references to Dr. Condon, saying, in effect, that he was a man to be watched.

July 9, 1947: Dr. Condon wrote to Mr. THOMAS offering to appear before his committee and answer any questions.

August 15, 1947: A subcommittee of the Thomas committee started its investigation of Dr. Condon.

February 24, 1948: The loyalty board of the Department of Commerce cleared Dr. Condon of any suspicion of disloyalty to the Government.

Last week the affair reached a climax. On Monday the Thomas committee issued a blast at Dr. Condon and demanded that Secretary Harriman either dismiss the scientist or set forth reasons for keeping him.

GIST OF THE CHARGES

The Thomas charges against Dr. Condon add up to this: Dr. Condon has associated with individuals suspected of disloyalty to the United States, including persons connected with the Polish Embassy in Washington; the FBI report of Dr. Condon states that he "has been in contact as late as 1947 with an individual alleged . . . to have engaged in espionage activities with the Russians in Washington"; Dr. Condon in 1945 tried to get a passport for Russia and was not permitted to leave this country.

In a statement in his defense, Dr. Condon said: "If it is true that I am one of the weakest links in atomic security that is very gratifying and the country can feel absolutely safe." Leading scientists supported him. It was pointed out that Mr. THOMAS had omitted a sentence in the FBI report which stated that there was no evidence that Dr. Condon's contact involved anything illegal or disloyal. It was also pointed out that Dr. Condon had tried to get a passport for Russia in order to attend an international scientific celebration in Leningrad, and that

Dr. James B. Conant, president of Harvard University, and other top-ranking scientists were also refused permission to attend the Russian ceremony.

On Wednesday the Thomas committee subpoenaed the Commerce Department's investigation records of Dr. Condon. On Thursday Secretary Harriman refused to honor the subpoena on the grounds that publication of the files would be "prejudicial to the public interest."

Mr. Speaker, I also insert an article appearing in the Christian Science Monitor of today which I feel will be enlightening to the membership and to the country, entitled "A Hearing for Dr. Condon—When?" as follows:

A HEARING FOR DR. CONDON—WHEN?

(By Richard L. Strout)

WASHINGTON.—On March 1 the House Un-American Activities Committee, under the chairmanship of Representative J. PARNELL THOMAS, Republican, of New Jersey, charged that Dr. Edward U. Condon, a well-known natural scientist and Director of the United States Bureau of Standards, consorted with persons suspected of being Soviet espionage agents. He was declared to be, accordingly, "one of the weakest links in our atomic security."

Dr. Condon asked for, and was promised, a hearing to answer this charge. In his own behalf, he declared that his duties required him to keep in touch with natural scientists of other nations so as to know what new discoveries are being made abroad, even if some of these foreign representatives happen to be Soviet agents without his knowledge.

The date for the Condon hearing was originally set for today (April 21) by the Thomas committee. It was called off, however, and no other date has been set.

Attacks on Dr. Condon have been made on the floor of the House by members of the Thomas committee. A court test of the validity of these charges (if Dr. Condon so desired) is precluded, because Members of Congress are privileged while speaking on the floor from the operation of the law of libel.

A number of noted natural scientists have protested the treatment of Dr. Condon. They ask that the facts be sifted one way or the other, and protest a situation as unfair where a man's reputation can be attacked without an opportunity to be heard or to reply.

The American Mathematical Society in annual convention at Philadelphia in a resolution for its 3,700 members expressed grave concern over the committee's actions. It called for rules of committee procedure that would guarantee to Americans just treatment by their Government.

A statement has been drawn up by 45 teachers in 27 law schools in all sections of the country, urging improved committee procedure and attacking the treatment of Dr. Condon. Among the signers of the statement are the deans of seven law schools: Harvard, University of Nebraska, Indiana University, University of Pennsylvania, University of Chicago, University of Oklahoma, and University of Iowa. "The committee's proceedings lead to proclamations of guilt, rather than to generalized corrective proposals," the statement declares. The professors propose six basic rights of a citizen before a congressional committee:

The right fully to receive and to answer charges; to call witnesses; to have the aid and advice of counsel; to be permitted cross-examination of witnesses making derogatory statements; and to have the case determined on the basis of the material presented at the hearing.

In the meantime, the chairman of a House subcommittee on executive expenditures under Representative GEORGE H. BENDER, Republican, of Ohio, has announced that, so far

as his small body goes, he intends to follow a set of prescribed rules to give witnesses a fair hearing. These rules include most of those urged by the professors above.

The fast-moving Thomas committee has meanwhile sidestepped the April 21 hearing previously scheduled for Dr. Condon's reply, in order to develop a new angle.

The loyalty of a couple of million Government workers from top to bottom is now being checked by FBI examination, subject to review by respective department loyalty boards. The Thomas committee demands that the particular FBI check on Dr. Condon be turned over to it. The executive branch of the Government declares that these checks are confidential (a) because publication would disclose sources of FBI information; (b) because material included is often hearsay, from critics or enemies of those investigated; and (c) the information is not final or definitive.

Secretary of Commerce Averell Harriman refuses to set the precedent of turning over the Condon file, acting under orders of President Truman.

Tomorrow, April 22, the House of Representatives is scheduled to approve a resolution demanding that Mr. Harriman produce the file. The Senate will then be called upon to approve it. Dr. Condon must wait to defend himself till later against charges already made. While the issue of the file disclosure is still unsettled, courts in the past have sided with the Executive against the legislature in similar show-downs over documents.

Mr. Speaker, several letters have been read from informants without the giving of their names, some of them allegedly having worked with Dr. Condon. I pause to question whether it is not possible that these letters were inspired by persons who were jealous of Dr. Condon.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to say that I do not know Dr. Condon personally, but I am appreciative of his straightforwardness in immediately asking to be heard. Unfortunately, the hearing has been delayed, and in the meantime he has been assailed and were he not a man of such high standing, the allegation of such charges might have ruined him. It is my belief that in all matters that the accused is entitled to the benefit of any doubt and that, in this instance, Dr. Condon is entitled to a fair and unbiased hearing. So why should not the committee have waited before pressing this legislation until the opportunity of a hearing had been afforded him.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA].

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, in considering this resolution the House must first recognize the fact that today we are not voting on any question as to whether or not Dr. Condon is guilty of any improper conduct. That is not the issue here at all. What Congress is seeking is further information to determine what its legislative policy should be; and whether what, if anything, Congress should do in trying to secure this information which has been denied it by the executive department.

The Committee on Un-American Activities has been presented with information which justifies, in my judgment, a further inquiry as to the facts. This House could not afford to stop at this

point. It should properly seek to get further information. I regret that Dr. Condon himself, as the holder of a very important commission of our Government, is not here insisting on this further information and offering a full revelation on which to demand a complete exoneration. If innocent, he could well afford to take that position.

Here we have knowledge that there is a letter written by Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, the head of a responsible agency of this Government, which is supposed to reflect, from some standpoint, on Dr. Condon. Without knowing what the information is, the Committee on Un-American Activities has properly requested that it be furnished this letter. So if we stop at this point, the Congress is liable to be subjected to the inference it is covering up or acceding to the concealment of facts it should know. I do not think that, with due regard to interest of the Nation at this time, Congress should be put in that position.

Let us look briefly as to what is probably the law in this case. From memoranda furnished by the legislative counsel to the committee, I cite just a few sentences that may help to clarify the situation.

One proposition is this:

That the scope of a congressional investigation is as broad as the legislative purpose requires.

From that standpoint this is a matter within the jurisdiction of Congress. Again:

That the subpoena of a duly authorized investigatory committee of Congress is no more restricted than that of a grand jury.

Again:

That the right of a legislative body to demand and receive, from the executive branch, information and papers which it deems pertinent to the legislative process is established.

That the President and the executive officers have vigorously defended against such asserted right on the basis of the fundamental doctrine of separation of powers of the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of the Federal Government.

That the Congress has merely asserted its right to obtain information without attempting to enforce it.

That the Congress has never attempted to invoke against executive officers the law which provides that every person who, having been summoned by either House to give testimony or to produce papers upon a matter under inquiry, willfully makes default, is criminally liable.

Now, Congress is not here invoking a criminal penalty. Here we have a right to ask for this information. Even if it be conceded that the executive department has the power to refuse, and does so, that is its responsibility. Its power to refuse a request of Congress does not detract from the power of Congress to request such information. There is no law that forbids the Executive from granting such a request. At the least, the Executive has discretionary power to grant such a request.

As an authority cited by the Legislative Counsel states:

When Congress suspects, for good and sufficient reason, that irregularities are taking place in a department, it is its duty and privilege under the Constitution to investigate as means to other action.

So in this case, if it be assumed that we have no right to compel the executive department to give this information, nevertheless there is no doubt about the authority of Congress to request it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include certain extraneous material, which I have heretofore obtained permission to do when the House was in session.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I am going to object to it being inserted at this point. I think it ought to go in the Appendix or later on in the RECORD.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I have obtained permission heretofore, by unanimous consent, to do so.

Mr. RANKIN. Not for this purpose.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Yes; for this purpose, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. If the gentleman has already obtained permission in the House, there is no necessity for him again obtaining permission to do so.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SADOWSKI].

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, the question involved here, Members of the House, is not so much Dr. Condon as it is the authority of the President of the United States. The President has instructed the Secretary of Commerce not to release a certain letter. The Congress by this action now is going to say that that letter must be released, regardless of the President's position.

I have served on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for 12 years. This is the first time during that whole 12 years that I have seen a resolution or bill come up for consideration before that committee where only the proponents were heard. That sounds strange, but it is true. The full morning before the committee was taken up by the proponents. The Members of the Committee on Un-American Activities appeared and testified. Before the vote was taken by the committee I requested that the letter from the Attorney General be read; that its contents be made known to the members of the committee. Now, heretofore that has always been done. That is done in every committee all the time. When I made the request that the letter be read it was denied. It would have taken about 10 minutes to read the report of the Attorney General and that, mind you, is the report of the President of the United States or, rather, it is a report in defense of the President's position.

The report of the Attorney General of the United States was not read and that happened in the great Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. That is the first time I have ever seen anything like that happen.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. WOLVERTON. May I call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that

everybody in the committee, unless I have to except the gentleman, knew that the Attorney General had rendered an opinion contrary to the resolution, and I read the conclusion of the Attorney General to that effect to the committee. The opinion was there for the gentleman to read it in full if he wished to. In order to be fair to the gentleman, I made it a part of this report so that everybody could see it.

Mr. SADOWSKI. I believe that is the only reason it is a part of the report, probably because I raised the issue in the committee. I still say that I asked to have that letter read. I am a member of that committee and I had the right to have that letter read. The motion was made to move the previous question and debate was discontinued, and the resolution was reported out. I say again, and I repeat, that that is not proper committee procedure.

Let me read from the letter from the Attorney General of the United States to the committee. Certainly everybody should read it. It is too bad that this letter was not considered by the committee, that its arguments were not considered in coming to a decision on this resolution.

The resolution would direct the Secretary of Commerce to transmit to the House "the full text of a letter dated May 15, 1947, written by J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and addressed to W. Averell Harriman, Secretary of Commerce, relating to Dr. Edward U. Condon."

The Secretary of Commerce has previously declined to make available to the House Committee on Un-American Activities the contents of confidential files relating to the loyalty investigation conducted by that Department with regard to Dr. Condon. This refusal was in keeping with the well-established principle that it is in the public interest to maintain on a confidential basis reports rendered by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and other investigative agencies of the executive branch of the Government.

The right of the Executive to maintain such reports on a confidential basis has long been recognized as his constitutional prerogative. The sound considerations of policy which support the assertion of this prerogative have been well stated many times. There is attached hereto a copy of an opinion rendered by Attorney General Jackson on April 30, 1941, addressed to the chairman of the House Committee on Naval Affairs. In that opinion, Attorney General Jackson took the position, with the approval and at the direction of the President, that records of the Federal Bureau of Investigation are confidential documents of the executive branch and that congressional or public access to such records would not be in the public interest. The opinion points out that this view accords with the conclusion reached by a line of predecessors in the office of the Attorney General and with the position taken by the President from time to time since Washington's administration. It further points out that exercise of this discretion in the executive branch has been upheld and respected by the judiciary. For the sound reasons which support this position, taken by the executive branch since the founding of the Republic, I refer you particularly to pages 2 and 3 of Attorney General Jackson's opinion. Pursuant to this well-established policy, the President on March 13, 1948, directed all officers and employees in the executive branch of the Government to maintain in confidence all reports, records, and files relative to the loyalty of employees, including the reports of such investigative agencies as the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Compliance with House Resolution 522 would require a member of the President's Cabinet, the Secretary of Commerce, to violate the President's directive in this regard. If there is anything well established under our tripartite system of government, it is that members of the President's Cabinet, although appointed by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, are responsible to the President (*Myers v. United States*, 272 U. S. 52). Agreement by the House to the resolution would, therefore, raise serious questions of a constitutional nature. The resolution would constitute legislative interference with an important executive function of the President, namely, the supervision of those officers of the Government who are responsible to him. As stated by William Howard Taft in his book, *Our Chief Magistrate and His Powers*, 1916, at page 129:

"The President is required by the Constitution from time to time to give to Congress information on the state of the Union and to recommend for its consideration such measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient, but this does not enable Congress or either House of Congress to elicit from him confidential information which he has acquired for the purpose of enabling him to discharge his constitutional duties, if he does not deem the disclosure of such information prudent or in the public interest."

There is attached hereto a memorandum which points to the provisions in the Constitution and to the Supreme Court decisions which bear upon this subject and which reveals the unconstitutionality of the proposal embodied in House Resolution 522.

A brief reference to historical precedents relating to resolutions similar to House Resolution 522 will be helpful. In January 1807 the House of Representatives passed a resolution that the President of the United States be requested to lay before the House information in his possession, except such as he may deem should not be disclosed in the public interest, touching any illegal combination of private individuals against the peace and safety of the Union. The Burr conspiracy was then stirring the country. Jefferson had made it the subject of a special message to the Congress. Jefferson's reply to the resolution was in the form of a message to the House and Senate wherein he pointed out that he had received a mass of data, most of which had been obtained without the sanction of an oath so as to constitute formal and legal evidence, which he could not, without divulging private confidences and exposing names furnished confidentially to the Government, divulge to the House. (Richardson, *Messages and Papers of the Presidents*, vol. 1, p. 412, January 22, 1807.)

Similarly, in 1843, a resolution of the House of Representatives called upon the Secretary of War to communicate to the House the reports made to the War Department by Lieutenant Colonel Hitchcock relative to the affairs of the Cherokee Indians, together with all information communicated by him concerning the frauds which he had been charged to investigate. The Secretary of War advised the House that he could not communicate information which Colonel Hitchcock had obtained in confidence, because it would be grossly unjust to the persons who had given the information. The House, however, claimed the right to demand from the Executive and heads of departments such information as may be in their possession relating to subjects of deliberations of the House. President Tyler, in a message dated January 31, 1843, said in part:

"And although information comes through a proper channel to an executive officer, it may often be of a character to forbid its being made public. The officer charged with a confidential inquiry, and who reports its result under the pledge of confidence which his appointment implies, ought not to be exposed individually to the resentment of those whose conduct may be impugned by

the information he collects. The knowledge that such is to be the consequence will inevitably prevent the performance of duties of that character, and thus the Government will be deprived of an important means of investigating the conduct of its agents." (Richardson, Messages and Papers of the Presidents, vol. 4, pp. 221-223.)

The reports of Colonel Hitchcock concerning the delegates of the Cherokee nation were not communicated by President Tyler to the House. The reasons given by the President for the failure to send the papers and documents referred to were that suggestions, anticipated projects, views dealing with the personal character of persons, would not be of aid to Congress in legislation, and their publication would be unfair and unjust to a Federal official and inconsistent with the public interest.

Our first President, in his Farewell Address, cautioned against the dangers resulting from the encroachment by one branch of the government upon the other. He wrote:

"It is important, likewise, that the habits of thinking in a free country should inspire caution in those entrusted with its administration to confine themselves within their respective constitutional spheres, avoiding in the exercise of the powers of one department to encroach upon another. The spirit of encroachment tends to consolidate the powers of all the departments in one, and thus to create, whatever the form of government, a real despotism." (Richardson, Messages and Papers of the Presidents, vol. I, p. 219.)

In view of the foregoing considerations, this Department recommends that House Resolution 522 be not favorably reported.

The Department of Justice has not had the opportunity to submit this report to the Bureau of the Budget.

Yours sincerely,

PEYTON FORD,

The Assistant to the Attorney General.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I yield.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ARENS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, that does not include the insertion of extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

THE HOOVER LETTER AND HOUSE RESOLUTION 522

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment briefly on certain aspects of House Resolution 522, which requests the Secretary of Commerce to transmit to the House a letter dated May 15, 1947, written by J. Edgar Hoover and addressed to the Secretary of Commerce relating to Dr. E. U. Condon.

The House may remember that this letter was quoted in part in the report of the special subcommittee of the House Committee on Un-American Activities on March 1, 1948, attacking Dr. Condon. I analyzed the letter as well as the entire report on March 9, 1948, on the floor of the House. At this time I wish to point out merely that the tactics of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, which the New York Times characterizes

as "punishment by publicity," are being continued in this matter of House Resolution 522. The public, in reading of this request, must wonder why the letter is not turned over.

In general the public is not aware of the significance of the constitutional division of powers between the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of the Government. This division is a good one, but, of course, disagreements are inevitable at times. House Resolution 522 is symptomatic of the disputes that arise in such a system.

However, the general public, in view of the previous tactics of the House Committee on Un-American Activities with respect to Dr. Condon, may wonder whether there is not an effort to conceal information. To this I say that the question of either revealing or not revealing the letter is immaterial. This question is purely a matter of administrative policy.

I know that Dr. Condon personally would be happy to see to it that the House Committee on Un-American Activities had every bit of information possible, for he has nothing to conceal. He has repeatedly volunteered to appear, cooperate, and testify. As long ago as last July, he wrote letters to every member of this committee offering his services and aid. Since then, he has even called on the committee in its own chambers, reiterating his offer. So far, nothing has been done. Even the hearing which had, at long last, been announced for April 21, 1948, has now been postponed.

What is really significant about House Resolution 522 is its background. Since the committee published a part of this letter in its report of March 1, 1948, I would like to know how the committee got the letter. For it is evident that the committee did manage to get this letter in some form or another. Where did it get the letter? Does the committee have a spy in the FBI or the Department of Commerce? And does this spy steal confidential documents regularly for the committee? Furthermore, since the committee has had the letter, why this fuss over getting it again? Is the committee trying to fool this House and the public?

The House and the Nation may recall that after the release of the report of March 1, 1948, in which the Hoover letter was quoted, it turned out that an important sentence favorable to Dr. Condon was omitted. Then a few days later, it developed according to a newspaper article in the Washington Post that the committee had also added a paragraph of their own to the Hoover letter. Thus, an important document, according to the committee, was tampered with by the committee. Now the committee wants the letter, they say. In view of the above facts with respect to their tampering with the letter, what are we to conclude?

Part of the letter was published by the committee as the Hoover letter. Then two instances of tampering with the evidence were revealed. Now the letter is requested through a House resolution. Well, either the committee had the letter or it did not. If it had—as is ap-

parent—the letter, then why this resolution?

Mr. Speaker, under permission heretofore granted I shall insert in the Appendix a letter from the Attorney General's office to the chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, Mr. WOLVERTON, an opinion on the constitutional aspects of the Committee on Un-American Activities request for the FBI letter, and a list of constitutional objections to House Resolution 522.

I regret that I have been unable to obtain time to properly explore and debate this subject. In my opinion Dr. Condon has no objection to the release of this letter. It has become a bone of contention between the executive and the legislative branch of our Government. The resolution may pass the House and the Senate but the Supreme Court will never, in my opinion, force the presentation of the FBI report in question.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, my thought on this resolution is that the Congress of the United States is entitled to all the information it can get when an investigation with reference to the security of this Nation is involved. This resolution only calls for one letter written by J. Edgar Hoover to the Department of Commerce of the United States. Two departments created by the Congress are involved. Any information that they hold, irrespective of the merits of this controversy, should certainly be given to the Committee on Un-American Activities. They are doing a job for the security of this country. It is fair to Dr. Condon, it is fair to the Congress, and it is fair to the people of the United States that the truth be known. If Dr. Condon is not a "security risk," then that fact should be proven, and if information is in the Department of Commerce, the Secretary ought to be made to furnish it. Let me point out to the membership of the House that Dr. Condon at this time occupies the most important position in our Government, insofar as dealing with the security of this Government is concerned.

The report read as follows:

The National Bureau of Standards, which acts as custodian of the Nation's basic scientific standards, is one of the most important national defense research organizations in the United States. It is engaged in projects at the present time concerning atomic energy, radar, proximity fuzes, instrument-landing systems, jet fuels, and other vital and secret projects that affect the security of our Nation. The Director of this agency has access to confidential records and information sought by virtually every foreign espionage agent in the United States.

Should the Congress be denied this information? Should a committee created by the Congress—the Committee on Un-American Activities—be denied this information at a time when we are in danger of war? That is what we are in. You know, when we are in a war, all these constitutional liberties and prerogatives that we enjoy as individuals are suspended, even the right of habeas corpus. The right of habeas corpus can be taken away from us in time of war. This investigation is just as important to the people of this country and the Congress as any other measure that has ever come before the House of Representatives be-

cause of the security involved. Irrespective of the merits of the controversy, I hope the House will adopt this resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. NIXON].

Mr. NIXON. Mr. Speaker, I think my distinguished colleague from the State of California [Mr. LEA] put his finger on this problem very neatly in his 3 minutes. I am going to address myself to that particular point.

There are Members of the House who may disagree on the merits of the Condon case itself. You may have different viewpoints as to whether or not Dr. Condon is or is not loyal. You may have different viewpoints as to whether or not his alleged associations do or do not constitute a security risk. You may have different viewpoints on whether or not the procedures of the Committee on Un-American Activities, in presenting the Condon case, have or have not been fair to Dr. Condon. These are not the issues before us, however.

I wish to address myself, as did the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA], to the narrow but very important issue before us, of this particular FBI letter. Referring to the letter, I want to summarize briefly the facts concerning it, most of which appear in the report, but an elaboration of which will, I believe, be of interest to the Members.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NIXON. I yield.

Mr. PRIEST. Will the gentleman point out, if he has knowledge on which to base it, whether or not in his opinion the disclosure of all the contents of this letter would in any way endanger the security of the country? That is troubling a great many Members.

Mr. NIXON. I am glad the gentleman mentioned that point, because I intend to discuss it in my remarks, specifically.

In the first place, this letter was the basis for a report by a subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities which was issued on March 1.

Certain paragraphs of the letter which had been obtained by a committee investigator were quoted in the report. The quoted portion referred to various associations of Dr. Condon with alleged foreign agents and the committee report concluded that these associations constituted a security risk in view of Dr. Condon's access to secret information.

On March 3, the letter again became a subject of discussion as the result of an article which appeared in the Washington Post. It is important to refer to this article because it fills out the story.

I quote from the article of March 3:

Two persons who saw the letter, and are known to be reliable, told the Washington Post last night that they were struck by the omission in the subcommittee's quoting of the letter of a certain sentence.

The following day, on the 4th of March, another article appeared in the Washington Post which stated:

The exact text of the missing statement was secured by the Washington Post last night.

The newspaper article, in other words, quoted directly from a letter which the executive department refused to turn over to a congressional committee.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NIXON. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. Can the gentleman, as a member of the Committee on Un-American Activities, who has given much time and thought to this question, tell this House whether or not the statement just read, together with the statement in the report issued by your committee, contains the full text of the letter in question?

Mr. NIXON. That is exactly the point. The gentleman has asked whether these quotations constitute the full and exact text of the letter. We do not know. That is what we are trying to find out. We do not know whether the version of the letter quoted in the committee report is correct, or whether the version quoted in the newspaper is correct, because we, apparently unlike the newspaper reporter involved, cannot get the text of the letter.

But this point should be emphasized to the House. Confusion has resulted by reason of the fact that portions of this letter were included in the committee report which apparently cast an unfavorable reflection upon Dr. Condon, while other portions have been quoted in the newspapers which create the inference that Dr. Condon is completely innocent, insofar as these particular associations are concerned. In order to clear up this confusion, in order to clear the air, it is essential that the whole letter come out.

I wish to point out that there are only two copies of this letter, one in the FBI and one in the Department of Commerce. Certainly no one will contend that the FBI made the letter available to newspaper reporters. The only other place from which it could have come was the Department of Commerce. We heard before our committee, in executive session, every available employee of the Department of Commerce who was supposed to have seen the letter. Every one of them refused to divulge the contents of the letter in any respect to a committee of Congress, and yet we find that portions of the letter are apparently made available to a newspaper reporter and are used to discredit the committee's report.

Now, I am not criticizing the reporter for getting the information. That is his job. But I do say that when the time comes that the executive department feels that a particular letter is so confidential that it cannot be disclosed in executive session to a committee of Congress but that its contents can be bandied about among newspaper reporters, it is certainly high time that the Congress did something about that situation and got the information to which it was entitled.

I am now going to address myself to a second issue which is very important. The point has been made that the President of the United States has issued an order that none of this information can be released to the Congress and that therefore the Congress has no right to

question the judgment of the President in making that decision.

I say that that proposition cannot stand from a constitutional standpoint or on the basis of the merits for this very good reason: That would mean that the President could have arbitrarily issued an Executive order in the Meyers case, the Teapot Dome case, or any other case denying the Congress of the United States information it needed to conduct an investigation of the executive department and the Congress would have no right to question his decision.

Any such order of the President can be questioned by the Congress as to whether or not that order is justified on the merits. So, looking at the order and noting the reasons which the President gave for denying this information to the Congress, let me read:

It is necessary in the interest of our national security and welfare, to preserve the confidential character and sources of information furnished, and to protect Government personnel against the dissemination of unfounded or disproved allegations.

This is from the memorandum of the President of March 13.

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

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from California one additional minute.

Mr. NIXON. In the brief time remaining to me I want to apply these two criteria to the Condon letter. First, the order says we must not disclose confidential sources of information. As a matter of fact, this letter does not disclose confidential sources of information, and I make this statement on the basis of the testimony of Mr. Towne, secretary of the Commerce Department Loyalty Review Board, before our committee. Let me quote from that testimony:

Mr. STRILING. * * * I contend that there are no names disclosed in Mr. Hoover's letter.

Mr. TOWNE. If Mr. Harriman's letter is limited to the letter of May 15, a thing of which I was not aware. I think it would be accurate to say that the FBI file, however, does contain the names of people, however, who are identified by name.

From this statement it seems apparent that there are no sources of information in the letter. There may be in the complete FBI file which is not covered by this resolution.

The second point, just as important, upon which the President based his secrecy order is that we must protect Government personnel against the dissemination of unfounded or disproved allegations. This point constitutes one of the strongest arguments for making the letter public rather than for keeping it secret. Because as a result of the portions of the letter which have already been released allegations have been made which reflect upon Dr. Condon. Some sources say that the letter in fact clears him of these charges. In the interest of a complete airing of all the facts and of dispelling these unfounded allegations, if they are that, it is essential that the entire content of the letter be released to the Congress.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I was not on the subcommittee that originally heard this case, but the question here is whether or not the Congress of the United States is going to permit a bureaucrat to draw an iron curtain between it and people on the Federal pay roll.

We can have a Bogota in this country, we can have a Pearl Harbor in this country. Five atomic bombs dropped at the proper place would paralyze this eastern seaboard and probably paralyze the country. That question is involved in this investigation. If the Secretary of Commerce wanted to be fair he could have brought that letter and submitted it to the committee in executive session, and every member of the committee would have treated it as such.

This man Condon is in a position in which he could be impeached for certain offenses. He has been confirmed by the Senate. Suppose we were impeaching Dr. Condon; then, could the Department of Commerce say: "You cannot have this information?"

When the Committee on Appropriations gets ready to make appropriations for a department can the Secretary of the department say that the committee cannot have information concerning the loyalty of men on the Federal pay roll in that department?

I call your attention to the following provision of the law:

TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE, CHAPTER 10.
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Sec. 604. Annual and special reports: The Secretary of Commerce shall annually, at the close of each fiscal year, make a report in writing to Congress, giving an account of all moneys received and disbursed by him and his Department in fostering, promoting, and developing the foreign and domestic commerce, the mining, manufacturing, shipping, and fishery industries, and the transportation facilities, of the United States, and making such recommendations as he shall deem necessary for the effective performance of the duties and purposes of the Department. He shall also from time to time make such special investigations and reports as he may be required to do by the President, or by either House of Congress, or which he himself may deem necessary and urgent. (February 14, 1903, ch. 552, sec. 8, 32 Stat. 829.)

Mr. Speaker, we have come to a showdown. Mr. Harriman has been nominated to handle the billions of dollars which you voted the other day for ERP. Do you want to put a man in charge of that who will defy the Congress before he starts? Are you going to be denied the right to investigate the loyalty of his subordinates who are to handle the money you are appropriating out of the pockets of your taxpayers? Are you going to be denied the right to see whether or not it goes to Russia or Russian satellite nations?

Mr. Speaker, this is a challenge to the Congress of the United States. This Government, according to the decisions of the Supreme Court, consists of the President, the Senate, and the House of Representatives. These are our prerogatives, and I submit it is our duty to demand that this letter and this file be

submitted to the proper committee of the Congress.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman for a brief question.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. If we pass this resolution, will the constitutionality of it be subject to a test before the courts?

Mr. RANKIN. No; I do not think so. I hope the resolution is passed unanimously.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I shall emphatically support the pending resolution. The purposes of it have been thoroughly discussed by those who have preceded me upon the floor today. I should like to point out, however, one thing which has not been touched upon.

The committee report which you have before you outlines in detail how the Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Harriman, has refused to help us fight communism in the United States. He has refused by failure to cooperate with the House Committee on Un-American Activities in its request that the Secretary provide the committee with the letter from his files, written by J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, about the subversive connections of Dr. Edward U. Condon, Director of the National Bureau of Standards. He has rejected a similar request from the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. He has even refused to testify on the matter. He has refused to permit the letter to be brought in under subpoena. He thus shields this appointee of his predecessor, Henry Wallace. This is also the same man who, as Secretary of Commerce, has refused to quit granting export licenses for war potentials being shipped to Soviet Russia. His constant appeasement of communism and refusal to cooperate with Congress in getting the Reds off our Federal Government pay roll, is a matter of public record.

Now, on yesterday, his refusal to resist communism at home has been rewarded by the President who names him our roving ambassador at a salary of \$25,000 per year, to resist communism abroad. I hope he does a better job at it abroad than he has done at home.

Certain apologists for this way of doing things have hailed this appointment of Secretary Harriman, to supervise the expenditure of billions of dollars of our tax money under the Marshall plan, as a great thing. Maybe the appointment of this Wall Street millionaire and bewildered liberal, in view of his past performances which I have outlined, is a great thing. But, it is not a great thing for the United States of America, and for the people who would like to see consistency in our foreign policy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to say anything in reference to this matter. I suppose I am going to be swept along with the crowd today. But I do want to give one warning, and that is when the reports of the Federal Bureau of Investigation become public property in general, that Bureau, as far as its usefulness in detecting crime is concerned, will about pass out. There is no such thing as detecting. You know, it is a wonderful thing to read detective stories, but people hunting out crime do not just pick the criminals out of the air. They have got to have confidential information from somebody on the inside of the crowd they are trying to catch.

If we start exposing reports and names of people generally who give this information to that agency of the Government, I fear we are going to very seriously cripple this whole thing.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say one other thing. I have known Averell Harriman a long time. He is a gentleman, he is a man of great ability, he is a patriot, and I do hate to see the gentleman from Missouri try to drag his name down like he did a while ago.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY].

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California, the ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce [Mr. LEA], and our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON], have laid the issue squarely before you. It is not a question of loyalty or disloyalty of Dr. Condon. It is a question of whether or not the various departments of the executive branch of Government are going to be permitted to withhold essential information from regularly constituted committees of Congress.

I regret very much that my good friend and colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] had to bring the political situation into this discussion when he remarked that the resolution under consideration was a political matter. For the enlightenment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] I wish to state that this resolution was reported out of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce unanimously, Democrats and Republicans voting for it.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, that is not quite true. It was not reported out unanimously.

Mr. BUSBEY. Who voted against it?

Mr. SADOWSKI. I voted "present" and I gave my reason for it, that only one side of this issue had been presented before the committee. Only the proponents were heard, and those in opposition, and the representatives of the President of the United States, were not heard before the committee.

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield no further.

Inasmuch as there was not a single vote against the resolution, I still say it was reported unanimously; therefore it certainly cannot be considered a political matter.

I have a very serious charge to make this afternoon. The various departments of our Government have requested many reports on individuals from the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and it is because they have drawn an iron curtain around or put the lid on these reports that the Committee on Un-American Activities and other agencies of the legislative branch of this Government have been prevented from exposing the fact that the administration is still codling and protecting known Communists in our Government. If you do not adopt this resolution we are not going to get these Communists out of our Government. I think as the duly elected Representatives of our districts we have a responsibility to our people. Everybody is crying about the Communists here, abroad, and everywhere, from the President of the United States on down. But the Communists remain. If we are sincere, let us back the committee up on this resolution and let us make this document available. I think we ought to make a lot more documents available to committees of Congress. On March 22, 1947, the President, by directive order, set up the so-called Federal Loyalty Board, and we appropriated millions and millions of dollars in order that the Loyalty Board might get the Communists, fellow travelers, subversives, and those who are security risks out of our Federal Government. I charge on the floor of the House today that this Loyalty Board, for which we appropriated millions of dollars, has not processed its first loyalty case in over 1 year of operation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, there is a complete and satisfactory answer to the remarks of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN], our distinguished former Speaker. Of course, if everyone knew what the FBI was doing, it might just as well go out of business, and if everyone in the departments is to know what the FBI is doing, then they will have to go out of business. I can see no reason why, if this information is given to the department, it should not also be given to the Congress.

Another thing, why should not the Congress have the authority to know what those agencies, which it creates and supports, are doing? Is the creature greater than the creator? And, again, the committee in this case, if I understand it correctly, did not ask for the source of the information. And that is an answer to the gentleman's objection. And, once more. Dr. Condon is not on trial here, nor is he being persecuted by the Department of Justice nor by the FBI, and this resolution, if it is adopted, will only aid the Congress, or more accurately, its committee, to learn whether he is or is not loyal. The only question is whether the House is to have the information which will aid it in legislation—help it learn whether new or different legislation is needed to protect the national security.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. I yield for a question.

Mr. HALE. Will the gentleman explain whether the passage of this resolution would not automatically make the letter public to the entire world? That is what I should like to know.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Yes; it would.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Un-American Activities at its organization meeting in January 1946 set down for itself an eight-point program. That program included, among other things, an investigation and exposé of Communists in the moving-picture industry, an investigation and exposé of Communists in the labor unions, an investigation and exposé of Communists in our atomic energy set-up and an investigation and exposé of Communists in the Government.

From that time on our investigators have proceeded with their investigations in pursuance of this program. In the course of their investigation they crossed the path of Dr. Edward U. Condon.

One of the first times that Dr. Condon's name was called to the attention of our investigators was in a letter addressed to a Member of Congress. Part of that letter is quoted in the report of the Subcommittee on National Security of the Committee on Un-American Activities and I want to read a part of the letter. The person who wrote it is presently employed in the Atomic Energy Commission, and who has held a high position in the Atomic Energy Commission, said this in a letter to a Member of Congress:

Attached is a very hurried attempt which may be of some help. Unfortunately, the group has loaded me down in preparation for Friday's meeting.

Remember, this is a high person in the Atomic Energy Commission, one who advocated civilian control of atomic energy. He said:

May I suggest that you demand Dr. Condon's record of the FBI. It would be enlightening.

Another time the paths of our investigators crossed the path of Dr. Condon was a letter given to our committee by a former Member of Congress, a former prominent member of the minority side. This was a letter written by Samuel Gelfan, who was writing for the membership committee of the American-Soviet Science Society, which the Committee on Un-American Activities has claimed right along is affiliated with the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, Inc., of New York City. This letter by Mr. Gelfan has this to say, and it is addressed to a person in the National Bureau of Standards, United States Department of Commerce, Washington, D. C. :

DEAR —: It has been suggested by Dr. Condon, who is a member of our executive committee, that you might be interested in the activities of our society and membership in same.

We are, therefore, enclosing a brief statement concerning the objectives and activity of our organization, and under separate cover are also mailing you a copy of our last bulletin.

Sincerely yours,

SAMUEL GELFAN,
For the Membership Committee.

We claim that the American-Soviet Science Society is affiliated with the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship.

The Attorney General of the United States, Mr. Tom Clark, stated that the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, Inc., is a Communist-front organization, but it has been denied and repeatedly denied that there was any connection between those two organizations, even though we stated that they have the same telephone number in New York and the same address in New York, and just the other day we found a little more definite proof which was in the form of a check. I have before me a photostatic copy of a check signed by an employee of the Bureau of Standards turning over his \$3 dues to the American-Soviet Science Society in response to the Gelfan letter. The check is endorsed on the back by the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, Inc., even though it was made payable to the American-Soviet Science Society. If that is not definite proof that this organization is affiliated with a Communist-front organization, and that they are all one and the same, then I would just like to know what is.

Here is another thing our committee ran into which bears upon the case of Dr. Condon and whether or not he constitutes a security risk as Director of the Bureau of Standards. It is a letter written by Dr. Condon himself to Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer. The date of Dr. Condon's letter is April 26, 1943. It was sent from Los Alamos, Santa Fe, N. Mex. Dr. Condon had this to say to Dr. Oppenheimer after he spent 1 month in Los Alamos Atomic Energy Plant when he then severed his association with the atomic bomb project. Dr. Condon said this:

The thing which upset me most—

Referring to Los Alamos—

is the extraordinary close security policy. I do not feel qualified to question the wisdom of this since I am totally unaware of the extent of enemy espionage and sabotage activities. I only want to say that in my case I found that the extreme concern with security was morbidly depressing—especially the discussion about censoring mail and telephone calls, the possible militarization and complete isolation of the personnel from the outside world. I know that before long all such concerns would make me so depressed as to be of little if any value. I think a great many of the other people are apt to be this way otherwise I wouldn't mention it.

Members of the House, that is the security attitude of the man that we are dealing with here today and who occupies the highly strategic position as Director of the National Bureau of Standards.

Mr. Speaker, what we are doing today is insisting upon a prerogative which the legislative branch of this Government has always had. This letter which Mr.

Hoover wrote to Mr. Harriman, I have been reliably informed, does not disclose the names of any confidential informants, or does it violate any confidences. This letter has become an important exhibit in our forthcoming hearing on Dr. Condon, and the Congress is entitled to the full text of this letter.

The files of the Committee on Un-American Activities, which were set up in 1939 by the authority of this House, today comprises the principal source of information on subversive influences in the United States. Personally, I feel that it is a great tribute to the foresight and alertness of the legislative branch of the Government that it took the precautionary measures of establishing a committee which would check upon the subversive influences in the United States at a time when the executive branch of the Government and the people were not too concerned with this threat.

During the 10 years since the committee was first created, we have amassed thousands of documents and records which have been of invaluable assistance to the various agencies of our Government charged with the security of the United States. The documents and records are irreplaceable. Our files have always been open to the agencies of the executive branch of the Government. Even though in the past 5 years there have been over 12,000 agents and representatives of the executive branch of the Government call at the committee for information on subversive individuals or organizations, never has there been an instance in which our committee has declined to cooperate or furnish information to those agents, and I doubt if the membership of the House is aware of the extent to which our files are being used today and every day by the agencies of the executive branch of the Government. As an indication, I should like to cite one typical day, April 13, 1948. On that day, six different agents of the United States Civil Service Commission worked in our files on a project calling for a check of over 2,000 names. On the same day, three FBI agents were working on a project of checking 337 names. Four agents from the Central Intelligence of the Army were working checking 924 names; one agent from the Treasury Department, checking 15 names. One agent from the State Department checking 58 names. One agent from the Secret Service checking two names. One agent from the Naval Gun Factory checking one name. Thus it goes every day. An agency of this House opens its complete files to the executive branch of the Government and yet in contrast we have the executive branch of the Government openly defying the legislative branch of the Government in refusing to furnish the House of Representatives with a document which pertains directly to the security of the United States.

I feel that you agree with me that we must assert our prerogative and demand this important letter which has been denied the Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired. All time has expired.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HALLECK). The question is on ordering the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 302, nays 29, not voting 98, as follows:

[Roll No. 47]
YEAS—302

Abernethy	Elston	LeFevre
Allen, Calif.	Engel, Mich.	Lenke
Allen, Ill.	Engle, Calif.	Lesinski
Allen, La.	Evins	Lewis
Andersen	Fallon	Lichtenwalter
H. Carl	Fellows	Lodge
Anderson, Calif.	Fenton	Love
Andresen	Fisher	Lucas
August H.	Fletcher	Lyle
Andrews, N. Y.	Foot	McConnell
Angell	Fuller	McCulloch
Arends	Gamble	McDonough
Arnold	Garmatz	McDowell
Auchincloss	Gary	McGarvey
Bakewell	Gathings	McGregor
Banta	Gearhart	McMahon
Barden	Gillie	McMillan, S. C.
Barrett	Goff	McMillen, Ill.
Bates, Ky.	Goodwin	Mack
Bates, Mass.	Gordon	MacKinnon
Beall	Gore	Mahon
Beckworth	Gorski	Maloney
Bender	Graham	Martin, Iowa
Bennett, Mich.	Granger	Mason
Bennett, Mo.	Grant, Ind.	Meade, Ky.
Bishop	Gregory	Merrrow
Blackney	Griffiths	Meyer
Bland	Gross	Michener
Boggs, Del.	Gwynn, N. Y.	Miller, Conn.
Boggs, La.	Gwynne, Iowa	Miller, Md.
Bolton	Hagen	Miller, Nebr.
Bonner	Hale	Mills
Bradley	Hall	Mitchell
Bramblett	Edwin Arthur	Monroney
Brehm	Hall	Morris
Brooks	Leonard W.	Morrison
Brophy	Halleck	Morton
Brown, Ga.	Hand	Murray, Tenn.
Brown, Ohio	Hardy	Murray, Wis.
Bryson	Harnes, Ind.	Nicholson
Buck	Harris	Nixon
Buffett	Hart	Nodar
Burke	Harvey	Norblad
Burleson	Havenner	O'Brien
Busbey	Hays	O'Konski
Butler	Hébert	O'Toole
Byrnes, Wis.	Hedrick	Owens
Camp	Heffernan	Passman
Canfield	Herter	Patman
Cannon	Heseltun	Patterson
Carson	Hess	Peden
Case, N. J.	Hill	Peterson
Case, S. Dak.	Hinshaw	Philbin
Chapman	Hoffman	Phillips, Calif.
Chelf	Holmes	Pickett
Chenoweth	Hope	Ploeser
Chiperfield	Hull	Plumley
Church	Jackson, Wash.	Poage
Clason	Jennings	Potter
Clevenger	Jensen	Potts
Coffin	Johnson, Calif.	Poulson
Combs	Johnson, Ill.	Preston
Cooper	Johnson, Ind.	Priest
Corbett	Johnson, Tex.	Ramey
Coudert	Jones, Ala.	Rankin
Cox	Jones, N. C.	Rayburn
Cravens	Jones, Wash.	Reed, Ill.
Crawford	Jonkman	Reed, N. Y.
Crow	Judd	Rees
Cunningham	Kean	Reeves
Curtis	Keating	Rich
Dague	Kee	Richards
Davis, Ga.	Keefe	Riehlman
Davis, Tenn.	Kerr	Riley
Davis, Wis.	Kersten, Wis.	Rivers
Dawson, Utah	Kilday	Robertson
Deane	King	Rockwell
Devitt	Kunkel	Rogers, Fla.
Donohue	Landis	Rohrbough
Doughton	Lane	Rooney
Durham	Lanham	Ross
Ellis	Latham	Russell
Ellsworth	Lea	St. George
Elsaesser	LeCompte	Sanborn

Sasscer
Schwabe, Mo.
Scott,
Hugh D., Jr.
Scrivner
Seely-Brown
Shafer
Sheppard
Short
Simpson, Ill.
Simpson, Pa.
Smathers
Smith, Kans.
Smith, Maine
Smith, Ohio
Smith, Va.
Snyder
Spence
Stanley

Stefan
Stevenson
Stigler
Stockman
Sundstrom
Taber
Talle
Teague
Thomas, N. J.
Thomas, Tex.
Thompson
Tibbott
Tollefson
Trimble
Twyman
Vail
Van Zandt
Vinson

Vorys
Vursell
Wadsworth
Walter
Weichel
Welch
Wheeler
Whitten
Whittington
Wigglesworth
Wilson, Ind.
Wilson, Tex.
Winstead
Wolcott
Wolverton
Wood
Woodruff
Youngblood

NAYS—29

Albert	Feighan	Kirwan
Blatnik	Fernandez	Klein
Bloom	Fogarty	Madden
Buchanan	Forand	Marcantonio
Carroll	Fulton	Powell
Celler	Hollifield	Price, Ill.
Clark	Huber	Sabath
Cooley	Isacson	Sadowski
Douglas	Karsten, Mo.	Somers
Eberharter	Kelley	

NOT VOTING—98

Abbitt	Gossett	Meade, Md.
Andrews, Ala.	Grant, Ala.	Miller, Calif.
Battle	Harless, Ariz.	Morgan
Bell	Harrison	Muhlenberg
Boykin	Hartley	Multer
Buckley	Hendricks	Mundt
Bulwinkle	Hobbs	Murdoch
Byrne, N. Y.	Hoeven	Norrell
Chadwick	Horan	Norton
Clippinger	Jackson, Calif.	O'Hara
Cole, Kans.	Jarman	Pace
Cole, Mo.	Javits	Pfeiffer
Cole, N. Y.	Jenison	Phillips, Tenn.
Colmer	Jenkins, Ohio	Price, Fla.
Cotton	Jenkins, Pa.	Rains
Courtney	Johnson, Okla.	Redden
Crosser	Kearney	Regan
Dawson, Ill.	Kearns	Rizley
Delaney	Kefauver	Rogers, Mass.
D'Ewart	Kennedy	Sadlak
Dingell	Keogh	Sarbacher
Dirksen	Kilburn	Schwabe, Okla.
Dolliver	Knutson	Scoblick
Domeneaux	Larcade	Scott, Hardie
Dondero	Ludlow	Sikes
Dorn	Lusk	Smith, Wis.
Eaton	Lynch	Stratton
Elliott	McCormack	Taylor
Flannagan	McCowan	Towe
Folger	Macy	West
Gallagher	Manasco	Williams
Gavin	Mansfield	Worley
Gillette	Mathews	

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Domeneaux for, with Mrs. Norton against.

Mr. Jenkins of Ohio for, with Mr. McCormack against.

Mr. Redden for, with Mr. Multer against.

Mr. Keogh for, with Mr. Dingell against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Cole of Missouri with Mrs. Lusk.
Mr. Schwabe of Oklahoma with Mr. Buckley.

Mr. Sadlak with Mr. Dorn.

Mr. Gavin with Mr. Kefauver.

Mr. Eaton with Mr. Battle.

Mr. Muhlenberg with Mr. Delaney.

Mr. Macy with Mr. Pace.

Mr. Towe with Mr. Pfeiffer.

Mr. Taylor with Mr. Gossett.

Mr. Cole of New York with Mr. Colmer.

Mr. Sarbacher with Mr. Byrne of New York.

Mr. Jenkins of Pennsylvania with Mr. Lynch.

Mr. Hardie Scott with Mr. Rains.

Mr. Kilburn with Mr. Regan.

Mr. Chadwick with Mr. Harrison.

Mr. Mathews with Mr. Johnson of Oklahoma.

Mr. Dondero with Mr. Andrews of Alabama.

Mr. D'Ewart with Mr. Harless of Arizona.
 Mr. Cotton with Mr. Kennedy.
 Mr. McCowen with Mr. Worley.
 Mr. Scoblick with Mr. Miller of California.
 Mr. Jackson of California with Mr. Williams.
 Mr. Dolliver with Mr. Manasco.
 Mr. Mundt with Mr. Boykin.
 Mr. O'Hara with Mr. Courtney.
 Mr. Rizley with Mr. Mansfield.
 Mrs. Rogers of Massachusetts with Mr. Folger.

Mr. Cole of Kansas with Mr. Hobbs.
 Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Morgan.
 Mr. Gillette with Mr. Jarman.
 Mr. Jenison with Mr. Hendricks.
 Mr. Hoeven with Mr. Price of Florida.
 Mr. Horan with Mr. Larcade.
 Mr. Knutson with Mr. Grant of Alabama.
 Mr. Hartley with Mr. West.
 Mr. Clippinger with Mr. Norrell.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

FIREWOOD

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 188.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, requested to return to the House of Representatives the enrolled bill (H. R. 5328) to amend paragraph 1803 (2) of the Tariff Act of 1930, relating to firewood and other woods; that if and when the said bill is returned by the President, the action of the presiding officers of the two Houses in signing the said bill be deemed to be rescinded; and that the Clerk of the House be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed in the reenrollment of the said bill, to make the following correction, namely, strike out "handled bolts" and insert in lieu thereof "handle bolts."

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HALLECK). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DEVITT (at the request of Mr. SEELY-BROWN) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. KLEIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include some newspaper articles.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and in each to include extraneous material.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, during the roll call on the Condon resolution, I was called away from the Chamber. I would like the RECORD to show that if I had not been called away and had been present and voting, I would have voted "yea."

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

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may have until midnight tonight to file a report on H. R. 6263, the Commodity Credit Corporation Act, and S. 2225, the Federal Credit Union Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HALLECK). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

OLEOMARGARINE LEGISLATION

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include editorials, tables, and other matters.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I am taking this time to make a few pertinent observations on the controversy which will be discussed on the floor of the House on Monday, and that is oleomargarine legislation. I have developed certain facts with reference to this controversy which I think will be helpful to the membership of the House in arriving at a conclusion. I hope to have more to say on the subject when the motion to discharge the committee comes up for consideration on Monday and also in connection with the so-called Rivers bill, which will be the order of business in the event the Committee on Agriculture is discharged from further consideration of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, the attempt to repeal the Federal taxes on oleomargarine is an irresponsible attack on our basic farm economy, the results of which no man can foresee. Reduced to its simplest terms, the South wants increased markets and increased prices for its cottonseed oil. It believes that the oleomargarine market promises to offer those increases. To foster the oleo market, then, the South is willing to encourage the practice of fraud and deceit against the consumer by allowing the oleo manufacturers to color their product in imitation of butter.

It hopes thus to insure increased consumption of oleo which can only come from its large-scale substitution for butter in eating places, in institutions, and in the public market place. American housewives are being used as a front by the cotton South and the oleomargarine manufacturers to increase prices on cottonseed oil and profits on oleo.

The National Cotton Council has contributed more than \$10,000 to the National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, which, in turn, has sponsored the activities of the American Soybean Association toward that end. In addition,

southern interests have brought pressure to bear on 218 Members of this House, many of them from the South, to petition discharge of the Rivers bill from the House Committee on Agriculture and to bring it to the floor of the House for a vote.

MONEY TALKS

For the year ending last November the oleomargarine industry, as represented by 26 major manufacturers, spent \$6,000,000 to advertise their product to consumers, according to Time magazine. The gist of this advertising was that oleo is as good as butter, that it is entitled to be colored yellow in imitation of butter, and that only "horse and buggy" legislation prevents it from being sold in this form. Not unnaturally, the impact of these millions of dollars of advertising revenue was reflected by columns of favorable news and editorial comment in return.

The so-called powerful butter lobby has spent not a penny on national advertisements in reply, for the simple reason that not even 1,250,000 dairy farmers have that kind of money to spend. The sole dissenting voice has been raised within the oleo industry itself by Mr. Fred Hoffman, president of the Cudahy Packing Co., the fourth largest manufacturer of oleomargarine, who this week stated:

If any hurt has come to the oleomargarine industry, it has been self-inflicted. During the past several decades the industry has encouraged, rather than discouraged, the consumer to take the time and trouble to color her oleomargarine yellow. All of the industry's advertisements have encouraged this practice.

Had the industry, on the other hand, spent its millions of advertising dollars encouraging the consumer to serve her oleomargarine white, she would be accustomed to using it that way today.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention at this point to some of the activities of the oleomargarine industry, and what they have been doing throughout the country to sell an erroneous idea to the people of the United States.

I have no quarrel with oleo. I want that strictly understood. The people of this country can buy and eat and use all the oleo they want to. All I am interested in, and I am sure I speak the sentiments of all dairy farmers when I say that all we require is that oleo be sold for what it is, and not as an imitator of butter.

Yellow is the color that we are fighting over in this issue. The oleomargarine industry stated they must have the color yellow in order to promote and increase the sale of their product. So all of the literature and information and advertisement that has gone out has been in a yellow color to induce the housewives to demand yellow-colored oleo.

For instance, here is a little piece of advertising. It raises this question: "Why do you bother to color your own margarine?"

Here is another one: "Ask to have your margarine colored yellow."

In other words, the propaganda has been all along the line of encouraging the housewives or to sell the housewives the

idea that they should have yellow-colored oleomargarine.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Suppose what you suggest and contemplate became true: As far as the State of Vermont is concerned, under our law, which prohibits the manufacture or sale of yellow-colored oleomargarine, of what benefit would it be to any consumer in Vermont?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I intend to discuss that a little later, but I will say the gentleman is correct. Even though we would repeal all the Federal laws, yellow oleomargarine could not be manufactured and sold in the State of Vermont, and 22 other States, because the State law prohibits the sale of that commodity.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I just want the gentleman to assist me in making a suggestion to an answer I should give to a letter which was written to me, in which the writer asked:

It is my understanding that there are forces afoot that will take up the difference between the amount repealed in the tax and the present price and that they will probably raise the price eventually after the tax is off.

Has the gentleman any information on that?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman has taken a very strong position on that and I understand he intends to offer an amendment to prohibit oleomargarine manufacturers from increasing the price in the event this law is repealed. I know the gentleman has that in mind; but let me call the gentleman's attention to what is going on. Yellow-colored oleomargarine is sold in certain States where there is no State law against it, but there is a 10-cent Federal tax wherever colored margarine is sold. Indiana happens to be one of those States. White oleo in Indiana is sold at around 37 to 40 cents a pound. The yellow-colored oleo on April 15 at Terre Haute, Ind., was sold at 59 cents a pound. Here is the package in which it was purchased; here is the sales slip. It was 19 cents a pound more than the price of white oleo.

The gentleman can therefore feel sure that in the event we repeal this law as proposed by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS], oleomargarine manufacturers will take care of that and will sell yellow-colored oleo for all the traffic will bear; and that, in most instances, will be more than 10 cents above the white oleo.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Then it is the gentleman's opinion that, if the tax is taken off, oleo will be sold at an increased price.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. There is no question about that. In the gentleman's State, the great State of New York, the people could not buy yellow-colored oleomargarine if they wanted to, because the State law prohibits the manufacture and sale of yellow oleomargarine.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Is not much of the support for this bill on the theory that it is a consumers' bill, a bill to protect the housewives? If it were believed that the price would go up, support for the bill would disappear, would it not?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. There is no question but what this legislation is not intended to protect housewives. The sponsors of the legislation have paid lip service to the low-income people of this country; but this is an economic fight, as I have already said.

I will just read a brief statement from the New York Times. It states that with reference to the petition on the Speaker's desk, which was sponsored by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS]:

Representative L. MENDEL RIVERS, Democrat of South Carolina, who has been trying for 8 years to obtain repeal of the margarine tax in the interest of the cottonseed-oil industry has already a discharge petition on the Speaker's desk.

So it is an economic fight, wherein the cotton South is trying to increase the price and sale of cottonseed oil, and this group has been joined by the manufacturers of oleo who want to make more profits, all of this is to the detriment of American dairy farmers.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I gladly yield to the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. RIVERS. I have heard of people grabbing at straws many a time—

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yielded to the gentleman for a question, not a speech. I will be glad for him to ask a question.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GROSS. In the State of Pennsylvania there is a law prohibiting the sale of colored oleomargarine. These men who paraded down the aisle to put their names on this discharge petition now have the responsibility on their shoulders to see that their States repeal their own tax laws against the sale of oleo.

Again, why is it that in the past 14 years the Democrats, when they had the votes, when they had absolute control of the Congress, did not pass this law? Why are they suddenly so solicitous about its repeal when for 14 years they could have done it without any opposition. Where were they then?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am glad the gentleman asked that question because I have served on the Committee on Agriculture during most of the time the Democrats were in control. Why did they not take it up, the gentleman asks?

Mr. GROSS. Votes. That is the answer.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Of course. They wanted the votes of the northern Democratic farmers. They did not dare to do it. And now they

want the votes of the solid South for Truman.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am sorry; I cannot yield.

Mr. RIVERS. I certainly appreciate the gentleman's fairness. That certainly exemplifies just about how much he has. And I want to congratulate the gentleman too on his great courage, because he is loaded with it.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I have always admired the gentleman for his astuteness, and for his ability as a statesman and a parliamentarian, and particularly for the protection that he is now trying to afford to the cottonseed growers.

Mr. RIVERS. I certainly appreciate the gentleman's courage because he is loaded with it, or he is packed with it, I should say.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I certainly appreciate the gentleman's sentiments.

Mr. RIVERS. I wish I had the gentleman on my team.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I would like to have the gentleman stay because I am sure he will be interested in what I have to say.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I would like to ask the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina who is now leaving the floor to stay here because in the few minutes I have I want to show the kind of leadership we are supposed to have from the great State of South Carolina. I would like to have him present.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am glad to yield to the gentleman for that purpose because I would like to have him present also.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. What I would like to know is do we have a direct tax on oleomargarine?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. A direct tax?

Mr. NICHOLSON. Yes.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The tax in States where the State law prohibits the sale of oleomargarine is $\frac{1}{4}$ cent per pound, which is absorbed by the manufacturers.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I wonder if the gentleman will discuss the question of the use of coconut oil in the manufacture of oleomargarine and what effect it is going to have on the farmers who raise soybeans and cottonseed which is presently being used to manufacture oleo? The only reason they are not using coconut oil is because it has not been imported due to the war.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That is right.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. What will happen to these farmers who presently

grow soybeans when the coconut oil begins to flow in at a low price?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. When coconut oil flows in and the price comes down, which it will, then the gentleman will find that the oleomargarine manufacturers of this country will go to making their product out of coconut oil rather than the domestic oils. Have no fear about that, because these oleomargarine manufacturers are not dumbbells. They are in the business to make money. They claim, probably rightly so, that they can make just as good margarine or oleomargarine out of coconut oil as they can out of the domestic cottonseed oil.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BUCK. When the coconut oil starts coming in and the price of margarine comes down, that will benefit the housewife; will it not?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Yes; I think the gentleman is right, and we want the housewife to have it. But let her have it for what it is, not as an imitator of butter.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GROSS. When that coconut oil begins flowing does not the gentleman think that the oleomargarine manufacturer will seek the protection of a tax to keep it out?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I think they may try to do that. If he does not, then producers of cottonseed oil and soybean oil will do so.

Mr. GROSS. They want to take it off now, but they will want it on then.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I may say to the gentleman that under the recent reciprocal trade agreements that have been approved, we are going on a free-trade basis in the United States under the lowest tariff in the history of our times, so that when the countries of the world get back into production again they will not only be shipping in oleo but other commodities.

Mr. GROSS. That is true. I had forgotten about that.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to show how clever this oleo lobby has been, and I compliment them on the wonderful public-relations job they have done in putting over their idea and using the American housewives as a front for them. We did not have any of them appear before the committee. But we insisted that one of them come before the committee and he did so reluctantly.

What did they do to put this over? They went out and hired one of the best public relation advertising firms in the country? Who were they? They were good friends of ours—Selfridge & Lee, who handled the Republican advertising in 1944 in the Presidential campaign. It is a good firm. They did a splendid job and they received good money for it. The National Cotton Council that represents the cotton growers of the South contributed \$10,000 before the first of the

year to the oleo lobby so that they could go ahead and put on this campaign. I have here a long list of large expenditures to build up the public relations part and sell the idea to the American housewife so that she would get busy and write to Members of Congress.

This was an organized campaign and it was cleverly arranged. They sent out secret instructions to the merchants and to the distributors and manufacturers of oleo. I want to read a few paragraphs to show how they proposed to organize this campaign on Congress, particularly the House of Representatives.

It was a clever idea. We should use some of those same tactics politically for ourselves and our political party. Here is what they said. Here are the instructions followed in the oleo campaign. Let me read it:

A RESOURCES ROUND-UP

(Confidential)

NEED

In order to mobilize each and every available resource for the best possible effort for success in revising the Federal margarine law, we request full information on the kind and amount of assistance each of the margarine manufacturers is ready to give.

Please be specific—attach as many pages as necessary to give full information.

THIS IS URGENT—PLEASE REPLY PROMPTLY

All requests for cooperation on the part of your personnel will be cleared through the addressee of this memorandum, unless certain companies desire and authorize us to work direct with their people in the field and give their field people authority to work with us. (We do not favor this, since we believe better results will follow if requests reach your people via their principals.)

1. A list of all home office and field personnel, by name and address, available to:

(a) Contact women's clubs, especially to promote club interest via agenda reprints.

(b) Contact editors.

(c) Develop letters, etc., to Congressmen and Senators, when desired.

(d) Organize any other type of support at the local level. Also, please be certain to mention friendly contacts outside your home area, which we may follow up.

(e) To organize and bring a delegation to Washington at the critical time to urge their own Congressmen to work and vote for passage of our measure.

2. List any (a) State or (b) congressional district for which your company, or your branches, or your jobbers, could take the responsibility of educating the congressional delegation, or any member thereof, in obtaining their, or his, support.

3. A list of the names and addresses of the heads of local civic, religious, charitable, fraternal, consumer, business, or other groups, in your home office territory, or in territory served by your branches, known to be friendly to margarine, whom you could contact for us, or whom we could contact direct, to distribute literature, write letters, organize public opinion at homes. Please indicate whether contact should be through you or direct by us.

4. When the times comes, can you promote our bill?

	Yes	No
(a) In your advertising.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
In your radio programs.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
By the distribution of leaflets to the grocers.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
If "Yes," please show amount of:		

(1) Space available in column inches, or number of words, and list of publications available.

(2) Amount of time or number of words you can use on the air and a list of radio stations you use.

(3) Approximate quantity of leaflets you could use, based on grocer contacts made by your representatives.

5. A list of supplier contacts which you wish us to contact. All should be sold on giving margarine a hand now, since all who sell to margarine manufacturers have a justifiable pocketbook interest in the future of margarine. Publications and radio stations carrying margarine advertising are an important part of this group.

6. A list of the names of any members of your organization, or of any organization retained by your firm, who work on public relations and publicity for you, who will be available to attend a meeting on promotional publicity, in New York early in December, and to assist on this part of the job during the campaign. On December 4, we expect to set the date for this meeting.

7. A list of any other cooperation of facilities you can offer, which you think will contribute to the success of this undertaking.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to show the advertisements that appeared in Life magazine. Two of these advertisements appeared in Life magazine. One firm, Leo Burnett & Co., Inc., of Chicago, was paid \$50,153.47 just to prepare this advertisement and another one that appeared in Life magazine. So they have done a real, thorough job, and we, as men in public life, subject to the will of the people, can well take a lesson from this lobby as to the magnificent job they have done. I, of course, compliment the Republican Advertising Agency in New York. The Cotton Council and the Oleo Institute did a clever piece of work when they employed this firm.

OLEO PROPAGANDA MISLEADING

The oleomargarine manufacturers have further misled the consumer to believe that she pays a Federal tax of 10 cents a pound on their product. The plain truth is that the Federal tax on uncolored oleomargarine amounts to only one-fourth of 1 cent a pound, which is absorbed by the processor. No housewife pays the additional Federal tax of 10 cents a pound unless she buys her oleomargarine already colored. Most consumers avoid this tax by coloring their own oleo, a procedure which takes only 2 minutes, according to the manufacturers' own advertisements. No housewife pays the 10-cent tax if she buys plain white oleo, as millions do.

Oleomargarine propaganda does not mention that 23 States prohibit the sale of the colored product altogether, and that repeal of the Federal taxes would not affect States' rights in this matter. These States, however, have heavy concentrations of industrial population and are targets for the 26 big oleomargarine manufacturers who produce and distribute the bulk of this product.

As the oleomargarine lobby itself says, "So long as Federal restrictions upon the manufacture and sale of margarine are continued in effect State restrictive laws are more difficult to remove."

Repeal of Federal taxes on oleo, therefore, may be considered as a deliberate first step in this direction in Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, Delaware, Pennsylvania, New York, Maryland,

Ohio, Michigan, Illinois, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, Idaho, Washington, Oregon, and California.

Data showing States in which State laws restrict or prohibit the sale of yellow-colored oleomargarine, as of April 1, 1948:

STATES THAT PROHIBIT OR RESTRICT THE MANUFACTURE OR SALE OF COLORED OLEOMARGARINE

COLORED OLEO SALE PROHIBITED

California, Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois, Maine, Michigan, Minnesota, Montana, New Hampshire, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, South Dakota, Vermont, Washington, and Wisconsin.

COLORED OLEO SALE RESTRICTED

Maryland, North Carolina, Oregon, Pennsylvania, and Wyoming.

MANUFACTURE OF COLORED OLEO PROHIBITED OR RESTRICTED

California, Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois, Iowa, Maine, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, Montana, New Hampshire, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Vermont, Washington, and Wisconsin.

Now, a lot of information has gone into various States, such as Illinois, Ohio, and New York, trying to make the housewives believe that they are paying a 10-cent tax at the present time. That is false. They have circulated this erroneous information to those people in an effort to try and mislead them so that they will become aroused to the point of bringing pressure upon Congress to have this so-called punitive tax law repealed. The tax is a quarter of a cent a pound on white margarine, which is sold in these 23 States, where more than two-thirds of the population resides.

MISLEADING PROPAGANDA AS TO COLOR

The oleomargarine manufacturers are further guilty of leading the public to believe that their product is naturally yellow in color. They infer that Federal restrictions force the removal of this color by bleaching, and that the housewife is unfairly required to restore it. Butter, they say, is colored with the same dyes with which oleo is colored; and restraints on their use of the yellow color is unjustified discrimination.

The facts are that it is impossible to make a naturally yellow oleomargarine out of domestic oils. The Armour Research Foundation of the Illinois Institute of Technology revealed this week the results of scientific tests in this respect. When cottonseed oils are turned into fat they become gray. When soybean oils are turned into fat they become green. They are then bleached not because of the Federal laws, but to remove undesirable odors, flavors, and colors.

Laboratory analyses of hydrogenated soybean or cottonseed oils, the domestic oils generally utilized in commercial production of oleomargarine, indicate that regardless of whatever other qualities oleo may or may not have, it does not in the least resemble natural butter in its original state as far as color is concerned.

Moreover, when color is added to butter it is for purposes of uniformity and not with the idea of making butter look

like something which it is not. Would the oleo manufacturers want to color their product yellow if butter was naturally pink? Certainly not.

OLEOMARGARINE IS A SYNTHETIC PRODUCT

We must remember that oleomargarine is a contrived product of uncertain ancestry. It can be and has been made of fish oil, animal fats, tallow, waste packing-house byproducts, and vegetable oils both domestic and imported. To say that oleo is the nutritional equivalent of butter is to say that horsemeat is the nutritional equivalent of prime roast beef. The statement may be technically true, but it is morally dubious.

In any case the processing of oleo requires the deodorizing of some oils, the removal of unpleasant off-tastes from others, and bleaching to give a uniform base for the addition of color. Diacetyl must be added to imitate butter's taste. Vitamin A, which is extracted from shark livers, must be added to imitate butter's nutrition. Milk must be added to oleo to imitate butter's texture. The use of yellow would be the final step toward fraud and deceit by imitating butter's color.

The consumer is entitled to get what she pays for. The dairy farmer is entitled to the quality market he works for. When an imitation of butter invades the butter market, both consumer and farmer suffer. Somewhere this parade of imitations must stop, and the time to stop it is now.

OLEO TAXES ARE NOT DISCRIMINATORY

For 62 years we have had Federal excise taxes on oleomargarine to pay for policing its manufacture and distribution. Nearly 30,000 persons were picked up by the Bureau of Internal Revenue in one 15-year period for selling oleomargarine as butter at butter prices. The Federal tax is the only way to maintain jurisdiction, police the continued sale of oleo, and protect the public welfare.

These taxes harm no one, least of all the oleomargarine manufacturer, since production of oleo has more than doubled since 1941. Oleo manufacturers have proved themselves well able to absorb this tax. Every other food store in the land now stocks and sells oleo, so it cannot be said that oleo distribution suffers from the tax.

Butter production, on the other hand, has been consistently discouraged since the outbreak of World War II. War-time price ceilings penalized butter manufacture in favor of other dairy products, and great quantities of milk went overseas in other forms. Butter production fell from 1,900,000,000 to 1,300,000,000 pounds during the war, and has not yet recovered. Like the Germans, we were told to choose between guns and butter, and, in a sense, that is still the choice which confronts us.

DANGER TO BUTTER PRODUCTION

The unrestricted sale, now, of yellow oleomargarine in imitation of butter might well be the final crippling blow to our native dairy industry. For instance, statistics show that 65,000,000 meals are served daily in public eating places. The unrestricted sale of colored oleo

would allow restaurant keepers to substitute it for butter. Their patrons would be paying for butter and eating oleo. Hospitals and other public institutions state openly that they want the right to serve colored oleo in place of butter without the knowledge of their patients. The public markets where butter is sold in bulk would not be immune to fraud and deceit, since its yellow color is the only way by which butter may be identified at sight. None of these deceptions come under the Pure Food and Drug Act, which operates only in interstate commerce. Within the border of each individual State any form of fraud and deception could be practiced in substituting colored oleo for butter, once Federal taxes and State restrictions were repealed.

The repeal of the Federal taxes on yellow oleomargarine, then, would lay the consumer open to substitution on every hand. The markets would be wide open to adulterations and imitations of every kind. The outlets for butter as a quality product would be destroyed—and that is exactly what the oleomargarine manufacturers want. They want not part of the market for spreads used on bread, nor most of that market, but all of the market. Their corporate greed, backed by the ravenous interests of the cotton South, is insatiable.

DAIRY HERDS ENDANGERED

If the drive to repeal the Federal taxes on oleo succeeds, what will be the effect on the dairy farmers? The lost butter market will be felt first by the 1,250,000 farmers who sell farm-separated cream, most of whom only milk from 3 to 6 cows. These farmers and their families depend upon some 5,000 creameries for almost their only weekly cash income.

In June, during the flush season, cows produce 50 percent more milk than in November while consumption remains the same. This surplus must go into butter, which can be stored longer and more readily than any other manufactured dairy product. Without butter outlets the small dairy farmers will have no alternative but to reduce their herds, with far-reaching results.

If Federal oleo taxes are repealed, I estimate that the reduction of dairy herds within the next 3 years will amount to not less than 2,500,000 head of cattle. This drop in the available milk supply will be severely felt in urban centers which absorb the surplus from our milk sheds, and will affect the very consumers to whom the oleo manufacturers now appeal. Any possibility of savings from the oleo taxes will be reflected many times over in the consumer's increased milk bill.

With increased population and increased demands for milk, the reduction in dairy herds would produce milk shortages. Higher prices for milk would be inevitable. Higher prices for meat would be equally inevitable, since 40 percent of our meat supply comes from dairy herds. If this vicious trend were continued, we could easily be reduced from our traditional American meat and milk products diet to a subsistence diet of grain and synthetic foods, as is much of

Europe today. Filled milk, filled cheese, and other filled dairy products using cottonseed oil would follow as a matter of course. How would your family like that?

Our modern soil-conservation practices would be equally crippled, since sound soil conservation goes hand in hand with dairy farming. Nourishment would no longer be returned to the soil in the form of fertilizer, as on every dairy farm at present. Legumes such as alfalfa, which build the soil rather than destroy it, would no longer be required for nonexistent dairy herds. The soil would be ruined rather than replenished, to the disadvantage of our children and our children's children.

A shift in production to soybean and other soil-depleting crops would be unavoidable. This, in turn, would mean larger appropriations from Congress to meet our increasing soil-conservation needs and to match the job once taken over without subsidy by our Nation's dairy farmers. The end would be disastrous for farmers and city folk alike, and would endanger the very existence of our country.

DAIRY FARMERS ARE NOT PROFITEERS

Although a vital part of our economy, dairy farming is not particularly profitable. In central New York it ranks only ninth in returns per hour for labor. In southern Wisconsin it ranks eighth. By contrast, the southern plains cotton farms are fourth among profitable agricultural operations.

Yet dairy farming is the backbone of diversified modern agriculture. Manufactured dairy products are a necessary outlet for milk which cannot be sold in bottles, and butter continues to be the product upon which the dairy farmer relies for tax money when the bottom falls out of other markets. It is a product which both farmer and consumer must be able to count upon—a quality product which is both a food and a flavor.

Dairy farmers are not seeking to deprive anyone of oleo. If the housewife wants oleo she should be able to buy it, and modern packing permits her to color it easily, quickly, and without waste. But, except for Federal tax, there is no way of controlling the manufacture and sale of oleo. No other control plan has been suggested.

OLEO PRICES WOULD GO UP, NOT DOWN

Oleomargarine, colored yellow in imitation of butter, has sold right here in Washington, D. C., for as much as 12 cents to 18 cents a pound more than plain white oleo, on the same day. Last week, in Terre Haute, Ind., oleo colored yellow in imitation of butter sold for as much as 29 cents per pound more than plain white oleo. The Federal tax on colored oleo is still 10 cents a pound. What accounts for the difference? Only one thing—the consumer is being stuck for this extra profit.

If all restrictions are removed from the sale of colored oleo it will replace white oleo entirely in the market. With no white oleomargarine to compete in keeping the price down, colored oleo will tend to follow butter prices even more closely than at present. What will then happen to the cost of "the poor man's spread?"

The price of oleo has no apparent relation to the cost of its ingredients, or to the basic Federal tax. The cost of adding vitamin A to oleo is more than three times the amount of the tax. The cost for advertising the leading brands of oleomargarine normally runs from 4 to 7 times the amount of the tax. The industry's profits on oleomargarine are currently running 8 to 12 times the amount of the tax.

Butter production shows no such profits as these, but it remains a vital part of our farm economy. From the consumers' standpoint, the laws give protection against fraud and misrepresentation in the substitution of colored oleomargarine in place of butter. The oleo manufacturers will tell you that there is no other parallel in our laws of one food product being protected against another food product. The answer is that no other type of merchandise affords even a close parallel for comparison.

The monetary incentive to sell colored oleo at the price of and in the guise of butter is absolutely unique. With the quantities of butter sold so huge and the price spread between oleo and butter so great, there would be tremendous incentive for substitution and fraud if the laws were repealed. No proof should be needed for such an obvious fact, but if proof is needed we have only to examine the long history of fraud in oleo sales as revealed in the records of the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

I hold that there has been no important change in the production and sale of oleo nor in the relationship of oleomargarine to other competitive products such as cheese, shortenings, lard, and butter—particularly butter—to cause the Congress at this juncture to make any change whatsoever in the Federal statutes. These bills have been introduced at a time when both national and international conditions are in a state of uncertainty and change. Precipitate action at this time by the Congress in weakening or repealing these laws would undoubtedly result in great damage to the dairy farmers of the country and increase the cost of oleomargarine to consumers.

A change in Federal law would have more far-reaching effects than might first be assumed, because it would change the relationship of some of the more important fats and oils and require adjustments to be made all along the line, the full extent of which cannot readily be foreseen. For example, no one can foresee at this time just what the ultimate effect upon the soybean producers may be if the market in soybean meal is substantially reduced as a result of the repeal of the oleomargarine laws.

Soybean growers get two and a half times as much income from soybean meal sold for dairy cattle feed as they get from soybean oil sold for oleo. Cotton planters get half again as much for their cottonseed meal sold for dairy cattle feed as they get for cottonseed oil sold for oleo.

Without an outlet for the soybean meal it may prove difficult for the soybean producers to compete against imported oils. Such effects as these, in turn, require compensating adjustments and changes further down the line. On

the other hand, maintenance of the status quo cannot in the least injure the manufacturers of oleo, their handlers, or the producers of oleaginous products from which certain oils, notably cottonseed and soybean oil, are extracted.

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

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. If there is no objection on the part of Members having special orders, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDRESEN] has led the fight against the passage of this iniquitous legislation. I wonder if the gentleman has noticed the letter from the Cudahy Packing Co. who, themselves, by the way, are among the large oleo manufacturers in America, the fourth largest, I believe. These people, Mr. Speaker, have made this statement, and I wish the gentleman from Minnesota would quote from that particular letter.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am glad to do so at the gentleman's suggestion:

Twenty-five percent of our dairy farmers depend largely upon the sale of cream for butter manufacture to maintain their dairy cows. If the oleomargarine laws were repealed, over a million of this type of farmer would, in our opinion, be forced to sell most of his cows. The permanent reduction in this segment of our cattle population would affect not only our supply of milk and cream but also our supply of meat.

Inasmuch as butter traditionally has served as the outlet for all surplus supplies of milk after all other milk products (including bottled milk, ice cream, evaporated milk, dried milk, and cheese) have been supplied with their requirements, it is quite apparent that any action adversely affecting butter could create chaotic conditions in the supply and cost to the consumer of all other dairy products. It might well be that in the event that the price of butter were unduly depressed, bringing about substantially reduced production of milk in the over-all in this country, the price of bottled milk and all manufactured dairy products would at times be increased substantially to the consumer.

Butter alone is entitled to the yellow color because it alone is always naturally yellow—in varying shades thereof. It is morally entitled to make the claim: "Yellow is the 'trade-mark' of butter." Oleomargarine, on the other hand, if processed from vegetable oils from American farms (as it is largely today) cannot be made a natural yellow. These oils are bleached not because of the Federal laws, but because it is necessary to remove undesirable colors. There has been a great deal of misinformation and misleading propaganda put out on this subject and the record should be set straight.

My time is about to expire, but on Monday I hope to have additional opportunity to further discuss what effect the Rivers bill, or similar legislation will have upon the economy of our country. I am honestly convinced that the passage of the proposed legislation will bring serious dislocation to American agriculture, and in the end work great hardship for consumers in this country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HAL-LECK). The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has again expired.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] is recognized for 10 minutes.

OLEOMARGARINE AND CUSTER'S LAST STAND FOR THE DAIRY INDUSTRY

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, long before this oleo bill was ever introduced there was much apprehension in the dairy world as to exactly what was happening. This administration through the many years of its more abundant life, started out by killing off all the goats, even going into the reservation of the Navajo Indians, with the result that the people on that reservation did not have protective food and now the Appropriations Committee has to give them \$1,000,000 to go out and buy goats.

If you do not want to go way back to the days of killing the little pigs and burying cattle while people were starving just take the last 5-year period. Once more I will call your attention to the antilivestock attitude of this administration. During the last 5 years you have seen over one-third, in fact, more than one-third, 37 percent to be exact, of the sheep of this country go over the hill. On January 1 of this year we had 40 percent fewer hogs than we had 5 years ago, and 6,000,000 fewer cattle. Mr. Luckman was selected to kill the chickens off last year, but the poultry men of the Nation soon saw that his program did not make sense and didn't kill them off. Now we have this effort to hang up the carcass of the poor old dairy cows in the coolers of the packing houses of this nation. This will have more serious consequences than killing the pigs ever had. We have fewer milch cows on the farms of our country than we had 15 years ago when the New Deal took over. Next year, the American people are faced with less milk and less dairy products than ever before in the history of this country. That is how serious this situation is before oleo ever gets into the picture. With 58 percent more babies and with an increase of millions in our national population it is high time someone does some forward thinking.

It is a sad day when in this great country the membership of this Chamber has to discharge its Committee on Agriculture from the consideration of important Agricultural legislation. This is but one more example of the desire to crush the American farmer. In the Washington milk shed they are even being threatened with jail sentences. It is also a sad day when we have to make a step backward and accept the leadership—and get this one—the leadership of a State which in 1947 could not or did not pay its farm labor more than an average of 28 cents an hour. In one of the States of this Nation the farm labor is paid 91 cents an hour—the State of Washington. Mr. Henry Wallace—and I am sorry his supporters are not here—has a dollar an hour in his campaign promises, as a minimum wage.

You will note that in the Midwest in the three States of Iowa, Minnesota, and Wisconsin where one-fourth the milk of the Nation is produced, the hourly wage is 70 cents per hour, 68 cents per hour, and 61 cents per hour, respectively.

My colleagues, do you wish an economy based on 28 cents per hour? Do you wish to promote a type of economy in the United States where one-third of the people cannot read or write? Do you wish to promote an economy that gives a 33⅓ percent draft rejection for health and educational reasons?

If that is your purpose do not follow the leadership of the agriculturally conscious Members of this Congress who are in favor of a farm hourly return that gives the American farm people an American standard of living. I would like to know just how many supporters of Mr. Wallace would want labor to get only 28 cents an hour, even on the farm. What is the use of talking about a minimum wage or a new minimum wage bill when the 28-cents-per-hour leadership is to discharge the Agriculture Committee? I will put this information in the RECORD if anyone has any doubt about the different States. I insert it at this point:

Annual average wage per day without board, 1939 and 1947

	Estimated daily rate		Converted to hourly rate ¹	
	1939	1947	1939	1947
Alabama.....	\$0.90	\$3.15	\$0.09	\$0.32
Arizona.....	2.07	6.00	.21	.60
Arkansas.....	1.04	3.85	.10	.38
California.....	2.82	8.10	.28	.81
Colorado.....	2.06	6.60	.21	.66
Connecticut.....	2.88	6.30	.29	.63
Delaware.....	1.94	6.10	.19	.61
Florida.....	1.25	4.35	.12	.44
Georgia.....	.90	3.20	.09	.32
Idaho.....	2.44	7.90	.24	.79
Illinois.....	2.19	5.90	.22	.59
Indiana.....	1.92	5.50	.19	.55
Iowa.....	2.23	7.00	.22	.70
Kansas.....	1.90	6.90	.19	.69
Kentucky.....	1.28	3.85	.13	.38
Louisiana.....	1.07	3.25	.11	.32
Maine.....	2.25	6.40	.22	.64
Maryland.....	1.86	5.70	.19	.57
Massachusetts.....	2.82	6.50	.28	.65
Michigan.....	2.19	6.40	.22	.64
Minnesota.....	2.81	6.80	.28	.68
Mississippi.....	.95	3.30	.10	.33
Missouri.....	1.43	4.75	.14	.48
Montana.....	2.58	7.30	.26	.73
Nebraska.....	1.84	7.10	.18	.71
Nevada.....	2.42	6.30	.24	.63
New Hampshire.....	2.93	6.40	.29	.64
New Jersey.....	2.47	6.50	.25	.65
New Mexico.....	1.67	5.30	.17	.53
New York.....	2.30	6.50	.23	.65
North Carolina.....	1.18	4.05	.12	.40
North Dakota.....	2.00	8.20	.20	.82
Ohio.....	2.10	5.50	.21	.55
Oklahoma.....	1.44	5.10	.14	.51
Oregon.....	2.41	8.00	.24	.80
Pennsylvania.....	2.24	5.50	.22	.55
Rhode Island.....	2.90	6.30	.29	.63
South Carolina.....	.82	2.85	.08	.28
South Dakota.....	1.97	7.50	.20	.75
Tennessee.....	1.03	3.20	.10	.32
Texas.....	1.28	4.70	.13	.47
Utah.....	2.55	6.30	.26	.63
Vermont.....	2.43	6.70	.24	.67
Virginia.....	1.44	4.35	.14	.44
Washington.....	2.63	9.10	.26	.91
West Virginia.....	1.48	3.85	.15	.38
Wisconsin.....	1.98	6.10	.20	.61
Wyoming.....	2.28	7.20	.23	.72

¹ Average daily rates were converted to hourly rates assuming a uniform 10-hour day. This assumption is not completely valid since average time worked per day varies between States and is also probably a little less in 1947 than in 1939. No estimate of the annual length of work day for hired farm workers is available.

Prepared by Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

Oh, there are a lot of States that are interested in a minimum wage. They say, "We want a minimum wage, but we want to eat off the minimum wage based on the new agricultural leadership of 28 cents an hour."

We have had a lot of that leadership and the more leadership we have of that kind the less the people of this country have to eat. Why, the President gets on the radio and tells us how serious the situation is from the consumers' standpoint. He is right but I often wonder why he does not do something about it. We are not going to have food for the people of this country unless somebody produces it, and the antilivestock attitude of this administration is not going to furnish it to them. They have demonstrated many times how allergic they are to dairy products in general and butterfat in particular. I think it is about time someone would want to check up on them.

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

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. If the farmers of this country went on strike as many of the unions have, I fear many of our labor racketeers would go hungry.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I would like to say a word about labor. I wish to say a good word for John Lewis because he deserves this expression. He is the whipping boy, but no one can charge by any of the statements that John Lewis has made that he wants to keep the American farmer from getting a decent price for his product and from having a decent price for their product. That is one thing you cannot lay onto John Lewis and I have followed his position for the last 25 years.

We are now faced with this new agricultural leadership with 28 cents per hour as in South Carolina.

Meat animals last year yielded a return of \$9,900,000,000.

Dairy products, \$4,059,000,000.

Poultry and eggs, \$2,900,000,000.

Corn, \$1,200,000,000.

Wheat, \$2,500,000,000.

Rice, which is one of the great basic commodities under the New Deal, only \$165,000,000.

Just think about a \$165,000,000 crop as a basic commodity, when a \$9,900,000,000 meat crop and a \$4,059,000,000 milk crop and a \$2,900,000,000 poultry crop is not classed as basic. The same can be said of peanuts and tobacco for that matter.

Cotton, \$2,000,000,000.

Tobacco, \$1,001,000,000.

Peanuts, \$213,000,000.

Are we going to have an antilivestock program going on forever and forever before someone calls a halt to it? We should call a halt before it is too late. That is the question to be decided. At this point I include the farm returns by States in 1947 and also the returns for certain agricultural products and crops:

Cash receipts from farm marketings, by States, 1947

[In thousands of dollars]

State:	Amount
Alabama.....	380,001
Arizona.....	182,574
Arkansas.....	490,001
California.....	2,144,538
Colorado.....	516,654
Connecticut.....	145,570
Delaware.....	81,598
Florida.....	354,377
Georgia.....	492,081
Idaho.....	359,880
Illinois.....	1,869,729
Indiana.....	1,079,761
Iowa.....	2,368,962
Kansas.....	1,266,671
Kentucky.....	579,258
Louisiana.....	309,133
Maine.....	171,686
Maryland.....	233,231
Massachusetts.....	193,772
Michigan.....	719,484
Minnesota.....	1,335,556
Mississippi.....	473,439
Missouri.....	1,080,676
Montana.....	397,350
Nebraska.....	1,125,518
Nevada.....	40,944
New Hampshire.....	59,448
New Jersey.....	278,822
New Mexico.....	181,939
New York.....	822,582
North Carolina.....	743,951
North Dakota.....	736,927
Ohio.....	1,052,485
Oklahoma.....	695,005
Oregon.....	376,350
Pennsylvania.....	767,172
Rhode Island.....	21,930
South Carolina.....	302,582
South Dakota.....	671,099
Tennessee.....	485,938
Texas.....	1,974,575
Utah.....	151,949
Vermont.....	109,443
Virginia.....	413,471
Washington.....	611,455
West Virginia.....	125,156
Wisconsin.....	1,051,210
Wyoming.....	148,821

Total..... 30,174,744

Bureau of Agricultural Economics, Apr. 19, 1948.

Wisconsin has been pushed down already from sixth place to eleventh place in farm-marketing returns in 1947. Some unthinking people of Wisconsin even wish to drive the farm income still further downward. The special-privilege crops, subsidized and pampered with legislative acts, enjoy the benefits.

Cash receipts from specified commodities, United States, 1947

Commodity:	Amount (in millions of dollars)
Meat animals.....	9,911
Dairy products.....	4,059
Poultry and eggs.....	2,903
Corn.....	1,248
Wheat.....	2,588
Rice.....	165
Cotton (lint and seed).....	2,139
Tobacco.....	1,001
Peanuts.....	213

Bureau of Agricultural Economics, April 19, 1948.

This is not a butter-oleomargarine controversy. This is a controversy as to the system of agriculture we are going to have in America. Are we going to have a system of a landed aristocracy where the people work at slave wages, carrying

on generation after generation, or do you believe in the American farm way where the people of this country can have family-sized farms and own a little piece of America themselves? I am not going to engage in the business of dividing anybody's land up, but, in my opinion, the time has come for the people of this country to recognize the fact that the great bulk of the people who want to live on our land are entitled to own some land and to farm it the American way—like real Americans. They are entitled to an American wage. This minimum-wage proposition does not only apply in New York City, it does not only apply in Philadelphia, it does not only apply in Los Angeles; it should apply to every citizen of America who labors, regardless of whether he is laboring in the factory or he happens to be laboring on a farm.

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

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. Is it not true that the dairy industry is the largest industry in dollar value in this country? It is bigger than oil, steel, or any other.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. There is no argument about that. The table I inserted showed over a \$4,000,000,000 marketing of milk, and the dairy industry also furnishes between 40 and 50 percent of the beef and veal of the Nation in addition.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BUCK. Would the gentleman favor a minimum wage on farms?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Yes. The gentleman does not catch me on that. I do favor a minimum wage and I will tell the gentleman why, too. If you had a minimum wage on the farm we would not have so many of these rich fellows getting farms so that it will help out on their income tax even though they may hire their labor for 28 cents per hour or less. If they can hire a man for nothing, the man who works his own land does not get anything either. That fact is evident.

I am personally willing to support legislation that will give the man on the farm equal wage and hour support, the same protective legislation that you give any other group of labor in the country. And, I am getting awfully tired of having our friends in the cities, who say that they have to have \$2 an hour, want the peasants to produce it for them, under the new agricultural leadership, by a rate of 28 cents an hour labor.

Mr. BUCK. What about a 40-hour week on the farm?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Forty hour? The cows cannot wait on Saturday and Sunday, so I cannot really do that. But, there is a comparable minimum wage in this dairymen picture, too. If we pass any more minimum wages around here, we better take into consideration the people that work the land and produce the food and fiber of this Nation, and if we do not, I am sure that a lot of these people on the farms will kind of go out of existence. Still more

millions will migrate to the cities for more per hour and less hours per day. There is a limit as to how far this can be carried on.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, one of the proponents of this legislation recently wrote a letter asking why you cannot sell milk, instead of at 10 or 13 cents a glass, for a nickel, like they do Coca-Cola. It seems that the proponents of this legislation thought you could get the milk out of a stream like you could Coca-Cola.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman. My distinguished friend the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] gave me permission to insert his letter to Mr. W. A. McDonald, of Flint, Mich., and Mr. McDonald's answer thereto. It contains consideration of the Coca-Coladairy values, and I recommend it to my colleague from Pennsylvania. I will insert the letters at this point:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., April 5, 1948.

HON. W. A. McDONALD,
McDonald Cooperative Dairy Co.,
Flint, Mich.

DEAR MR. McDONALD: In your letter of the 2d you enclosed a resolution which I think indicates the complete lack of understanding on the part of the average milk producer of the relative importance of the various markets. If the processors would make the same effort to sell fluid milk to the public at a fair price that the soft-drink companies have made, I believe there would be very few farmers who would want to sell milk for the production of butter. Our country should consume much more fluid milk, and it could do so with benefit to the public and profit to the dairy farmer, but instead of developing this market the milk processors seem determined to charge the public all the tariff and to pay the milk producer as little as possible.

You cannot build a great industry on the basis of high unit costs. You have got to get prices down so that all of the public can consume. A few weeks ago I went to the great milk-producing State of Wisconsin. I paid 13 cents for a glass of milk in a restaurant. This is not the way to get the most money for the farmer. At 10 cents a glass the restaurant operator can make 100 percent profit and still pay a wholesale price for that milk that should return twice as much to the farmer as that same farmer would get if the milk were sold for butter which would retail at \$1 a pound.

The milk producers of America would do well to employ some of the salesmen who have made Coca-Cola great. These people put out a cheap drink, and they meet all competition even competition that undersells them, that uses a similar name and an almost identical color. They have, however, sold the American people on the idea that they furnished a dependable quality product at a fair price. If the milk producers of America could but do the same thing, they could make far more than they could ever make selling milk for butter, and they could improve the whole standard of American nutrition. I think it is about time that instead of trying to hide behind a legislative monopoly, that the milk producers applied some modern business principles to their own industry. Maybe they need to kick out some of their present leadership and get somebody who has the vision of a Henry Ford.

Yours very sincerely,

W. R. POAGE,
Congressman, Eleventh Texas District.

MCDONALD COOPERATIVE DAIRY CO.,
Flint, Mich., April 20, 1948.

Hon. W. R. POAGE,
Congressman, House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. POAGE: Your letter of April 5 is amazing. I am reproducing it, together with my reply, for other Members of Congress. I think they should know that a member of the Committee on Agriculture has such a provincial viewpoint and so little knowledge of business and agricultural economics, particularly how and when a cow gives milk, and the production cost in relation to selling price.

I agree with you—Americans should consume more fluid milk, but apparently you do not know that they already lead the world in this respect, and that the milk distribution function is performed in this country more efficiently than anywhere else in the world.

You are unhappy that you paid 13 cents for 8 ounces of milk in a restaurant in Wisconsin. It is unlikely that the restaurant paid over 4½ cents for this milk. Did you price a bottle of Coca-Cola or a highball in this restaurant? In some restaurants there is no more comparison between the wholesale price of a commodity and the charge to the customer than there is between the ingredient cost in a bottle of Coca-Cola, which is infinitesimal, and the charge to the purchaser.

While you were visiting in Wisconsin, did you notice what a Garden of Eden this dairy-producing State is compared with the millions of acres of cotton land that has been eroded and rendered utterly worthless by that type of agriculture? Certainly a member of the Committee on Agriculture should not have missed this telling argument in favor of butter versus cottonseed oleo.

I understand that Coca-Cola is approximately 10.7 percent solids, mostly sugar at three-tenths of 1 cent per 6-ounce bottle. Add two-tenths of 1 cent for gas and flavor, making ½-cent total. Coke at 5 cents is six times the retail mark-up of the dairy industry. You can buy Coke for 26½ cents a quart if you go after it and carry it yourself. This is approximately 1½ times the price of a quart of milk delivered on your doorstep in Flint, rain or shine, snow or ice. Do you know the relative food value of a quart of milk and a quart of Coca-Cola?

From the standpoint of low-cost service, the Coca-Cola Co. and even the United States postal service, has much to learn from the milk industry. The net income of the Coca-Cola Co. has been about 20 percent of sales in the last 7 years, which is approximately 6 times that of the fluid-milk industry. It is hard to tell from your letter whether you are complaining about the mark-up in the milk industry, or whether you are recommending that it be multiplied by 6.

You point out that Coca-Cola meets competition that undersells them. True, but their product is identified by their container when the consumer gets it, and that is just the point that butter people are making on the oleo question. Oleo, colored and flavored and fortified and preserved with benzoate of soda, cannot be distinguished from butter in a restaurant. The consumer and manufacturer are entitled to protection against substitution.

Oleo bears another resemblance to Coca-Cola in its low ingredient cost in that the Texas cotton farmer selling cottonseed oil for oleo gets only 31 cents out of the consumer's dollar, whereas the milk producer selling cream for butter gets approximately 80 cents.

Apparently when you advocate that the 33.4 percent of milk used in butter should be added to the 35 percent of total milk production distributed in fluid milk in the

cities and villages, you do not understand that this is not possible for several reasons.

1. You can't make people drink twice as much milk.

2. Farms producing butterfat for butter are not located near consuming population.

3. God arranged for cows to produce twice as much milk in May and June as they produce in November and December, but He did not make human beings so that they would drink twice as much.

In other words, in order for the dairy industry to exist there must be a concentrated form in which dairy products may be preserved from the flush to the scarce season, and this form must have a ready market. Powder and butter answer this description.

Has the oleo lobby, with its abundantly financed campaign, given you the answers to these questions?

1. If it is good to substitute vegetable fats for butterfat in the spread for bread, should it also be substituted in ice cream, cheese, and evaporated milk?

2. If you destroy the market for the butterfat portion of the milk, how do you get the solids-not-fat, since the cow produces fat and solids together?

3. If we allow oleo to drive butter out, what will happen to soil fertility?

4. Where will you get the 40 percent of beef now coming from dairy cattle?

5. Since there is little relationship between the cost of ingredients and the selling price of oleo, what will prevent the sale of colored oleo for very little less than the cost of butter? (Witness the history of vegetable fats and lard, and the consequent higher price on the meat portion of pork.)

6. How to prevent fraud in the sale of colored oleo as butter?

7. How to maintain American stamina on a Hindu diet resulting from legislating the dairy business and 40 percent of the beef business out of existence?

8. If imitation butter is desirable, why not encourage all other imitation and deception—for instance, horse meat for beef?

9. Were the legislation proposed by the oleo lobby adopted and the enormous population depending on milk production pauperized, what would you then do for or with these millions of people?

10. When you have abolished the dairy industry what becomes of the market for soybean oil meal and cottonseed meal used for feeding milk cows? In 1946 cotton farmers received \$21,000,000 from oleomargarine manufacturers for cottonseed oil, but received \$31,000,000 from dairy farmers who fed cottonseed meal. In the same year soybean growers received \$23,000,000 from oleo manufacturers, and \$55,000,000 for soybean products fed to dairy cattle. To turn these feed producers into oleo boosters is certainly clever fifth column work.

11. Why have oleo prices advanced much more above prewar levels than butter prices? Why does the price of oleo follow the price of butter instead of the cost of oleo ingredients?

This letter does not cover this most important subject adequately. Additional information will gladly be supplied. Your comparison of milk with Coca-Cola is a bad blunder. It shows an utter lack of sound understanding or comprehension of agriculture in general and milk economics in particular. The reasons you advance for permitting oleo to masquerade as butter are certainly fallacious.

I believe that the proposals of the oleo lobby would wreck the dairy industry and the economic security of the millions of farmers and workers depending on it. Notwithstanding this fact, demonstrate to me that the proposals of oleo would actually

benefit our whole country and all its people, and I will not oppose it.

I am convinced the facts are not on the side of the oleo lobby, and that their arguments are not basically and economically sound, even though advanced plausibly.

Yours very truly,

W. A. McDONALD.

I just want to say this: I have been through this oleo-versus-the-people argument. I have not been angry at anyone; neither have I tried to be unduly unkind. If anyone is angry at me, because I cannot let this unjustified attack on the dairy industry go unchallenged, I feel only sorrow for him. I have no scars on me, and I hope I have not given anyone else any scars. I have not said anything that I will take back or retract. Not one word. I believe they are taking the American housewives for a ride in this matter. They will find out if they pass this bill that they will pay and pay and pay more for the privilege of buying margarine. Every ounce of every pound of oil in oleo is subsidized. The subsidy is between 1 and 10 cents per pound. The first thing you will do will be to destroy the whole dairy industry, and the second is, they are subscribing to a system of American agriculture, based on the philosophy, if you please, in 1947, of 28 cents an hour for labor. I hope you will not pass this bill. It is a backward step. I hope you will not prefer the 28-cents-per-hour formula of South Carolina for the American wage of Washington. If you do, I just hope that every time you take a mouthful of that oleomargarine—you may be getting \$2.50 an hour or \$40 a day—but remember this, that the fellow that raises this oleomargarine under the new leadership of the gentleman from South Carolina will get only 28 cents an hour. In 1939, the seventh year of the more abundant life, the South Carolina hourly wage was 8 cents per hour. I ask, "Did it taste good to you in 1939 when agricultural labor in South Carolina received 8 cents an hour?" I ask, "Will it taste good to you in 1948 with 28 cents per hour for labor?"

This is Custer's last stand so far as the dairy industry is concerned. You have the choice. You either accept the agricultural leadership of our colleague, the gentleman from Kansas, CLIFF HOPE, the whole Agricultural Committee, or you accept the new agricultural leadership of our distinguished colleague from South Carolina, MENDEL RIVERS.

Your decision is not only about oleo and butter. Your decision will have untold effect upon the future of American agriculture.

You will decide whether you want the American farmer to live like an American, own a piece of America, educate his family as an American family should be educated. You will also decide whether or not you wish to take a backward step. You will decide whether you want to follow the pathway of an agricultural aristocracy, where the big landowner controls the land and where the worker of the land seldom has a chance to own a small piece of it. My colleagues, that is the over-all issue, and do not be misled by the oleo-butter con-

troversty that is just an excuse and not a reason for the legislation. If your conscience is your guide you should not discard the Agricultural Committee for a 28-cents-per-hour agricultural leadership.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under special order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] is recognized for 15 minutes.

WHY WERE THE CONDON HEARINGS POSTPONED?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, April 14, 1948, the House Committee on Un-American Activities announced a postponement of the hearings by Dr. E. U. Condon, Director of the National Bureau of Standards, scheduled for April 21, 1948. This was the matter which was so urgent that a special subcommittee of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, in a report ostensibly to the full committee but actually to the press for obvious publicity purposes, characterized in that March 1, 1948, report as "of such importance that it demands immediate attention."

This matter, "of such importance that it demands immediate attention," has, in fact, been cooling its heels in the committee for over a year. Twenty-three days after the March 1, 1948, report, the committee announced hearings for April 21. Then on April 24 came the announcement of the postponement. Just how urgent is this matter that demands immediate attention?

The announcement of the hearings on March 24, 1948, coincided with the issuance of a subpoena to Dr. Condon, an ironic and needless gesture in view of the fact that as long ago as last July 1947 Dr. Condon wrote the committee, offering to appear and to cooperate, and even went so far as to call on the committee in its chambers this last March, repeating his offer.

Yet all we have are what the New York Times calls punishment by publicity—attacks, reports, leaks, announcements to the press, released in sensational and theatrical fashion. Why all this fanfare?

Is it because the only purpose of the committee is to smear Dr. Condon and other distinguished scientists? Is it because the committee prefers a one-sided punishment-by-publicity campaign in order to prevent Dr. Condon from having his day in court? Is it because Dr. Condon has received tremendous backing from scientists and citizens throughout the Nation? Is it because the editorials and columns throughout the press have been uniformly critical of the tactics of the committee, and the committee is hoping that the Nation will forget? Is it because Dr. Condon has retained one of the leading law firms of the Nation and because this firm has requested certain minimal rights for this honored and revered scientist? Is it because the committee does not want to grant him these rights—granted by the Constitution to every common chicken thief—and does not want to establish a precedent of the granting of such rights?

The letter addressed to the House Committee on Un-American Activities by the legal firm, Arnold, Fortas & Porter, is an

important document. Their analysis of the issues implicit in the Condon case strikes at the very real dangers to the Nation in these troubled times. Their request for certain minimal rights for Dr. Condon is warranted; those rights are and must be the inalienable rights of every citizen if democracy is to survive anywhere in this world.

The letter reads:

ARNOLD, FORTAS & PORTER,
Washington, D. C., March 29, 1948.
The CHAIRMAN, THE COMMITTEE ON
UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Dr. E. U. Condon, Director of the National Bureau of Standards, and other distinguished scientists of national reputation have consulted us with respect to hearings which your committee has scheduled for April 21. We have been asked to advise them concerning the procedure which your committee will follow.

The issues involved in the Condon case are such that the procedure which you adopt at this hearing is a matter of great national importance. Unless safeguards are imposed, Dr. Condon's hearing could become a forum for rumors, innuendo, and unsubstantiated charges which would prejudice Dr. Condon and jeopardize the critical program of secret scientific work in this country. Scientists cannot function under the threat of public scandal and of unjustified charges against which they cannot defend themselves. The security, morale, and, to some extent, the continued utility to the Nation of all men of science engaged in Government work depend on the fairness of your hearing procedures in this case.

The seriousness and alarm with which American scientists regard the committee's previous procedure is evidenced by a testimonial dinner arranged by a group of scientists for the purpose of showing their confidence in Dr. Condon and their profound disapproval of the methods pursued by the committee. The sponsors of that dinner constitute a Who's Who of distinguished American scientists, including nine Nobel prize winners. A copy of the letter of invitation, which includes the list of sponsors, is enclosed for your information.

The basis of the danger which these scientists fear inheres in the methods which your committee has pursued in an effort to uncover so-called un-American activities. These methods involve denial of the rights of confrontation and cross-examination and the concealment of sources of the committee's information. Necessarily this sort of procedure encourages irresponsible and baseless statements and accusations, based on suspicion, gossip, and even willful invention. Deliberate malice, recklessness, and bias on the part of the informants are protected. False information may be deliberately planted with impunity and a virtual guaranty that its falsity will not be exposed. Both the committee and the public can be misled.

Nothing is received in evidence, considered, or published that is favorable to the accused. Only one side of the story is permitted to be stated or considered, and that is the side which is prejudicial and derogatory to the accused. Even this one side of the story is apt to be highly colored, emotionalized, and distorted. The net effect is strikingly reminiscent of the infamous purge trials which the Communists themselves have conducted in the Soviet Union.

The danger from unsubstantiated charges and intentionally distorted evidence is illustrated by the report concerning Dr. Condon which a subcommittee of your committee published on March 1, without any prior hearing. This report contained a purported quotation from a letter written by J. Edgar

Hoover. According to statements in the press, language was inserted in that quotation which was not found in the original letter. Other language exonerating Dr. Condon was deliberately omitted. A spokesman for your committee has publicly conceded that some committee investigator was responsible for this tampering.

The motives for false and distorted evidence in proceedings before your committee are many and apparent. Some informant may be paying off a grudge. An overzealous investigator may be more concerned for publicity than accuracy. What motivated the spurious addition to the Hoover letter we do not know. We assume, of course, that you and your colleagues of the committee were unaware of it. But this episode demonstrates the reality and seriousness of the danger created by the disregard of ordinary procedural safeguards. No scientist or any other citizen is safe against this kind of slander. In this particular instance the source was known and the deception could be checked and exposed. But when anonymous sources are relied upon and there is no opportunity for confrontation or cross-examination, there is no protection against false evidence or malicious distortion.

There is another real source of danger that your committee should not ignore. It is in the interest of the Communist Party to hamper scientific work in the United States. Nothing could be more effective for the Communist cause than false documents planted with the committee by Communist agents in the hope that their publication will impair the reputation of some indispensable scientist and make his services unavailable to this country. The opportunity to use your committee for that purpose is apparent.

The effect of the publication of your accusations against Dr. Condon, and of the inflammatory and reckless manner in which that was done, may be devastating to the national interest. There is abundant evidence that it has impaired the security and peace of mind of practically all of the leading scientists who are now employed on atomic bomb, radar, and related projects of fundamental importance to our security. Your actions must inevitably cause scientists to hesitate to accept work in these fields; and they will doubtless tempt scientists now employed in these activities to seek other work of less national importance where their reputations will not be exposed to irresponsible attack, and their civil rights will be safe.

In fact, we respectfully suggest that the practices of your committee may be retarding the scientific research which is the most vital part of our defense program.

The number of scientists qualified for the exacting work required on many crucial projects is small. The need for their services at this critical point in history is great. Hitler drove out of Germany the very men qualified to discover the atomic bomb. Among them were Albert Einstein, Leo Szilard, James Franck, Hans A. Bethe, Otto Stern, and others, who came to this country and made possible our development of the atomic bomb. Mussolini drove Enrico Fermi out of Italy. Dr. Fermi is now one of our most distinguished atomic scientists. The Communists persecuted George Gamow, and forced him to flee the Soviet Union. Dr. Gamow is now one of our great nuclear physicists.

These men and many others, including outstanding native American scientists like Dr. Condon, now have reason to wonder whether they will be allowed to work in this country, free from molestation.

Nothing can serve the ends of communism today better than the intimidation of American scientific personnel through such tactics as your committee has followed in the Condon case to date. This committee must avoid becoming an unconscious instrument of Communist purposes.

We, therefore, respectfully suggest that the committee exercise extreme care in proceedings involving this country's critically important scientific program and, further, that you avoid the possibility that your activities might aid and abet the very forces you seek to combat; namely, communism and the apparent effort of its agents to create disunity and confusion in this Nation.

We know of no way in which the necessary precautions can be made effective except by objective investigations, fairly conducted, and hearings in which the truth is ascertained by men of impartial minds proceeding in accordance with traditional and tested American methods. We urge that the national interest, as well as the interests of the scientists whom we represent, requires that the Committee should follow this simple prescription.

Accordingly, for the reasons stated above, we request the committee to advise us with respect to the following procedural questions which we believe represent minimal procedural rights:

1. Will the distinguished scientists who are fully qualified concerning the subject matter of your hearing be allowed to testify?
2. Will Dr. Condon be permitted to present, in factual and dispassionate form, answers to the accusations made against him? This would include the opportunity by Dr. Condon either to read a statement or to respond to questions addressed to him by his own counsel, and, further, to present such evidence and witnesses relevant to a consideration of your previous statements and such other issues as may be involved. Any witnesses that Dr. Condon might present will, of course, be available to the committee and its counsel for cross-examination.
3. Will the committee afford Dr. Condon an opportunity to cross-examine any witnesses whose testimony may be considered or made public by the committee?
4. If the committee proposes to adduce charges or accusations relating to Dr. Condon, in addition to those in the report which was made and published without hearing, will the committee advise Dr. Condon of the details of such accusations in advance of the hearing so that he may prepare the material and have present at the hearing witnesses necessary to meet such charges? Will the committee advise Dr. Condon or his counsel, in advance of the hearing, of the names of the witnesses who will be called, so that preparations for the hearing may be made?

We assure you, on behalf of ourselves and Dr. Condon, that if these fundamental procedural rights are accorded, the hearing, so far as we are concerned, will be conducted with dispatch and within the scope of the issues. Dr. Condon requested an opportunity to be heard before your committee by letter dated July 9, 1947. This privilege was denied to him and 8 months later a derogatory report, since discredited and even disavowed in part by the chairman of the committee, was issued by a subcommittee which had held no hearings.

Dr. Condon is now and always has been eager for a public proceeding at which he may furnish any information concerning himself that may be desired. Even the publication of your report before you had even heard Dr. Condon himself has not altered his desire for an opportunity to appear before your committee or any other forum, although we have directed to his attention the obvious fact that your subcommittee has already pronounced a judgment in its published report and that in the absence of adherence to ordinary rules of procedure, the hearing can serve no purpose except a belated attempt to support a judgment already pronounced in an ex parte proceeding.

Nevertheless, the issues involved in this case are so grave that we respectfully suggest that in the hearings concerning Dr. Condon, your committee should follow the

traditional and tested judicial methods of ascertaining facts and grant the minimal procedural rights we have requested on behalf of Dr. Condon and some of his distinguished colleagues of science, all of whom desire to preserve an atmosphere in which they can conscientiously dedicate their talents to their country's welfare.

We shall appreciate a reply to this letter at your earliest convenience.

Very truly yours,

THURMAN ARNOLD.
ABE FORTAS.
PAUL A. PORTER.

So far, the committee has not declined to reply, inscrutable and ineffable.

The problem of congressional committee procedures is a grave and growing one. I do not question that Congress must have broad powers to conduct investigations: actually, I know of no one who questions this right and this need. It is in the method of conducting such investigations that the fault lies, and those committees that have exceeded the bounds of fair play and fair procedures are the very ones that jeopardize the rights and privileges and the reputation of the Congress. Recognition of this travesty on the constitutional rights of individuals has grown, among the citizens, businessmen, publishers, the press, and Members of the Congress. Thus, the Senator from Illinois has introduced Concurrent Resolution 44 in recent months. Prior to that, on December 4, 1947, I introduced H. R. 4641, to prescribe the procedures of investigating committees of the Congress and to protect the rights of parties under investigation by such committees. This bill provides:

Be it enacted, etc., That it is hereby declared to be the purpose and policy of the Congress that all legislative committees and subcommittees shall conduct their proceedings with the utmost fairness to all who may be affected by them and shall make every effort to avoid the abuse of their proceedings as a forum for the making of charges detrimental to the persons involved, which are not supported by convincing evidence. To this end the following specific regulations are prescribed.

SEC. 2. (a) All witnesses at hearings of the committees, whether public or private, shall have the right to have the aid and assistance of counsel and such other assistance as may be necessary to protection of their rights and to a full and fair presentation of the matter under investigation.

(b) Every witness who testifies in a hearing shall have a right at the conclusion of his testimony either to make an oral statement or at his option to file a sworn statement which shall be made part of the record of such hearing, but such oral or written statement shall be relevant to the subject of the hearing.

(c) If a committee, or any member thereof, shall make public any report furnished to it by its staff or others, or if any witness shall make, by oral testimony or documentary evidence, any statement reflecting adversely upon the character or reputation of any other person (including governmental officials or employees) the committee shall either at once strike such material from the record or shall grant to the person referred to an opportunity to cross-examine the persons responsible for the report or making the statement, and to present countervailing evidence. Such cross-examination and evidence shall be relevant to the interests of the individual who is involved, and may be subject to such reasonable limits of time and duration as the committee may impose. In addition, the persons concerned shall have the right, but

unless subpoenaed shall have no obligation to file with the committee any denial, defense, or explanation they may see fit and they shall have the right to testify in person.

SEC. 3. The Congress hereby reaffirms the right and the duty of the press to comment on the activities of the Congress and individual Congressmen, whether favorably or adversely, and declares that it is contrary to this fundamental principle of a free society for editors, publishers, and reporters to be called into question before any committee of Congress unless it is deemed essential by a full committee to the conduct of a legislative inquiry. And it is further declared to be the policy of the Congress that, except at his own request, no reporter, editor, or publisher shall be called to testify before a committee to be questioned concerning any publication by him, unless upon vote of a majority of the committee or subcommittee before whom he is called to testify: *Provided*, That no such person shall be called before any committee or subcommittee having less than five members.

Certainly some such measure is appropriate and necessary. The investigatory powers of the Congress are in no way invaded by such a measure. On the other hand, the constitutional rights of citizens are protected. No one who believes in and respects the Constitution can maintain that the rights granted to individuals in such a bill are either unimportant or unnecessary. If we expect the Nation to believe that Congress is an upholder of the Constitution and that Congress intends to preserve and maintain both the spirit and the letter of the Constitution—instead of merely paying hypocritical lip service to it—it is high time that we established democratic procedures for the conduct of our committees.

As far as I know, all of the rest of the committees of the House extend to their witnesses the customary minimal protective procedures. This bill, H. R. 4641, would have no effect on their procedures. It would have an effect on the procedures of the Committee on Un-American Activities and would force them to grant to witnesses certain basic protections which are vital to democratic processes. It would give American citizens the right to defend themselves against assassination of character by any individual member of a congressional committee.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOLIFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

A MOTHBALL AIR FORCE—THE 66-GROUP AIR FORCE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, one of the things that makes democracy so much better than other forms of Government is that in a democracy we have freedom of speech. Here in America there is, or there should be, no muzzling. Here in America we may speak the truth as we see it. We will preserve that freedom only so long as we exercise it and stand up and call deception, sham, and delusion what it is.

Headlines in the morning papers from coast to coast tell our citizens that the

Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Secretary of Defense have agreed on a 66-group air force. It is said that in reaching this decision General Bradley assured the Air Force that two light-bomber groups and two troop-carrier groups would not be required this year in support of ground operations. Therefore, it is implied that the 70-group program passed by this body by a vote of 343 to 3 only last Thursday could be reduced by these 4 groups. That has been accepted by the Secretary of Defense and his military advisers.

WHAT KIND OF 66 GROUPS?

Mr. Speaker, it is better not to enjoy freedom of speech at all than to sit silently and see it used as a vehicle for deluding and misleading the Congress and the people. The Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Secretary of Defense apparently did agree on a 66-group air force for 1949. What kind of 66 groups? What every Member should know, and what every citizen should know, is that the 66-group proposal is not 66 modern groups as contemplated by the House, but 66 moth-ball groups; 66 World War II groups; 66 T-model groups, not jet-model groups.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. Does the gentleman tell us this proposal is to use old planes, old models?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I said to the House a moment ago that this is a 66-moth-ball-group program. The proposal made in another body yesterday contemplated canceling out every dime of the \$822,000,000, completely vitiating the action of the House last Thursday when we, by a vote of 343 to 3, added the Taber amendment. They now go into the moth balls and pick out some old planes that have been wrapped up and stored, wheel them out of the warehouse and roll them in to fill up 66 groups. They then say to the country: "You want 70 groups. We are reasonably prudent men. We give you 66."

Mr. POAGE. It seems to me that is a most astonishing statement in view of the fact that we have already been told, and I think very correctly, that an air force that is only second to somebody else's air force is not worth anything. Is it not true that an air force to offer us any protection at all must be superior and have the latest planes? If we were to equip our Air Force with the kind of planes Orville Wright flew at Kitty Hawk, it would not be worth much more than knights and coats of armor, would it?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. And the Orville Wright-Kitty Hawk deal may be just exactly what we are getting now. We are not placing an order for new modern planes for a 66-group air force. The gentleman—the intelligent, constructive Member he is—knows that and anticipates me. If he will permit me to continue, I will point out some of the things he just questioned me about.

Mr. POAGE. I will be glad for you to go on, but I want to enter my protest against any program that will tie us to old models. We must have the best models in the world.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I have no doubt but that the 342 other gentlemen who joined the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] the other day will follow him again once they realize what a delusion, a sham, and a snare this 66-group proposition is.

MILITARY CONSIDERATIONS DICTATE 70 GROUPS

I now quote from the Secretary of Defense, Mr. Forrestal, in his statement before the committee in the other body on yesterday, in which he said that the unanimous report of the Joint Chiefs of Staff was "based solely on military considerations."

It is the opinion of the Joint Chiefs of Staff that the administration should advocate a balanced Military Establishment commensurate with the 70-group air program for the Air Force.

That was the statement the Secretary made only yesterday—that is, "the administration should."

Further, Secretary Forrestal stated:

As a military matter—

And I stress "military"—

the wisdom of this step cannot be questioned—

The Secretary refers to the 70-group step—

provided, of course, that the planes which are purchased are of sufficiently advanced type that we do not end up with a large supply of obsolete or obsolescent equipment.

Secretary Forrestal continued:

The Joint Chiefs of Staff, in their memorandum of April 14 to me, are unanimously on record on this subject.

Unanimously for what? Unanimously in favor of a 70-group program. This House, too, is almost unanimously on record for a 70-group modern air force.

NO MILITARY CONSIDERATION REDUCED 70 GROUPS TO 66

So, Mr. Speaker, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, presumably our greatest military leaders, invested with a responsibility for protecting this country and its security, have made it abundantly clear that "based solely on military considerations" a 70-group program is the program needed. It must not have been a military consideration that reduced this 70-group modern air force to a 66-group moth-ball air force. The combined voice of our military leaders says the administration should advocate a 70-group program. Because of military considerations, they say, the "administration should"—and we ought to capitalize that "should."

Why in the name of heaven, if our leaders believe we should have 70 groups, do they not recommend 70 groups?

PULL CLOAK OF DECEPTION AND SHAM FROM 66-GROUP PROPOSAL

Instead, the substitute proposed is a 66-group program. Let us examine that substitute. Let us this afternoon pull the cloak of deception and sham off the body of this 66-group proposal presented to the committee yesterday.

The first thing this proposal does is vitiate the action taken by the House of Representatives by a vote of 343 to 3, and eliminates—or proposes to elimi-

nate—every dollar of the \$822,000,000 that was added on the floor of this House last Thursday. So, No. 1, it eliminates \$822,000,000. It says "not one dollar for these planes; not one dollar for the designs to go on the drawing board to produce the planes" that we may need in 1950 and 1951, and maybe earlier.

TAKES MODERN JETS OFF OF ORDER

The second thing this proposal does is take out of moth balls World War II planes—and I call this to the attention of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE]—take these World War II planes that have been wrapped up and take off-of-order the modern jets that our air strategists think they must have. So, we pull out of the warehouse old planes, and we cancel the plans for the new ones. That is the second thing.

The third thing it does is to give the Army average personnel for the fiscal year 1948 of 695,700. That is the Army—the land army. I do not begrudge a single man you give the Army. We are sitting here with nine divisions. The other great power has 170 well-trained, seasoned divisions plus an additional 90 in its satellite countries. But, this proposal of yesterday gives the Army 695,700. That is the average personnel for the year. The Navy and the Marines are given 528,000, and the Air Force, our first line of defense, comes out last with 416,000. That is the third thing: It lines up the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, in that order.

Now, what is the fourth thing it does? It gives to the Navy \$5,018,700,000. It gives to the Army \$4,260,600,000. It gives to the Air Force \$4,227,700,000. That is a total of \$13,507,000,000. The Navy gets the big share, followed by the Army. The Air Force brings up the rear, not only in dollars but in men.

It should be remembered that it takes just as much Army and just as much Navy to handle a 70-group modern force as it does to handle a 70-group "moth-ball" force.

A committee of the other body was told on yesterday that there are "other considerations." But if you confine this thing solely to military considerations, every military man in the country—from General Eisenhower down—says the minimum air force this country should have to protect its security in peacetime is 70 groups.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include at the conclusion of my remarks some quotations by General Eisenhower, Secretary Patterson, and other eminent military people on the subject I am discussing.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HALLECK). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WINSTEAD. I wish to compliment the gentleman on this splendid presentation. The gentleman referred to the recommendation of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. I should like the gentleman to insert, if he will, at this point, who compose the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

How many of them are connected with the Navy, how many with the Army, and how many with the Air Force?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I am not a military strategist and I am not an authority on the individuals and the background of each man on the Joint Chiefs of Staff. I do respect them. I like to follow their suggestions. For that reason, I want to make it clear that their recommendations made to the Finletter Commission, the President's own commission, were for a 70-group air force. Now again the Joint Chiefs of Staff say that solely, from a military standpoint, we will need 70 groups. But getting back to the gentleman's question, I understand that Admiral Leahy, Chief of Staff to the President, participates in those meetings, together with General Bradley, of the Army; Admiral Denfeld, Chief of Naval Operations, for the Navy; and General Spaatz, of the Air Force.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Is it not true that Secretary of Defense Forrestal continues to talk about a balanced force all the time? What are we trying to balance this force with? Are we trying to balance our naval strength in this country with other navies of the world? Are we trying to balance our Air Force with other air forces of the world? Or is it a fact that the Air Force has not had fair representation on the Joint Chiefs of Staff?

ADDS UP: THREE NONAIRMEN TO ONE AIRMAN

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Admittedly Admiral Leahy is a great Navy man. Admittedly General Bradley is one of our greatest Army leaders. Admittedly Admiral Denfeld is familiar with the Navy's needs. If the gentleman wants to do a little arithmetic, it adds up to three non-airmen to one airman.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. The gentleman has made a splendid explanation of what this means and the tragedy that is in store for our country if we follow this backward-looking advice. I wonder if the gentleman will go a little further—he may plan to, and I hope he will—and give a little further explanation as to just why there should be any other than military considerations.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I am going into that very fully.

Mr. POAGE. Right now the gentleman has shown us that the military men say that from the military standpoint there should be 70 air groups. He has also shown us and we all know that the House of Representatives, which I assume speaks the political and the economic views of the people of America, has determined that from that standpoint, the civilian standpoint, there should be 70 groups. Consequently, why should there be anyone who should question the judgment of this House on the civil side and the judgment of the Chiefs of Staff on the military side?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I wish that the gentleman were correct, but our founding fathers in their wisdom decided there should be another body in the legislative establishment, and they also pro-

vided that legislation passed by this establishment should have the approval of the President of the United States. Rumors prevail in the lobbies and the cloakrooms and the committee halls that the President of the United States would veto legislation that sought to provide the 70-group program.

AMERICA DOES NOT INTEND TO ACCEPT
SECOND-RATE AIR FORCE

I am not informed. I am unwilling to accept such gossip. But I do say that in the light of the action taken by this body last week in voting 343 to 3, if similar action is taken in the other body, whatever may be done down at the other end of the Avenue will be comparatively unimportant. It will be unimportant because we will have established in this country the program for a 70-group force. We will have sent a message to all the world that the people of America do not intend to sit silently by and accept as a first line of defense a second-rate air force.

We have discussed the military considerations, and we are all agreed on the military considerations.

WHAT ARE THOSE OTHER CONSIDERATIONS?

But a committee of the Senate on yesterday was told that there are other considerations. The proposal to draft our young men moves speedily through our Armed Services Committee in the House. No one has suggested that other considerations should prevent the Government from taking these young men out of their homes, place them in training camps and start them to drill and to march. While we are passing legislation affecting human beings out of our committee, the Senate committee is told by the leaders of our defense departments that other considerations make it inadvisable to provide this country with a 70-group force. What are those considerations, Mr. Speaker? I quote from the very able Secretary of Defense, Mr. Forrestal. The other considerations listed in the Senate hearings yesterday are:

The impact of the cost of the program on our national economy.

In the interest of our national solvency.

If we do not have a 70-group air force, we may have no solvency at all.

Continuing with Mr. Forrestal's words:

And in the interest of avoiding allocations—

That means allocating steel, power, oil, and aluminum—

rationing, price controls, and a host of other restrictions. Then we should proceed in such a manner that will get the most national security for each dollar we spend.

WE ARE WILLING TO PAY COSTS OF SECURITY

Mr. Speaker, there are those who believe a 70-group force is the minimum for national security. There are those who love security more than they hate the cost involved. There are those who think that we can buy security and are willing to pay for it even if the cost should be allocations and restrictions. There are those who believe that if we refuse to put planes on order now as approved by the House, if we refuse to modernize and give this country an air

force of 70 groups, that there may be no security for our flesh or for our dollars. I am one of those.

It is passing strange that the same concern for "the impact of the cost of the program on the national economy" as related to selective service and universal military training was not expressed until the Congress asked, by the action of this House, the industry of this Nation to start making equipment to provide for these men. It is unthinkable that we should mouth about "allocations" and "a host of other restrictions" when we talk of equipment for the men but should remain silent when we apply those controls, those allocations, those hosts of restrictions, those drafts, if you please, upon human lives.

NOT A NEW ROAD WE ARE ASKED TO TRAVEL

This is not a new road that we are being asked to travel. It is the same road the eloquent Churchill pled with England, the great home of freedom, to follow in the early thirties. When his plea was rejected, when the members of Parliament turned him down, they deceived Hitler into thinking democratic nations would not provide for an adequate common defense.

Churchill, speaking in the House of Commons on July 7, 1935—13 short years ago—said:

We are admittedly the fifth air power. I dread the day when the means of threatening the hearts of the British Empire should pass into the hands of the present rulers of Germany.

To the little band of you House Members who are gathered here listening to me today I think we might well echo those words:

I dread the day when the means of threatening the hearts of America should pass into the hands of others.

And just as certainly as I stand before you today, air supremacy is passing into the hands of others.

FAMILIAR PHRASES ECHO IN WASHINGTON TODAY

Mr. Churchill in his memoirs writes of his attempts to awaken his nation to the need for stronger air power. His voice was not heard. His words went unheeded. It was said then, "We must have balance." Those familiar phrases echo through Washington today. But this is what Mr. Churchill says now, in looking back to World War II, of his nation's failure to maintain its grasp on air supremacy:

Had we acted even with reasonable prudence and healthy energy it might never have come to pass.

Prime Minister Baldwin, commenting on the prospects for security, gave England the same assurance then that we are getting now; assurance based on "other considerations."

When you go back to your district, you may be asked: "Why did you not vote for the 70-group air force?" If you start to give them this "balance blah," I hope some young man who was out in the Pacific in the early days crying, "Too little and too late" will remind you that the Joint Chiefs of Staff months ago told the Finletter Commission that we should have a minimum of 70 air groups.

GENERAL EISENHOWER FAVORED 70 GROUPS

General Eisenhower has said to this Nation, not once but time and time again, that we should have 70 groups. He is a land general, an Army man—not an air man. He said on July 10, 1946:

Now we have reached one concentration which we think is fixed. We cannot see any change in the foreseeable future where our Air Force will go below 70 groups.

The great Secretary of War, Robert Patterson, expressing belief that a 70-group force "would be a minimum," said, "but of course the question depends upon what types of planes the organization of the 70 groups is equipped with. If they are going to be equipped with planes that are relics of World War II they will not be any good."

And then yesterday, based on military considerations, not considering having to allocate things, the JCS still say we should have 70 groups, and yet there is recommended only 66 mothball groups.

Prime Minister Baldwin, too, made the tragic mistake some of our great able men are making today and that we almost made here in 1939.

Mr. Baldwin was called upon to acknowledge his mistake, only 3 months after it was made. He told Commons:

Where I was wrong was in my estimate of the future. There I was completely wrong. We were completely misled on that subject.

And there are present-day Baldwins who are wrong in their estimate of the future. Some who echo his words 13 years later are completely wrong.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. In just a moment. Let me finish. Then if I have time I shall be glad to yield.

MAY HEAR SAME WORDS HERE

Mr. Speaker, the admission of Mr. Baldwin to Mr. Churchill 3 months too late, may be repeated to this body 3 months from now. We need not repeat and recount to this body the price England paid and we ultimately may pay in blood and dollars with interest if we make that dreadful mistake.

Today in this country there are those who press to increase the authorized strength of our manpower, and I applaud them. I only wish they could be as enthusiastic in their demands to provide that manpower with what the joint chiefs say "as a military matter the wisdom of this step cannot be questioned."

I need not dwell on what transpired in the House in 1939 when 150 Members of this body stood opposed to increasing the size of our Air Force by 2,290 planes. I read the debates the other day. There are some sections of those debates of 1939 that could be substituted almost word for word for arguments heard here within recent days. In 1939, some Members

stood here opposing the appropriation for 2,290 planes, trying to whittle it down to 1,007 planes. Thank God, when the roll was called, 217 other Members foresaw our urgent need and cast their votes for a larger air force and smothered that group.

EITHER FOR 70 GROUPS OR NOT

We are either for the 70-group program or we are not. I am one of those who believe that all legislation is a result of compromise. Although I would reluctantly agree to 66 modern groups in order to insure unity in the Congress and with the military, my face would blush with shame if I would be a party to accepting the 66-group proposal offered. That proposal vitiates the action of the House, completely eliminating the \$822,000,000 and insuring nothing more than a second-rate air force for this country. Gen. Ira Eaker put it better than I can when he said, "A second best air force is like a second best poker hand."

Incidentally, I assume we are to conclude that the Secretary of Defense's presentation before the Senate committee was agreed upon by the Secretary for Air and all the Joint Chiefs of Staff, including General Spaatz. It is regrettable that those of us who believe in air power did not hear from Symington and Spaatz. Where were they? Why did they not speak out? Since when have their voices been stilled? What hope do the men who pilot the planes have if these men have retired voluntarily from the scene?

I pray that this Nation may not suffer as a result of its delinquency and its fear of controls as the people of London suffered from failure to provide a great air force after rejecting Churchill's pleas to increase air power.

WE MAY SUFFER MORE

But unless we stop, look, and listen, we may suffer more. If the other body swallows in toto the adroit and well-presented program it received yesterday, our people will not have the security I think they are entitled to have. The men we draft into our Air Force will not have the planes they may need on that fateful day of decision in 1951 or 1952. Remember, not a single plane used in World War II was even on the drawing board before Pearl Harbor.

GO OVER THIS WITH FINE-TOOTH COMB

I pray that this House will curvy this 66-group proposal with a fine-tooth comb. I believe that the "too much, too soon" addicts will not prevail when the final roll is called. The recent bitter experiences that caused our boys to shout "Too little—too late" from the Pacific islands should not be forgotten.

"NATION NEVER IN GREATER PERIL"

Do you want a 66-group program that is not fully modernized? Do you want to file away the plane designs now on the drafting boards? Do you want to accept compromise in this hour when General Eaker, among many others, warns:

This Nation was never in greater peril.

If you do, sit by and peacefully let them shove this 66-group proposal down your throat. If you do not, speak out and support the action of this House less

than a week ago in providing \$822,000,000 additional for plane procurement. Then you again will hear our boys saying we have enough, and we have it on time.

AMERICAN PEOPLE WILL SUPPORT 70 GROUPS

This Congress will have the support and approval of the American people only provided we furnish our people with the protection and the security that a 70-group air force—and a 70-group air force alone—can give us.

Peace cannot be stored in mothballs and left safely untended. Peace demands a constant vigil. Let us not dare toss away this hard-earned peace by entrusting its protection to a stop-gap air force drawn from the mothballs of the past.

The quotations referred to above are as follows:

Gen. George C. Marshall, October 1943:

I think maintenance of a sizable ground expeditionary force properly impracticable except on basis of allotments of fillers after 6 months. Having air power will be the quickest remedy.

Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower before subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs, and the Committee on Military Affairs, United States Senate, Seventy-ninth Congress, second session, on S. 2343, a bill to provide for the appointment of additional commissioned officers in the Regular Army, and other purposes, on June 27, 1946:

Specifically, in the Army, we have calculated that we will need no fewer than 70 air groups which imposes a strength of about 400,000 upon us. We can never maintain an Air Force with fewer than 400,000 men.

I have gone over the troop dispositions that we must maintain at present, and the dispositions that I think we should keep permanently, and until there is a definite trend showing a growing confidence in the United Nations I believe that the 70-group program is about as low as we can go.

Gen. Dwight Eisenhower, speech at Air University, Maxwell Field, Ala., April 8, 1947:

The military has always been accused of being narrow-minded, reactionary, stubborn, slow to change, bound by ritual, and the reason that it has always irritated us to hear these charges is because there has usually been an element of truth in them.

Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, Chief of Staff, United States Army, before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, United States Senate, Eightieth Congress, first session, on H. R. 3678, a bill making appropriations for the military establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, on June 28, 1947:

When I urge you to maintain a modern, effective air force my mind is literally filled with examples of the bleak fate of those who failed to provide air superiority during the past war. I am sure that the importance of the air arm has been overwhelmingly demonstrated to all. We are talking about our first line of defense, gentlemen, our first line of defense against attack which might be brought to our homes and families. With all the emphasis at my command, I urge you to keep that first line strong, modern, and ready.

Gen. Dwight Eisenhower, speech before the Air Force Association, Columbus, Ohio, September 15, 1947:

Against such threat, our first defense is air defense. But no real security resides in a second-best air force. Either ours shall be equal to any test a possible aggressor might impose or, under attack, it will quickly cease to be.

Today American air power is assurance against the terror that another Luftwaffe, whatever its name or flag, would strike in men's hearts. If we are prudent and foresighted, and design our forces to match our world position, no possible aggressor can repeat the Nazi strategy of fear.

James Forrestal, Secretary of Defense, before Armed Services Committee, March 25, 1948:

We need a strong air force, capable of striking sustained blows far beyond the peripheral bases which we now hold; an air force capable of the air defense of our homeland and our protective bases and capable of seeking out and destroying an enemy that might impose war. Such an air force requires more aircraft and more manpower than we have today in readiness to meet the lightning war of tomorrow.

Hon. Robert P. Patterson, Secretary of War, before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, United States Senate, Eightieth Congress, first session, on H. R. 3678, a bill making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, on June 24, 1947:

The ability to oppose quickly with military force wherever the interest of the United States requires such action is an indispensable requisite for peace and stability in these difficult times. For this purpose, the War Department looks to the air as their first-line force. If our relatively small Air Force is to carry this heavy responsibility, it must be kept modern.

I maintain that we need an Air Force well trained and ready to fight. Do not jeopardize it.

Hon. Kenneth C. Royall, Secretary of the Army, before the Senate Armed Services Committee, March 25, 1948:

The principal initial offensive weapon of any present or future war will be air power. The principal defensive weapons will be anti-aircraft, interceptive air power, antisubmarine defense, and means of repelling airborne or submarine-borne forces, and of protecting our atomic and other vital installations and—as far as possible—our cities against sabotage, and of preserving order in the event of an attack against them.

Since air power would be vital for offense and defense, it is important that we should promptly make certain that we have undisputed air superiority in the world, just as it is important that we retain our present undisputed sea superiority. We should have, as soon as possible, planes of such speed and armament—and in sufficient numbers—that in the event of a war in the years ahead we could launch from our own shores effective—and sufficiently frequent—round-trip attacks on any enemy points in the world which military strategy dictates. To accomplish these purposes we must have an adequate aircraft program, and we should start it now. For planes cannot be improved or built in a day—or in a year. Every type of plane we used in World War II, including the B-29, was planned before Pearl Harbor.

Hon. Kenneth C. Royall, Secretary of the Army, before President's Air Policy Commission, December 2, 1947:

The importance of air power to the defense of this country is hard to overestimate. It is certainly our first line of defense in the event of any war and any attack upon the United States. Unless there are considerable changes in the present concepts and methods of warfare, it would be an important factor in the waging of any world-wide war.

Therefore, I think it essential for the defense of this country that there be an Air Force in being, which is adequate to deal with the possibility of a surprise or sudden attack upon the United States, sufficient to seize and hold foreign territories and to attack enemy territories.

In response to a question from the chairman as to whether or not Secretary Royall was satisfied with Air Force plans, Secretary Royall stated:

Their plans are satisfactory, and their plans for the future are satisfactory if they can get what they want.

Gordon Gray, Assistant Secretary of the Army, address before the Lions Club and other civic and veterans' organizations, Portland, Maine, April 6, 1948:

We need air power second to none in the world. We need a full-strength, well-trained, well-equipped Army and Navy . . . and we need all three of these service branches backed up by the National Guard and efficient reserve organizations.

And, most important, we need these things in being—not on paper or in the blueprint stage or based on push-button theory—but actual equipment, trained men, all up to date and ready to move immediately if attack should come.

Gen. Carl Spaatz, before subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, Seventy-ninth Congress, second session, on the Military Establishment appropriation bill for 1947, on May 20, 1946:

Needs for current tasks must be balanced against the necessity for economy. An air force of 70 combat groups, backed by a pool of personnel and organizations in the Air National Guard and the Air Reserve, is the minimum force we believe adequate.

Maj. Gen. Edward M. Powers, Assistant Chief of Air Staff, before subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, Seventy-ninth Congress, second session, on the Military Establishment appropriation bill for 1947, on May 20, 1946: Seventy groups is a carefully computed irreducible minimum number of tactical units required to carry out the Air Forces' over-all mission.

Gen. Jacob L. Devers, commanding general, Army Ground Forces, address before the District of Columbia convention, American Legion, August 2, 1946:

General Eisenhower has estimated that we will send an army of 850,000, divided about equally between ground forces and air forces.

Gen. Curtiss LeMay, April 11, 1947:

We must have well-thought-out, properly integrated programs for land, sea, and air forces-in-being and in potential. Programs for land and sea forces have been developed and are most intelligently presented by members of those forces. The Air Force program has been developed and approved by land, sea, and air leaders; it is not a pipe dream of ambitious air generals. That program includes:

1. An adequate program of air research and development, coordinated with similar programs for land and sea.

2. A healthy, readily expansible aviation industry.

3. A properly balanced, operationally ready, strategically deployed, 70-combat-group air force-in-being, equipped with superior weapons.

4. A readily available, 1,500,000-man air force-in-potential . . .

What can we say about the 70-combat-group air force-in-being? The 70-combat-group air force-in-being, in the considered opinion of the War Department—not Air Force alone—is, not was, the absolute minimum air force consistent with national security.

Lt. Gen. C. P. Hall, director of organization and training, War Department General Staff, before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, United States Senate, Eightieth Congress, first session, on H. R. 3678, a bill making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, on June 25, 1947:

It is the opinion of the War Department that we must have a strong Air Force in being, capable of successfully meeting an attack of an aggressor and of taking immediate retaliatory action. A reduction in officers will necessarily restrict the operation of our already reduced strategic and tactical Air Forces plan for 1948, and the build-up to our 70-group program, which we consider essential for national defense, will be greatly retarded.

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

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WEICHEL (at the request of Mr. GRANT of Indiana) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

TRADE CONCESSIONS TO CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter from the State Department, also excerpts from a proclamation issued by the President and excerpts from the general agreement on tariffs and trade negotiated at Geneva last fall.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the announcement that the President is giving the trade concessions, which were negotiated at the Geneva Conference, to the Communist-controlled Government of Czechoslovakia will be a great shock to the American people. There is absolutely no way to reconcile that action with the European recovery plan with its billions of dollars taken from the American taxpayers for the avowed purpose of strengthening the economic structures of those western European nations who are outside of the iron curtain.

On the one hand we propose to spend an initial outlay of \$5,300,000,000 for the economic rejuvenation of western Europe and to contain communism behind the iron curtain, and now our Chief Exec-

utive has broken through the iron curtain to provide trade advantages to this satellite Government, so that through an increased trade they may acquire more American dollars. It is probably the most inconsistent and indefensible action ever taken by our Government. Either communism is a threat or it is not. If it is, then today's action by this Government should never have been taken. If it is not, then the American people and their representatives in Congress have been sold a bill of goods in the form of the Marshall plan.

Following is a letter from the State Department, delivered to me today, in which the State Department attempts to justify its action. The letter follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, April 22, 1948.

The Honorable ROBERT A. GRANT,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. GRANT: I have reference to your recent conversations with various officers of the Department regarding the signature by Czechoslovakia of the Protocol of Provisional Application of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, and the implications of this action for the United States in the light of the events surrounding the governmental changes of last February in Czechoslovakia. This matter has been given the most careful study both within the Department of State and in meetings of the President's Cabinet.

The President today has decided to issue a proclamation putting into effect the provisions of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade with respect to Czechoslovakia, thereby implementing an obligation entered into by this Government more than 5 months ago, on October 30, 1947, when the general agreement was concluded at Geneva, and prior to the Communist coup of February 1948. Since Czechoslovakia has now placed the general agreement in effect with respect to the United States and the other contracting parties, this country as well as the other contracting parties is obligated to apply the agreement to Czechoslovakia. This Government's attitude toward the events of last February in Czechoslovakia has not changed from that indicated in the joint statement of February 26, 1948 by the Secretary of State of this Government and by the Foreign Ministers of the Governments of the United Kingdom and France. These events, however, do not directly affect the legal status of the reciprocal obligations under the general agreement.

The general agreement is a comprehensive trade agreement among 23 countries. It is part of a world-wide program, sponsored by the United Nations and actively participated in by the United States, designed to reduce trade barriers and to restore international trade to an orderly and stable basis. It is clearly to the interest of such a program to include the fullest possible participation by any countries which are willing to undertake the necessary obligations.

Concern has been expressed by a number of persons that making effective the general agreement as between the United States and Czechoslovakia will give undue assistance, without receiving adequate reciprocal advantage in return, to a country subject to the influence of the Soviet Union, while depriving the American economy of the goods which are necessary to maintain our defensive strength. I would like to emphasize, in particular, that should Czechoslovakia or any other contracting party fail to fulfill the obligations of the agreement or adopt any policy which impairs or nullifies the tariff concessions, the application by the United

States to that country of such obligations or concessions under the agreement as may be appropriate in the circumstances may be suspended. In addition, if, as a result of unforeseen circumstances, any of the concessions extended in the agreement should result in such increased imports from Czechoslovakia as to cause or threaten serious injury to domestic producers in this country the United States is free to withdraw or modify the concessions to the extent necessary to prevent or remedy the injury.

In addition to this safeguard with respect to imports, the United States also exercises export controls to protect the American economy generally, to promote the objectives of foreign policy, and to safeguard national security. Since March 1, 1948, no shipments to European destinations, including Czechoslovakia, can be made without appropriate license. These export controls prevent shipment of goods contrary to the national interests of the United States.

There is enclosed a statement being issued to the press today which contains some of the considerations discussed in this letter and outlines the pertinent facts relating to the reciprocal concessions included in the general agreement on the part of the United States and Czechoslovakia. It should be noted that the entry into force of these concessions granted by the United States on products of special interest to Czechoslovakia will also benefit certain other countries which signed the general agreement in Geneva and which are participating in the European recovery program.

Sincerely yours,
CHARLES E. BOHLEN,
Counselor

(For the Acting Secretary of State).

By way of justification and defense the State Department points to the so-called escape clause which could be invoked if injury to American industry should follow. If that escape clause is not applied better than it has been during the past, then it means absolutely nothing at all.

The State Department insists that "this country as well as the other contracting parties is obligated to apply the agreement to Czechoslovakia."

If that statement is true, then the simplest words in the English language have lost their meaning.

Article 27 of the general agreement expressly provides that "any contracting party shall at any time be free to withhold or to withdraw in whole or in part any concession in respect of which such contracting party determines that it was initially negotiated with a government which has not become, or has ceased to be, a contracting party." The difference between the government of Jan Masaryk and the Communists who took over that government is the difference between day and night. The American people will want to know why article 27 of the general agreement was not relied upon in this situation.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ARNOLD (at the request of Mr. LEONARD W. HALL) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement in reference to the Taft-Hartley Act.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS ON THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN ECONOMIC COOPERATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communi-

cation from the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, which was read:

APRIL 13, 1948.

Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr.,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to provisions of Public Law 472, Eightieth Congress, I have this date appointed the following Members to represent the Committee on Foreign Affairs on the Joint Committee on Foreign Economic Cooperation: Hon. JOHN M. VORYS, Ohio; Hon. JAMES G. FULTON, Pennsylvania; Hon. SOL BLOOM, New York.

Sincerely yours,
CHARLES A. EATON,
Chairman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, which was read:

APRIL 22, 1948.

Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr.,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: In conformity with section 124 of Public Law 472, Eightieth Congress, I have this date appointed the following Members to represent the Committee on Appropriations on the Joint Committee on Foreign Economic Cooperation: JOHN TABER, New York; CLARENCE CANNON, Missouri.

Very truly yours,
JOHN TABER,
Chairman.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. HOEVEN (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), on account of death in family.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 329. An act for the relief of Gentaro Takahashi;

S. 560. An act to prohibit the operation of gambling ships, and for other purposes;

S. 936. An act for the relief of Burnett A. Pyle;

S. 1021. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to pay salaries and expenses of the chairman, secretary, and clerk of the Fort Peck General Council, members of the Fort Peck Tribal Executive Board, and other committees appointed by said Fort Peck General Council, and official delegates of the Fort Peck Tribes;

S. 1263. An act for the relief of Fire District No. 1 of the town of Colchester, Vt.;

S. 1304. An act to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the organization of Minnesota as a Territory of the United States;

S. 1312. An act for the relief of Jeanette C. Jones and minor children;

S. 1393. An act to provide additional subsistence allowances and to raise the ceilings on wages and allowances pertaining to certain veterans;

S. 1468. An act providing for payment of \$50 to each enrolled member of the Mescalero Apache Indian Tribe from funds standing to their credit in the Treasury of the United States;

S. 1583. An act to provide for the conveyance to the State of Maryland, for the use of the University of Maryland, of the northern portion of a parcel of land previously

constituting a part of the campus of the university and previously conveyed by the State of Maryland to the United States for the use of the Bureau of Mines;

S. 1696. An act to amend the act of August 13, 1940 (54 Stat. 784), so as to extend the jurisdiction of the United States District Court, Territory of Hawaii, over Canton and Enderbury Islands;

S. 2278. An act to authorize the sale of certain public lands in San Jose County, Utah, to the Southwest Indian Mission, Inc.;

S. J. Res. 189. Joint resolution to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of the Five Civilized Tribes of Indians in Oklahoma; and

S. J. Res. 207. Joint resolution to provide for the commemoration of the sesquicentennial anniversary of the establishment of the Department of the Navy.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LeCOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1799. An act for relief of Eva L. Dudley, Grace M. Collins, and Guy B. Slater; and
H. R. 4931. An act to amend title 17 of the United States Code entitled "Copyrights."

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 24 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, April 26, 1948, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred, as follows:

1485. A letter from the Archivist of the United States transmitting lists or schedules covering records proposed for disposal by various Government agencies; to the Committee on House Administration.

1486. A letter from the Postmaster General transmitting a statement showing the number of envelopes, labels, and other penalty inscribed material on hand and on order June 30, 1947; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1487. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting volume 9 of the report on the audit of Reconstruction Finance Corporation and affiliated corporations for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 622); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed.

1488. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting volume 10 of the report on the audit of Reconstruction Finance Corporation and affiliated corporations for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 623); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed.

1489. A letter from the Chairman, National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems, Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the Securities Act of 1933, the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, and the National Bank Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk

for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. S. 1985. An act to amend the act entitled "Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act," approved July 19, 1940; without amendment (Rept. No. 1779). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 3731. A bill authorizing modifications in the repayment contracts with the lower Yellowstone irrigation district No. 1 and the lower Yellowstone irrigation district No. 2; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1780). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 5153. A bill to provide for the establishment and operation of an experiment station in the Appalachian region for research on the production, refining, transportation, and use of petroleum and natural gas; without amendment (Rept. No. 1781). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 5587. A bill to add certain lands to the Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park, in the State of North Dakota, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1782). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 5901. A bill to provide for the distribution among the States of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming of the receipts of the Colorado River development fund for use in the fiscal years 1949 to 1955, inclusive, on a basis which is as nearly equal as practicable and to make available other funds for the investigation and construction of projects in any of the States of the Colorado River Basin in addition to appropriations for said purposes from the Colorado River development fund; without amendment (Rept. No. 1783). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 6056. A bill to amend an act of Congress approved February 9, 1881, which granted a right-of-way for railroad purposes through certain lands of the United States in Richmond County, N. Y.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1784). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 6067. A bill authorizing the execution of an amendatory repayment contract with the Northport irrigation district, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1785). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 6091. A bill to withdraw certain land as available land within the meaning of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act of 1920 (42 Stat. 108), as amended, and to restore it to its previous status under the control of the Territory of Hawaii; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1786). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 6071. A bill to provide for the treatment of sexual psychopaths in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1787). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WOLCOTT: Committee on Banking and Currency. H. R. 6263. A bill to provide a Federal charter for the Commodity Credit Corporation, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1790). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WOLCOTT: Committee on Banking and Currency. S. 2225. An act to transfer

administration of the Federal Credit Union Act to the Federal Security Agency; without amendment (Rept. No. 1791). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. O'HARA: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 6203. A bill to incorporate the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Washington a corporation sole; without amendment (Rept. No. 1788). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. O'HARA: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 6209. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to incorporate the Protestant Episcopal Cathedral Foundation of the District of Columbia," approved January 6, 1893, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 1789). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CURTIS:

H. R. 6312. A bill to provide for the deduction from gross income for income-tax purposes of expenses incurred by farmers for the purpose of soil and water conservation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H. R. 6313. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Canton reclamation project, Oklahoma; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BUSBEY:

H. R. 6314. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code to provide for the deduction from gross income of losses incurred upon the sale or exchange of residences; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:

H. R. 6315. A bill to provide for the deduction from gross income for income-tax purposes of expenses incurred by farmers for the purpose of soil and water conservation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois (by request):

H. R. 6316. A bill to amend the Life Insurance Act to make available group life insurance to employees of members of trade associations; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HARNES of Indiana:

H. R. 6317. A bill to amend section 2402 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, and to repeal section 2402 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SANBORN:

H. R. 6318. A bill to amend section 3 of the Standard Time Act of March 19, 1918, as amended, relating to the placing of a certain portion of the State of Idaho in the third time zone; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H. R. 6319. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, so as to provide that individuals who have completed at least 35 years of service may retire on a full annuity, without regard to age; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

H. R. 6320. A bill to provide for wildlife restoration through the use of unobligated

balance in the special fund known as the Federal aid to wildlife restoration fund and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 6321. A bill to provide for the deduction from gross income for income-tax purposes of expenses incurred by farmers for the purpose of soil and water conservation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

H. R. 6322. A bill to authorize the construction of access roads necessary to the national defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BROOKS:

H. R. 6323. A bill to provide additional compensation for employees in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HEDRICK:

H. R. 6324. A bill to authorize and direct the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to conduct an investigation and study of the feasibility and desirability of adopting the plan, known as the West Virginia plan, for the construction and financing of low-cost housing facilities for veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SOMERS:

H. Con. Res. 187. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the executive branch of the United States Government recognize the Hebrew Republic of Palestine and extend certain aid thereto; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HARNES of Indiana:

H. Res. 547. Resolution requesting the President of the United States not to proclaim rates of duty listed in schedule XX of the general agreement on tariffs and trade signed at Geneva, Switzerland, on October 30, 1947, with the country of Czechoslovakia; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ALBERT:

H. R. 6325. A bill for the relief of John Thompson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 6326. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Army to bestow the Silver Star upon Michael J. Quinn; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CHAPMAN:

H. R. 6327. A bill to provide for the issuance of a license to practice chiropractic in the District of Columbia to Samuel O. Burdette; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 6328. A bill to authorize the Commissioner of Public Buildings to lease to the Temple Methodist Church, a nonprofit corporation, of San Francisco, Calif., that portion of the federally owned building known as 100 McAllister Street, San Francisco, Calif., which was previously occupied by the Temple Methodist Church; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JACKSON of Washington:

H. R. 6329. A bill for the relief of the Olympic Hotel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING (by request):

H. R. 6330. A bill for the relief of Aurelio Espada Alvarez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. R. 6331. A bill for the relief of José Antonio Elias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WELCH:

H. R. 6332. A bill to authorize the Commissioner of Public Buildings to lease to the Temple Methodist Church, a nonprofit cor-

poration, of San Francisco, Calif., that portion of the federally owned building known as 100 McAllister Street, San Francisco, Calif., which was previously occupied by the Temple Methodist Church; to the Committee on Public Works.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

1811. By Mr. CASE of South Dakota: Petition of Ray C. Herschlec, Mobridge, S. Dak., and 25 others, urging enactment of H. R. 5759, to increase the retirement of beneficiaries under the Railroad Retirement Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1812. By Mr. CANFIELD: Resolutions adopted at a mass meeting in Paterson, N. J., April 2, 1948, honoring Stanislaw Mikolajczyk, former president of the Polish Peasant Party, calling for aid to the beleaguered people of Poland and other subjugated nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1813. By Mr. FERNOS-ISERN: Petition of the United States Army and Navy Retired Association, of San Juan, P. R., urging approval of H. R. 5043; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1814. Also, petition of Puerto Rican veterans, urging support of the universal military training program; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1815. Also, petition of the International Longshoremen's Association of Mayaguez, P. R., urging support of H. R. 5739 and H. R. 5653; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1816. By Mr. TAYLOR: Petition of Avis Fleischer and 16 other residents of Troy, N. Y., in opposition to universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1817. By Mr. REED of Illinois: Petition of Kenneth W. Bellows, Elgin, Ill., consisting of 40 signatures, in support of H. R. 5213; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1818. Also, petition of Paul H. Traub, Elgin, Ill., consisting of 43 signatures, in support of H. R. 5213; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1819. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Walter Marlow, Brooklyn, N. Y., and others petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the amputee bill, which would provide automobiles at no expense to veteran amputees; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1820. Also, petition of the board of managers and members of the Pennsylvania Society of Sons of the American Revolution petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of universal military training; to the Committee on the Armed Services.

1821. Also, petition of Mrs. B. W. Kellogg, St. Cloud, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1822. Also, petition of William Chandler, Orlovista, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1823. Also, petition of T. M. Nuzum, Orlando, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1824. Also, petition of T. S. Kinney, Orlando, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1825. Also, petition of Orlando Townsend Club, No. 2, Orlando, Fla., petitioning con-

sideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1826. Also, petition of John A. Davies, Orlovista, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1827. Also, petition of Miss Maggie Ellis, Orlando, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1828. Also, petition of Miss Gertrude Hoschma, Geneva, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1829. Also, petition of the City Council of the City of Chicago, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to requesting removal of restrictions on evictions of excess-income families residing in permanent housing projects; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1830. Also, petition of Ray Jerome Gross, New York, N. Y., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to the preservation and general welfare of the Nation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

MONDAY, APRIL 26, 1948

(Legislative day of Thursday, April 22, 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:

It is not our brothers or our friends, but it is we, O Lord, who are standing in the need of prayer. Much as we would like to see this great company engaged in fervent supplication, we remember that Thou hast promised: "If any two are agreed, I will do it."

Let us not be staggered by statistics but rather by the implications of the prayers here uttered by a few. When they really move us, they can move our Nation. Let us not be the stumbling-blocks. We ask in Jesus' name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 22, 1948, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF A BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on April 24, 1948, the President had approved and signed the following act:

S. 2038. An act to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct research on foot-and-mouth disease and other diseases of animals and to amend the act of May 29, 1884 (23 Stat. 31), as amended, by adding another section.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its