

Law 439, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved September 27, 1944, which defines line of duty and misconduct for pension and compensation purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. J. Res. 401. Joint resolution to continue until December 31, 1953, the authority of the United States Maritime Commission to make provision for certain ocean transportation services to, from, and within Alaska; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H. J. Res. 402. Joint resolution to exempt from levy of admissions tax the International Air Exposition and the Golden Anniversary Educational Exposition, being produced by the city of New York through the Mayor's Committee for the Commemoration of the Golden Anniversary of the City of New York; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COMBS:

H. Con. Res. 198. Concurrent resolution to create a joint committee to formulate rules with respect to the powers, duties, and procedures of investigating committees of either House of Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H. Con. Res. 199. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the report (H. Rept. No. 1920) on the Communist Party of the United States as an advocate of overthrow of government by force and violence; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. CARROLL:

H. R. 6558. A bill for the relief of Harry B. Landers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6559. A bill conferring United States citizenship posthumously upon Vaso B. Benderach; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRANT of Indiana:

H. R. 6560. A bill for the relief of the former shareholders of the Goshen Veneer Co., an Indiana corporation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SADLAK:

H. R. 6561. A bill for the relief of Stanley John Rybczyk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 6562. A bill for the relief of James G. Smyth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 6563. A bill for the relief of Mary Wyshoff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

1913. By Mr. BOGGS of Delaware: Petition of postal employees, their friends and relatives, of the Wilmington post office, Wilmington, Del., containing 181 signatures and urging prompt favorable action by the Congress on the salary-increase bill for postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1914. By Mr. HART: Memorial of the State of New Jersey, urging the Congress of the United States to adopt legislation amending the Bankruptcy Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1915. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution of members of Shopiere Congregational Church, Shopiere, Wis., in opposition to universal military training and conscription; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1916. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Muhel Nassiff and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to in-

creasing wages for Federal workers; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1917. Also, petition of Mrs. A. Dework and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to defeat of legislation titled "The Subversive Activities Control Act"; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

1918. Also, petition of M. Simon and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to defeat of legislation titled "The Subversive Activities Control Act"; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

1919. Also, petition of Rise Wortman and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to defeat of legislation titled "The Subversive Activities Control Act"; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

1920. Also, petition of Judeth Liebman and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to defeat of legislation titled "The Subversive Activities Control Act"; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

1921. Also, petition of Edith Wise and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to defeat of the legislation titled "The Subversive Activities Control Act"; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

1922. Also, petition of Matilde Montenegro and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the defeat of legislation titled "The Subversive Activities Control Act"; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

1923. Also, petition of Ann Dunbar Williams and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to protesting the Mundt-Nixon bill; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

1924. Also, petition of Mrs. Albina Bibeau, St. Petersburg, 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.

1925. Also, petition of Bertha Gillman and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to enactment into law House Joint Resolution 343 which lifts the arms embargo to Palestine Jewry; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1926. Also, petition of American Labor Party—First Assembly, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the defeat of legislation titled "The Subversive Activities Control Act"; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

1927. Also, petition of Emily Ginsburg and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to defeat of legislation titled "The Subversive Activities Control Act"; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

SENATE

FRIDAY, MAY 14, 1948

(Legislative day of Monday, May 10, 1948)

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

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

Our Father in Heaven, humbly we bow in prayer this day, feeling the deep loss of our Nation and the Senate in the call that has summoned our brother into that life where age shall not weary nor the years condemn.

Knowing in whom he placed his trust, we know that his faith was well founded.

We pray for those who loved him best and will miss him most. May they have the comforting ministry of Him who shall wipe away all tears from their eyes and is able to bind up broken hearts.

So teach us to number our days that we may apply our hearts unto wisdom.

May our sympathies be warm and real, and in our great loss may we learn better how to love one another, through Him who has promised, *Whosoever liveth and believeth in Me shall never die. Because I live, ye shall live also.* Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 13, 1948, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

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

H. R. 6500. An act making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 342. Joint resolution directing all executive departments and agencies of the Federal Government to make available to any and all standing, special, or select committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate information which may be deemed necessary to enable them to properly perform the duties delegated to them by the Congress.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 200. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Clerk of the House to make corrections in the enrollment of H. R. 3350; and

H. Con. Res. 201. Concurrent resolution accepting the invitation to attend the meeting of the Empire Parliamentary Association in Bermuda.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

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

S. 2287. An act to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1308. An act for the relief of H. C. Biering;

H. R. 4966. An act directing the Secretary of the Interior to sell and lease certain houses, apartments, and lands in Boulder City, Nev.;

H. R. 5669. An act to provide for adjustment of irrigation charges on the Flathead Indian irrigation project, Montana, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6067. An act authorizing the execution of an amendatory repayment contract with the Northport irrigation district, and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bill and joint resolution were each read twice, by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 6500. An act making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H. J. Res. 342. Joint resolution directing all executive departments and agencies of the Federal Government to make available to any and all standing, special, or select committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate information which may be deemed necessary to enable them to properly perform the duties delegated to them by the Congress; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 201) accepting the invitation to attend the meeting of the Empire Parliamentary Association in Bermuda was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

NOMINATION OF JESS LARSON TO BE WAR ASSETS ADMINISTRATOR

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, when the Senate recessed last night it was in executive session. Because of a situation with which we are all familiar, which has arisen since the recess of the Senate yesterday, I now ask unanimous consent that the order for today at 12 o'clock relative to the nomination of Jess Larson, of Oklahoma, to be War Assets Administrator be postponed to the same hour on Tuesday next, May 18, and that its consideration be then proceeded with in executive session under the same terms and conditions.

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of legislative business.

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

DEATH OF SENATOR JOHN H. OVERTON

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I deeply regret to announce the death of my distinguished colleague, Senator JOHN HOLMES OVERTON. He died this morning at 5:50 in Bethesda Naval Hospital.

He was born 72 years ago at Marks-ville, La., then a small country village located in central Louisiana, only a few miles from the confluence of the Red and Mississippi Rivers, and in the path of Louisiana's worst flood area.

He graduated from Louisiana State University with the degree of bachelor of arts, and from Tulane University Law School with the degree of bachelor of laws.

After a most brilliant career as one of Louisiana's leading lawyers, he decided to enter politics. He was elected on May 12, 1931, as Representative from the Eighth Congressional District of Louisiana to fill the unexpired term of James B. Aswell. On November 8, 1932, he was elected to the United States Senate for the term ending January 3, 1939, and thereafter he was again elected for two additional terms.

From early childhood he personally witnessed the ravages of floods from the overflow of the Red and Mississippi Rivers. It was natural, therefore, that in early life he resolved to devote his talents to flood control. However, it was not until he became a Member of this body that he could do effective work toward that end.

His chief efforts during his 16 years in the Senate were devoted to flood control and rivers and harbors improvements. Against odds which at times seemed unsurmountable Senator OVERTON, by his brilliant presentations on the subject, was responsible for the saving of countless lives and many millions of dollars in property.

It is ironical that he died on the very day the Senate was due to take up the civil functions bill of the Army, which he had sponsored in the Appropriations Committee, and it is significant that his last thoughts were directed toward the preparation of an outline on the subject which he intended to present. Because of his inability to participate personally in the debate on this momentous question, it was only yesterday that he requested me to read his prepared remarks when the bill was called up for action.

I know of no more fitting tribute than to recite to the Senate the last paragraph from the remarks of the great man whom we all mourn. I read:

No, Mr. President, the only objection to this bill is that it fails to meet fully and squarely the issue which faces us. We are the breadbasket of the world. We are the hope of the world. Unless we protect and husband our resources, unless we strengthen ourselves to meet the challenge, then all is lost. I know of no better way that we can meet these great responsibilities than by protecting our industry and agriculture from the ravages of flood and by extending our defenses through improvement to our waterways and harbors. When we fail to meet this responsibility by hiding behind a cloak of economy, we deny our faith in a great America.

These were the last official thoughts of my distinguished friend and colleague. They mean much to the cause for which he was fighting. Thus, even in death shall his wise counsel and advice and influence shape the great work to which he devoted his manifold talents.

Louisiana has lost a distinguished son. The Nation has lost a valiant leader.

May his soul rest in peace.

Mr. President, I was informed a few minutes ago that I would be a member of the committee to accompany the funeral train to Louisiana. I do not know when the Senate will take up H. R. 5524, the civil functions War Department appropriation bill. In the event this bill shall be taken up during my absence, I ask unanimous consent that the statement prepared by my distinguished colleague in connection therewith, which he requested me to read, be read from the desk by the clerk.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, at this time I send to the desk a resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the resolution.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 235), as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of Hon. JOHN H. OVERTON, late a Senator from the State of Louisiana.

Resolved, That a committee of 23 Senators be appointed by the President pro tempore

of the Senate to take order for superintending the funeral of the deceased Senator.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I know that what I have done this morning has violated the rules of the Senate, but I ask that they may be suspended. The bouquet of gladiolus on the desk of our former colleague was on my desk in my office, and as I started to the Senate this morning they seemed so symbolic of the sturdiness and the strength of JOHN OVERTON and his character that I brought them to the Senate to place them on his desk. I am aware, as I have said, that it is contrary to the rules of the Senate, and I ask their suspension and the privilege of doing what I have done.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I have a very strong sense of personal grief in the death of Senator OVERTON. It so happened that although we disagreed on many political questions, we were very good friends. I worked with him here, and when I was in Louisiana during Army maneuvers in 1941 I was a guest in his lovely house, and came to see him as the affectionate family man he was.

If I were to enumerate a few of Senator OVERTON's traits, I would say that loyalty to his friends, affection for his family, and deep feeling for his country, were fundamental in his being.

He was a man of real brilliance, of very considerable ability. He was an ornament to the Senate.

I extend my profound sympathy to the members of his family, and I hope that they will derive the real strength and comfort to which they are entitled from the pride which must be theirs in all that he was and all that he did for his fellow men.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the news of the death of JOHN H. OVERTON overwhelms me with a sense of deep personal loss. The State of Louisiana has indeed lost one of its ablest sons, and the Nation has lost a wise, patriotic public servant.

JOHN OVERTON was a kindly, gracious gentleman, a gentleman of the old school. He was of the type that is fast disappearing, to the great loss of our Nation and our civilization. He respected the rights of all men, and he demanded respect for his rights.

JOHN OVERTON was truly a Jacksonian Democrat, both by instinct and inheritance. No one has ever read any life or biography of Old Hickory without being impressed by the frequency with which the name of Overton occurs among the intimates of that great American. JOHN OVERTON inherited the strength of character and the devotion to principle and conviction which made his forebears great men and placed them in the forefront among the builders of the Nation.

JOHN OVERTON was a gallant fighting man. I never saw him take counsel of his fears nor overawed by odds. I never saw him take an unfair advantage of an opponent, even if that advantage was open to him. He was a

master of forensics but always courteous to his adversaries.

As has been well said, he had the greatest knowledge of the matters involved in flood control and in rivers-and-harbors legislation of any man in the Congress of the United States. He was an advocate of those public works, not in a narrow, local sense, not in the sense of the pork barrel. I have heard him in committee vigorously urge projects which were located in States that were far removed from Louisiana. He had truly a national grasp of that problem. He was a statesman with a national vision.

I am sure that all Senators share the feeling of personal loss that comes with the knowledge we shall not see him here again. I know that the Nation has suffered a great loss in his passing.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I cannot express in feeble words the profound sorrow I feel in the loss of our beloved colleague and eminent statesman from the State of Louisiana.

It has been my privilege since being a Member of the Senate to enjoy a very close association with him and to serve with him on two important committees where we were engaged in developing a program of legislation in which we were vitally interested and which is of much importance to the progress of our section of the Nation. Since he had a keen insight into that character of legislation I immediately found in him an experienced counselor who was able to give effective guidance to my own efforts in this particular program and service to my own people.

I shall not only miss him because of the warm personal friendship that developed between us, but because I know that I have lost the source of able assistance in legislation in which I am so keenly interested.

JOHN H. OVERTON truly, faithfully, and ably represented in the Congress a great State and a great people in accordance with the finest traditions. He was more than a Senator from the State of Louisiana. He was a real servant to all the people of our Nation. He was devoted to the noble ideals of our democracy and to human liberty. He stood firm and steadfast as the Rock of Gibraltar in defense of these ideals and the principles upon which our Government is founded, and fought valiantly against every assault made upon our system of government. He was a champion of true progress, and worked constantly for the development and the improvement of our rivers, our streams, our waterways and the other great natural resources of our Nation.

Not only has the Southwest area profited and progressed by reason of his untiring efforts, his work and leadership in this important field of national legislation, but the entire Nation has greatly benefited thereby.

There are many monuments of river and harbor improvements already erected which stand as a tribute to him and to his memory. These improvements have added immeasurably to the strength and power of the Nation he so dearly loved and in whose service he has given his life.

I express my profound and deepest sympathy, Mr. President, to his family, and I close with this sentiment:

May God give us men, more men in the United States Senate, whose character, courage, quality of service, stature, and capacity can compare with those of our departed colleague.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I know of no person whose passing from the Senate could cause a greater feeling of sadness than the passing of the senior Senator from Louisiana.

He was the one character in the Senate of whom the word "beloved" can be used in its truest and highest sense. JOHN OVERTON was revered because of his lofty character, he was admired because of his mental ability; but he was beloved on both sides of the aisle because of his great human qualities.

Humanity and humanness were so pronounced and outstanding in the character of JOHN OVERTON that these qualities perhaps transcended the other elements of his greatness, which was marked by one of the finest judicial and cultured minds of the country. He was a student of the law and the classics. He was perhaps the greatest classical student in the Senate.

Mr. President, JOHN OVERTON was a man of the very highest integrity. Throughout his whole life he was noted for honor, honesty, candor and his firm stand for right and justice. His influence in Louisiana and the Nation was wide and wholesome. He stood for decency in politics and Government.

JOHN OVERTON's memory was phenomenal. It was a well from which he constantly drew without ever finding the bottom of its richness. In these attributes he was perhaps one of the last remaining symbols of the old South from which he derived his greatest inspiration and whose culture contributed so much to his greatness.

JOHN OVERTON was proud of the South; he was one of its great noblemen, and symbolized its perfection as much as any man that region has ever sent to this body.

Six years ago when I came to the Senate, I was struck by his legal ability, his statesmanship, and great intelligence. He possessed one of the most analytical and one of the keenest minds I have ever seen. Mr. President, it was a privilege to be associated with a man of such great mentality and great integrity. In his passing the Nation has lost one of her great men.

I know that I speak for the entire Senate, my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, when I state that the Senate will not be the same without his presence. An American landmark is gone. As he goes to his reward, let us all say: God bless his memory.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the passing of no Senator in the long time I have been a Member of this body has caused me greater grief than the passing of my warm and devoted friend JOHN OVERTON.

I did not know Senator OVERTON before he came to the Senate, but after he came and I learned to know him he was probably as intimate a friend as I ever had in this body.

Mr. President, I think JOHN OVERTON was one of the noblest characters I ever knew in my life. He was one of the most straightforward, upright and honest of men, and one of the most honorable men I ever knew. I never knew him to express a dishonorable thought or do a dishonorable act. He was the soul of honesty; courteous to a degree and most delightful and pleasing to those he came in contact with in this body.

JOHN OVERTON's life was an open book. His treatment of his brother Senators and his kindness and consideration for all constituted one of the finest traits in his lovable and attractive character. I loved him as a friend.

JOHN OVERTON made a great record here as a legislator. He believed in building up, never in tearing down. He was a member of the old Rivers and Harbors Committee and was devoted to the building up of the rivers and harbors of our country. It was one of his principal activities as a legislator.

He was a member of the Appropriations Committee and took a great part in its activities. As we all know, that is a very busy committee and he was one of the most active men on it. In every transaction and on every question he stood square for the right. He had the esteem and affection of every man on the committee as I remember.

I knew him intimately. I served on the Appropriations Committee during all the years he was a member of that committee. I have tried to think today since I heard the sad news of his passing early this morning of any difference we ever had on that committee or on legislation generally. So far as I can now recall, I do not believe that we ever had a serious difference.

He was a model of patriotism. He loved liberty. He loved humankind and he will live in the memory of all who knew him.

I never knew an abler, a finer, or a more splendid gentleman in all my life. I shall respect and esteem his memory as long as I shall live. I am deeply grieved at his passing.

I want to extend my heartfelt sympathy to his wife and children. The State of Louisiana has lost a great citizen and our common country has lost a great Senator.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the Senate has been inexpressibly touched in its deepest feelings by the death of our beloved colleague Senator OVERTON, of Louisiana.

It was my privilege to know him with a fair degree of intimacy since he first became a Member of this body. I was profoundly impressed by his great legal ability and his thorough understanding of the fundamentals of government and democracy. He was a student of the Constitution. His forebears were intimately associated with national affairs in the very formative period of the Republic, and participated in the determination of the many vital issues which touched the life of the Nation.

He was a man of great personal charm and warmth of friendship. He was a man of the highest integrity and unblemished honor. I could say more, Mr.

President, but it would be only adding words to other words.

The State of Louisiana has suffered the loss of one of her greatest sons. The Senate and the Nation have sustained an irreparable loss. Personally I feel a deep and abiding grief that he should have been taken from the circle in which he served with such great distinction and ability.

When I speak of ability, I mean what I say. He was one of the ablest men with whom it has been my pleasure to be associated in the United States Senate. He was a modest man. He was not always pushing his personality into questions; but whenever he directed his attention to a problem before the Senate he gave it an exhaustive treatment and illuminated it by the intelligence of his great mind.

I deeply sympathize with his family. They have, of course, suffered an affliction which no tongue can express. I deeply grieve at his passing. His memory will stand out as a monument, not of marble, not of stone, but an imperishable monument to his integrity, to his lofty concepts of the functions of government, to the great traditions of the Republic, and to his outstanding ability and grasp of the things which are so vital in American life.

I pay my tribute of love and affection to the memory of JOHN H. OVERTON, of Louisiana.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I am sure that we all are depressed by a sense of inadequacy, if not futility, when one of our colleagues joins the innumerable caravan in its journey to that mysterious realm from which no traveler has ever returned. Nevertheless, we would not wish that an opportunity go ungrasped, in our feeble way, to express our appreciation of the character and services of one so outstanding as JOHN OVERTON, of Louisiana.

I counted him one of my warmest personal friends. It was a friendship in which I took pride and by reason of which I felt greatly honored. When he first came to the Senate, it fell to my lot to render to him what I thought was a routine service to a new Member of the Senate. I forgot about it, but he never did, and he never allowed me to forget it. Too often we are reminded by others of what they have done for us, whether in public or private life. JOHN OVERTON was always reminding me of something I had done for him. He never allowed an opportunity to pass without expressing his appreciation.

I agree with those who have characterized him as a man of outstanding ability, of unusual legal attainments, and of a literary culture and moral fiber which we might well emulate.

William E. Russell, once Governor of Massachusetts, I think, said that it is not difficult to make a living, but it is infinitely hard to make a life. In the case of JOHN OVERTON, his outstanding ability as a lawyer made the process of making a mere living easy, but in the broader field of private and public life, as a public servant and as a man, JOHN OVERTON made a life in Louisiana, in the Senate, and in the appreciation of the American people. We sometimes de-

scribe a man's character as a public servant, his character as an American citizen, his character as a man, as a human being. In all those categories JOHN OVERTON met the test.

I have known since he came here his gracious and charming wife and his beautiful and vivacious daughters—a charming, lovely, typical American family circle. I appreciated them and now appreciate them no less than I appreciate him. My warmest sympathy and deepest affection go out to all of them and to all of his friends as I pay this sincere tribute to his memory, which we shall keep precious in our hearts.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I wish to pay my tribute to the integrity, the ability, the intelligence, and the earnestness of JOHN OVERTON. The thing that always has impressed me about him has been the intensity of his convictions and his willingness to serve his convictions. As has been said, he has been perhaps the foremost legislator dealing with rivers and harbors and inland waterways in our country. I have had much contact with him upon those questions. I do not share all his philosophy in those directions, but I do pay my tribute to the faithfulness and earnestness and the ability and intelligence with which he carried out his views.

Only recently, Mr. President, Senator OVERTON and I were associated together on the question of dealing legislatively with the matter of daylight saving time. With me, that was a matter of convenience, to be settled as may be. JOHN OVERTON profoundly believed in his view about time and the use of time to the very depths of his soul, and he served that conviction.

I brought to the Senate Chamber this morning the flowers which now are on his desk because I wished them to be symbolic of the vigor and earnestness and sturdy character of JOHN OVERTON. I am glad the Senate has permitted me to place those flowers on his desk.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, I mourn the untimely passing of one of our most distinguished colleagues. I shall always cherish the memory of the fact that I was privileged to serve in this body with him, even though it was but for a short time, and that I had the opportunity to know him. To see his brilliant mind operate was to admire his native ability. To see his big heart operate was to love him. I shall miss Senator OVERTON, but I agree with the distinguished Senator from Texas who said that his spirit will live on in this body. His example in advocating what was high-minded, what was noble, what was patriotic, will not soon be forgotten.

Next week the mortal remains of Senator OVERTON will be buried in the soil of his native State, but in the words of Pericles, "The whole earth is in the sepulcher of famous men and their story is not graven only on stone above their native earth, but lives on far away without visible symbol, woven into the stuff of other men's lives."

My sympathy goes out to his bereaved beloved ones. My sympathy goes out to a great State that has lost a public servant of whom Louisiana and the whole

Nation are proud. But I also have a very deep feeling of personal loss which brings home to me the uncertainties in which all of us live in these hectic days. A few days on the floor of the Senate—active, vigorous, wrestling with great national and international problems—and then we pull about us a cloak and lie down to pleasant dreams.

It will not be necessary for Louisiana to erect a monument to Senator OVERTON. His name is indelibly linked with monuments to the conservation of natural resources erected throughout the Nation with his help.

Careless of monument by the grave, he built it in the world—a monument by which men might be taught to remember, not where he died but where he lived.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, word of the loss of Senator OVERTON came to me this morning, and brought to me a very deep feeling of personal sorrow, and it also brought to me a realization of the loss to the Senate and to the country of a very great and outstanding statesman.

Throughout the past several years that I have known him, I have grown to admire him very much for his high ability and for his fine intellect, and, more than that, for that sterling attribute of character which we call fairness. He was gifted with an understanding and with wisdom seldom possessed.

In the past year and a half it has been my privilege to serve on the Public Works Committee of this body, on which Senator OVERTON was the ranking minority member. Often I sought his counsel and advice. His contributions to the work of that committee cannot be measured. The value of his work is beyond measure. His knowledge of the affairs with which that committee dealt added very much to the achievements of the committee and to the guidance of its members.

Today I express my deep sympathy to the members of his family in their bereavement, and to the people of the State of Louisiana, and to the Nation in the loss of a great man, a good man, and a distinguished and able leader in our national life.

His sound, clear advice will long guide his colleagues, and his courageous and wise service will be an inspiration to those who have served with him. Memory of his life will be an enduring monument to his good works.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I have suffered a real personal loss in the death of the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana. I knew him well. I had the privilege of serving in both branches of the Congress with him. I knew his family well. His great devotion to and love for his family and their devotion to and love for him are almost unexcelled in the experience I have had.

I was privileged to serve with Senator OVERTON on many committees, and from my knowledge of him, I know that words are inadequate to describe his integrity, his character, his great ability, and his outstanding public service.

Though he will be taken to his native soil for burial, I think it will be most difficult to know just where in this country to place a monument to his memory. Such

a monument, Mr. President, would not be out of place anywhere in the United States, because in his public service, in both the House and Senate, he knew not the meaning of the word sectionalism.

Not only has the State of Louisiana lost a great son, not only has this body lost an able, honest Member, but, speaking for the West, speaking for those who would develop our great natural resources in order to make us strong, the whole Nation has lost, in the passing of JOHN OVERTON, one of the ablest and most effective advocates of the development of national resources it has ever known.

I express to the bereaved family and to all others who mourn his loss my deepest sympathy.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I am reluctant to attempt to pay tribute and to voice my thoughts concerning JOHN OVERTON. I do not feel that I can fashion in words the impulses of affection, admiration, and high respect which leap to my mind on this occasion. I shall not attempt to dwell upon his accomplishments in this body or upon other aspects of his life. It is rather to the qualities of the man that I should like to address myself in a few words.

I can imagine no contest of life, whether it be physical or mental, in which one could have a sturdier compatriot than JOHN H. OVERTON. If it were physical and you were fighting back to back with him, you could always be certain that nothing would lower his arm except death itself. So it was in the forensics and the polemics that stir these legislative halls.

JOHN OVERTON was a rugged adversary and a rugged advocate. He asked no quarter, he gave none, when his deep convictions were involved in public questions. Yet with it all there was that charm, that sense of fairness, of affection and warmth which made you love him, even while he was contesting, with rare vigor, against the things perchance in which you yourself believed.

Such men are rare. The forest of life from day to day only has a number of the tallest and sturdiest oaks. I have a feeling in this hour of sadness that one of the very tallest of them has fallen before the sweep of time.

I desire to express, though I realize but too well how inadequate that expression may be, my deep sense of personal loss. I shall miss his happy countenance, and I shall think of him for many days to come.

I desire to express my sympathy to his family, for I know that the name of JOHN OVERTON today is in the thoughts not only of his family but of all the people of Louisiana, and, indeed, to a large extent in the sorrowing thoughts of the people of the Nation.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I confess my utter inability adequately to express in words the deep feeling of personal loss that comes to me through the death of our colleague, JOHN H. OVERTON. Senator OVERTON was not only a close friend of mine in the United States Senate, but he was also a neighbor of mine at the Wardman Park Hotel. For many years our association in the Senate and at Wardman Park had been friendly and

intimate. Senator OVERTON was a man with a fine legal mind, which is so indispensable to the handling of the many complexities of governmental problems appearing before us from day to day. He was an unusual legislator, a man with a fine character and a great background for high public service. He truly was a great and good American.

The Senate of the United States obviously will miss his wise counsel and voice. His death is a great loss to his State and to the Nation. I mourn his passing. I send to his family assurances of respect, affection, and sympathy in this, their unusual hour of trouble and bereavement.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I am one of those who were glad to call themselves the friends of Senator JOHN OVERTON, and I believe that he was my friend. I have many times felt the warmth of his friendship, and I have many times felt, when alined with him in a cause he was espousing on this floor, the strength of his friendship and of his character.

The State of Louisiana has lost a great citizen; the Nation, a great statesman. To my mind, Senator OVERTON's outstanding characteristics were, perhaps, his integrity and his courage. He was a man of keen intellect, a man possessing many fine characteristics, as his record in Congress will attest. But I think his courage perhaps and his integrity were outstanding among all the other finer attributes of character he possessed.

I join with this body, with his friends, and with his family in mourning his loss.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, in the passing of Senator OVERTON I have lost a friend and the Senate has lost a very distinguished Member. It has been my privilege to know him since he came to the Senate and to serve with him for 12 years on the Appropriations Committee. As a member of that committee I have been in very close touch with him from day to day. He was sincere, earnest, hard-working, and able. The tolerance of his approach to all problems has always impressed me. During the 12 years I served with him as a member of the Appropriations Committee he was always sound in his approach to the very complex problems which the committee was called upon to meet. He was not only fair, but he considered all questions in a nonpartisan manner. He contributed greatly to the nonpartisan spirit which marks the deliberations of the Appropriations Committee. We shall miss him as a Member of the Senate. We shall especially miss him as a member of the Appropriations Committee, to the work of which he contributed greatly.

In this their hour of supreme sorrow I extend to Mrs. Overton and to each member of the Overton family my sincere sympathy, as I express the deep sense of personal loss which I feel as chairman of the Appropriations Committee, and which I know is shared by all members of the committee with whom he was closely associated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution submitted by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

The resolution was unanimously agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Later in the day the Chair will appoint the committee for which the resolution provides.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore subsequently, under the second resolving clause, appointed the following Senators as the committee to attend the funeral of the deceased Senator:

Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. WHITE, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. BYRD, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. REED, Mr. STEWART, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. BUCK, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. LANGER, Mr. HAWKES, Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. REVERCOMB, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia, Mr. McGRATH, and Mr. MALONE.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as a further mark of respect to the memory of Senator OVERTON, I move that the Senate take a recess until Monday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 52 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, May 17, 1948, at 12 o'clock noon.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, MAY 14, 1948

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

Rev. Father Edward A. McDonough, of the Veterans' Administration, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and eternal God, we dare to stand in Thy presence this morning conscious of our dependency on Thee. Humbly we thank Thee for the many blessings we have received from Thy bounty, especially for the gift of freedom. Make us always to walk in Thy favor. Make this our country an instrument of Thy peace. Enable us to supplant hatred and to sow love. When we have been injured, let us be quick to grant pardon. Where there is doubt and despair, let us establish faith and hope. To those living in darkness and sadness, let us bring light and joy. Heavenly Father, grant that we may not so much seek to be understood as to understand; not so much desire to be honored as to give honor. For it is in giving that we receive, it is in pardoning that we are pardoned, and it is in dying to our own selfish interests that we are born to eternal life.

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 agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5933) entitled "An act to permit the temporary free importation of racing shells."

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On May 5, 1948:

H. R. 334. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of James Harold Nesbitt, a minor.

On May 7, 1948:

H. R. 2622. An act to authorize loans for Indians, and for other purposes; and
H. R. 4090. An act to equalize retirement benefits among members of the Nurse Corps of the Army and the Navy, and for other purposes.

On May 10, 1948:

H. R. 550. An act for the relief of Lizzie Reynolds, administratrix of the estate of Grace Reynolds, deceased;

H. R. 4571. An act for the relief of the estate of Carl R. Nall; and

H. R. 6055. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes.

On May 11, 1948:

H. R. 1498. An act for the relief of Hempstead Warehouse Corp.;

H. R. 3530. An act for the relief of Jesse L. Purdy; and

H. J. Res. 242. Joint resolution to confirm title in fee simple in Joshua Britton to certain lands in Jefferson County, Ill.

On May 12, 1948:

H. R. 1036. An act to provide for the licensing of marine radiotelegraph operators as ship radio officers, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 3089. An act for the relief of Mississippi Central Railroad Co.

On May 14, 1948:

H. R. 5963. An act 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.

ANNUAL MEMORIAL SERVICES

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Committee on Memorials, I take this time to advise the membership that all necessary arrangements have been made for the annual memorial services to be held next Monday, May 17, in this Chamber. The families of our deceased Members who passed on during the past year have been invited, and many have signified that they will be here. We should make every effort to be here next Monday, just before noon. It is a mark of respect, we owe to our deceased colleagues.

The memorial addresses will be delivered by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and by the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN]. Solo selections in the sacred tradition will be offered by our distinguished colleagues the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. TIBBOTT] and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST]. The United States Navy Orchestra will play.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

[Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts addressed the House. Her remarks appear in the Appendix.]

PALESTINE

Mr. JAVITS. 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. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, it seems certain now that the Jewish state in Palestine will be proclaimed tonight. Accordingly, I think the House should know the posture of events as they stand today. Despite every effort to overturn the partition resolution of the General Assembly of the United Nations, partition remains the expressed judgment of the nations of the world as to what is fair and just in Palestine.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that now statesmanship will replace vindictiveness or resentment. I hope that now pacification may come to the Middle East, through recognition by the nations of the world of what exists—the fact that the Jews have earned their state through the only way it seems that independence can be earned, by blood and sweat and tears—and that they may be permitted to inhabit the territory within the borders of their state, as determined by the United Nations General Assembly, in peace. I believe that now the nations of the world in the United Nations should see that the Jewish state enjoys peace, through protecting it against the aggression of the neighboring Arab states by the means which the United Nations Charter now fully affords.

I trust that the United States will now recognize what exists and will cease its efforts to reverse or betray the fate that has enabled the Jews of Palestine to realize nationhood and will recognize the Jewish state, giving it full international rights, and be among the first to do so.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, along the lines expressed by the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS], I have a few observations to make which I think will briefly express my state of mind on the question of partition of Palestine.

I have felt deeply on this subject for years, back in the days when I was a member of the legislature. I have always felt that the only ultimate solution of this age-old question, going back through the last 2,000 years, was the establishment in Palestine of a free and independent Jewish commonwealth.

As chairman of the Democratic Committee on Platform and Resolutions in the last convention, I think I can point with pride to the fact that I played an important part in including in the platform the position of the Democratic Party which stood for a free and independent Jewish commonwealth in Palestine.

Mr. Speaker, there is a welcome stranger seeking our recognition and admission into the council of the nations of the world. A new nation has been established, located in the Middle East. At this very moment its citizens are fighting behind the barricades. It is the new Jewish state in Palestine, which has been established in the face of tremendous odds. It exists. That fact cannot be denied.

Our country has, time and time again, by congressional resolution, Presidential statement, and through other forms of public expression, supported Jewish aspirations in Palestine and in the ultimate establishment there of "a free and independent commonwealth in which all men, regardless of race or creed or color, shall have equal rights."

We are now faced with a clear-cut situation. Our Government should recognize the new Jewish nation in Palestine. The reasons are numerous why we should do so.

First. Such recognition would be in accordance with our stand on this question and the wishes of the American people.

Second. America, conscious of its own history, has been traditionally friendly and helpful to new states.

Third. This state has been set up by one of the least warlike peoples in the world and one which has suffered most at the hands of the war makers.

Fourth. We will be carrying out the United Nations mandate.

Fifth. The Jewish state will be an arm, a real strong right arm, of democracy in the Middle East; of real democracy, that recognizes and will preserve and defend the rights of man and the dignity of the individual. It will stand for what free people stand everywhere.

Leaving aside matters of ethics, sympathy, and of humanity, it would be wise and proper on the basis of pure and noble political considerations to give, by our recognition, every possible aid to the new Jewish state.

On another plane altogether, I should like to suggest that the sooner this state is strong—both by political recognition and internal establishment—the less likelihood there is for trouble in the Middle East between Jews and Arabs. A

weak Judea will invite aggression. A strong Judea will discourage it. All things pass, and so, too, will pass the chagrin and bitterness of those Arab leaders who have fought so long to reverse what was irreversible. They must realize now that justice is indivisible. I call for the recognition by the United States of the new state of Judea. The Palestinian Jew has been long ripe for independence. They have taken it now. A circle of 2,000 years has been completed. Let the United States, traditional symbol of democracy, and the greatest democracy on earth, extend the warmth and the esteem of her people by recognizing forthwith this new and gallant state.

Speaking my own individual thoughts which are firmly embedded upon my mind, I feel that the only solution of this question of the ages is the carrying out of partition and in the cooperation in every way with the establishment of the Jewish state to the full blooming and fruition of nationhood, and enabling the Jewish Nation in Palestine to thrive with strength and vigor, and in the future that nation, through its representatives to take its place with the representatives of other nations of the world in the solution of world problems that confront not only the United States but the troubled people in other nations.

RECOGNIZE PALESTINE INDEPENDENCE

Mr. CELLER. 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. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, for the first time in 2,000 years the Sabbath candles in Palestine will burn on the soil of a Jewish state.

Tonight an old state is recreated. All hail the State of Israel!

Like the Maccabees of old, the Jews valiantly fought off all foes. They now proudly hoist the blue and white flag of Zion with the Star of David.

While Warren Austin lamented that partition could not be implemented, Haganah took Tiberius. While the United Nations delegates were inundated in a sea of words, Haganah stopped the Arabs at Mieshmar Haimek. While Creech Jones gave us a lot of palaver, Haganah took Safed and Kastel. While Secretary Forrestal defended the overcharge of the Arabian-American Oil Co., Haganah smashed open the road to Jerusalem. While the administration said, "Maybe the remedy is federalization or yet maybe truce, or yet maybe mediation," Haganah stormed into Jaffa.

The Jews have shown their true metal. Their fighting spirit has won universal admiration.

Most unrealistically the administration demanded that the Jewish agency delay any declaration of independence. That demand was promptly and properly rejected. Independence will be declared at 6 p. m. this evening.

What now?

The United States should recognize the new state and acknowledge its "belligerent rights" with consequent shipment of arms and supplies. We had better do so and save our face before Russia and the Slavic countries do, before many pan-American Republics and the British Dominions form a willing procession of recognitionists.

To give American recognition would be within true American tradition. How can the United States of America which jealously has guarded its independence for 175 years deny it to the Jews who have sought it for 2,000 years?

I say to the President in all kindness: "Take hold of yourself, head off and push back some of your misadvisers, and do what your heart prompts you to do. Recognize and hail the newly created state of Israel."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VURSELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include an article.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a column appearing in last night's Evening Star by David Lawrence.

Mr. ROSS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article.

CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATORY POWER

Mr. MACKINNON. 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 Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, for the future I wish to venture the prediction that if the question ever comes before the Supreme Court it will determine that Congress possesses the right to investigate the official actions and the conduct in office of every Federal official we have power to impeach and that the right to investigate will be held to carry with it the power to compel the production of all written and oral testimony relating to the official actions and the conduct in office of the official in question. Congress is vested by the Constitution with the power of impeachment of all Federal officers, including the President.

I have heard and reread all the reams of argument on this question which the House listened to the last few days and not one single responsible authority, when thoroughly analyzed, denies this proposition. The fact that prior Congresses have not chosen and that subsequent Congresses may not choose to press their full powers because of the amenities of the various situations is not controlling authority against the existence of the power.

PETROLEUM IN THE NEAR EAST

Mr. SHORT. 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 Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, last fall the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE] headed a subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services which made a trip over the Pacific visiting many of the countries in Asia. I was chairman of a subcommittee of the same Committee on Armed Services that visited several countries in Europe, the Near East, and north Africa.

After our return from Iran and Saudi Arabia we made a full report to the Committee on Armed Services, and at the suggestion of the very able gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] and the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS], a special subcommittee was set up to study the petroleum situation from a purely objective point of view, particularly as it affects our national security. We began hearings on the 19th of January. We heard many witnesses over a 3 months' period. There were over 2,500 pages of testimony.

I am sure the Members of the House will be interested in those hearings which will prove a valuable document in your library for reference purposes. A copy of the report has been sent to each Member and I hope you will find time to peruse it.

Mr. Speaker, without objection, I shall place in the Appendix of today's RECORD, several letters that I have addressed to high Government officials who deal with this subject, also correspondence addressed to me with my replies thereto. These letters will give Members some information regarding the most important aspects of this very vital problem. Busy as Members are I trust they will find time to survey our study.

CARE FOR OUR AGED CITIZENS

Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to address myself to another pressing problem and one that is very near and dear to my heart, namely, whether or not we shall give additional and much needed assistance to the old folk and disabled citizens of our country.

It seems that in these trying times of much confusion and great bewilderment, when we are sending billions of dollars abroad to help people in the foreign corners of this earth, we have either ignorantly or cruelly overlooked a large portion of our own people who need help at home.

Everyone knows that since VE- and VJ-days we have loaned—or, more accurately, given away—more than \$22,000,000,000 to many countries in Europe, Asia, and all parts of this world. Employees in private industry have received increases in their wages and salaries and we have rightly and justly increased the wages of employees in our Government, and have voted thousands of income taxpayers relief through tax reduction. Even congressional annuities have been voted. Congress has appropriated billions in subsidies and parity payments. Indeed we have taken care of practically everyone, including ourselves, except the elders of America.

Mr. Speaker, the chances are about 10 to 1 that a person will be on charity at the age of 70 to 75. There are about two and one-half million persons over the

age of 75, and only 264,000 are self-supporting.

There are approximately 9,000,000 persons over the age of 65—90,000 are wealthy, 360,000 are well-to-do, and 450,000 are self-supporting. At present there are more than two and one-quarter million persons over the age of 65 receiving old-age assistance. The cost is more than \$83,000,000 per month, or almost \$1,000,000,000 per year.

Old-age-assistance payments range from an average of about \$17 in Georgia to \$65 in Colorado. The national average is about \$36 a month.

Everyone knows that with the increased costs of living, old people who need medical care and usually nursing care or domestic assistance simply cannot get by on this paltry sum.

It is unnecessary for me to tell the people in my district that I favored old-age assistance before I ever came to Congress, that I voted for the enactment of the original social-security law, and that for several years I have advocated a minimum pension of \$50 a month for each person—married or single—who has reached the age of 60 and is unable to take care of himself. This is the very minimum they should receive at this time, and we perhaps should increase the amount to \$60 per month.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress now recognizes that the Government has a responsibility for the general welfare of those citizens who have reached a place where they are no longer required to be active in the fields of industry, business, professions, and labor.

It seems to me that there is just as much reason for us to legislate for the care and support of those who are too old to work as it is for us to legislate to train those who are too young. Social security as it exists today falls far short of meeting the needs of our elder citizens, even to provide the meager necessities of life. It has been pointed out by Members of this House, on both sides of the aisle, time and time again, that this situation is serious. The present allowances in what we term "old-age assistance" provide the elder citizen with scarcely enough to purchase one fair meal per day. For housing, nothing; for clothing, nothing; for medical care, nothing; for heat, light, and the myriad of other incidental expenses, nothing. Remember, Mr. Speaker, I am talking of the appropriations we make for our own elder American citizens. I am talking of those who have given a lifetime of service to this country; those who have given us their very best in peacetime and in war; yes, they have given us largely what we have with which we so abundantly provide for the needy in other lands. Our ability to provide for the nations of Europe, Asia, Africa, and our neighbors in North and South America; all of this ability has largely come through the good efforts of these very senior citizens about whom I am speaking. Moreover, they have given us the fine young American men and women to whom we look to protect our liberties.

What are we doing for the comfort and security of these worthy senior citizens? Nothing for the most of them. Then for the few who have been ad-

judged helpless we come forward with the paltry sum provided by the Federal Government of about \$1 per day on an average, and many of them receive far less than that amount.

If I were talking about the sad plight of displaced persons of Europe, Asia, or Africa, this Congress would respond with great enthusiasm. They would cry large tears and their hearts would melt in holy sympathy. But when I talk of our own helpless fathers and mothers we pass it by as though it were a matter that might be considered in some far-off day, after the needs of every other land are met, and as and if the time comes when we have money to spare that we have no other use for, then we might consider an increase in these meager pittance that we are now paying.

Mr. Speaker, it is time now that this Congress should provide an American pension to take the place of this inadequate, inequitable hodge-podge that we shamefacedly call old-age assistance. It is time to face this issue squarely. Either we admit that our worthy elder citizens have a right to a Federal pension for their declining years or they do not have such a right. If they do have such a right, and I maintain that they do, then they are entitled to a decent American pension. If they are not entitled to that, we should be courageous enough to say so. Then we should do away with this farce that now appears on our books which we advertise as social security, which is neither social nor secure, and cease trying to mislead the people.

I say again that the very fact that we have gone on record, by the enactment of the so-called Social Security Act, is an admission that the Federal Government does have a responsibility in this field. The fact that there is an old-age assistance provision is an admission by the Congress that there should be a provision by the Federal Government for the deserving aged citizens. It is conclusive evidence that our elder citizens are entitled to receive from their Government a decent retirement.

Permit me to say further, that having admitted this responsibility, and having made the gesture that now exists toward this end, in the form of old-age assistance, the case is established, and our duty is crystal clear. We should provide a decent American old-age pension for our unemployed elder citizens.

Now, why are we not doing it? Is there one among us who will rise on this floor and say we are doing it? Is there one who will say that our \$1 or less per day in these times is adequate for a decent American to live on? If there is, Mr. Speaker, let him stand up now and be counted. I say there is no defense for this present penurious abortion that we call old-age assistance. It should be replaced at once with a decent American pension worthy of the deserving elder citizens of the greatest Nation on the earth.

Again I pose the question, Why do we not do something about this situation? Is it because we do not have the money? Now, do not make me laugh. A look at our recent experience and history washes away this frail excuse as a mist before a mighty wind. A nation that can fi-

nance a war running into hundreds of billions, and one that can during both war and peace, appropriate thousands of millions for the relief and support of people in other lands, can, without a single doubt, provide the money to pay a decent American pension to her own retired elder citizens.

We have a program to provide such a pension, to take the place of old-age assistance and without disturbing the other features of social security now working in this Congress. This pension is reasonable in amount, merely \$60 per month, to be paid by the Federal Government. It is honorable in its application. It is an American pension, not an old-age charity. It has been written by Members of this Congress, and it is not being promoted to glorify any individual or organization. It is merely an honest, American, reasonable pension for elder citizens. It is being sponsored by a large number of our colleagues, headed by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS] on the majority side, and by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORRIS] on the minority side.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to associate myself with this very timely and worthy endeavor. I urge every Member to align himself with us, and let the leadership of the House take due notice and cooperate that this very acute condition can be resolved before this session ends.

Let our great America awake to this solemn duty and arise to meet her obligation to our own fathers and mothers. Let us "honor our fathers and mothers that our life may be long in the land which the Lord our God has given us."

THE OIL PROBLEM

Mr. SHORT. 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 Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit for the RECORD several letters I have addressed to prominent Government officials with two letters written by the chairman of our Committee on Armed Services, Mr. Andrews, to Hon. John L. Sullivan, and Hon. John Taber; a letter addressed to me from J. H. Holderman and my reply to him; also a letter addressed to me from R. J. Schmunk with enclosed copy of a letter he addressed to the President of the United States, and my reply to Mr. Schmunk's letter.

Now that the special subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee which has made an exhaustive study of the oil problem as it relates to our national security, the members of our committee do not want to let our report die, but we are eager to get quick and positive action on the recommendations we have made.

The following letters deal with various aspects of this most vital problem:

U. S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., May 11, 1948.

The PRESIDENT,

The White House,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am taking the liberty of enclosing a report on the national defense aspects of petroleum, which report

has just been rendered, by unanimous vote, by the Special Subcommittee on Petroleum of the House Committee on Armed Services, of which subcommittee I have had the honor to be chairman.

The enclosed report is as frank, as accurate, as nonpartisan, as unbiased an appraisal as we can make of the national defense situation as affected by the present and long-range petroleum potentialities of this Nation. It is our view, after receiving and studying over 2,500 pages of detailed testimony from industry and Government leaders, that the Nation must move more forthrightly and vigorously in dealing with this serious question of petroleum than it has in the past, if our armed forces and the Nation as a whole are to have adequate supplies for a time of national emergency.

In the report you will find a number of recommendations directed to this very basic, very vital subject affecting our national security. May I invite your attention specifically to these recommendations, and ask, on behalf of the subcommittee, that you seek their implementation as promptly as possible:

1. That the present program attempting the allocation of steel by voluntary means be continued; but if this program gives evidence of failure, if the international situation deteriorates or is not improved, and if within 6 months the armed forces are still without adequate supplies of petroleum to meet an emergency, the voluntary program not be permitted to continue, and at the end of that 6-month period Government controls should be imposed, by recommendation from you to the Congress, to allocate steel to the petroleum industry.

2. That the same procedure be followed, as proposed in (1) above, in respect to rationing of petroleum products.

3. That the National Security Resources Board be directed by you immediately to establish a Commission on Petroleum composed of major and independent oil industry leaders, the consuming public, and appropriate officials representing the Government, to study thoroughly all aspects of the short and long-range petroleum problem facing the Nation, the Commission being directed to submit to the Congress, with Presidential approval, a legislative proposal designed to establish an integrated inclusive petroleum problem for the Nation to follow consistently in the years ahead.

Within the enclosed report of investigation, Mr. President, there are also numerous recommendations as to what the Commission suggested in (3) above could profitably consider. I earnestly hope that your staff will make these recommendations known to you and the National Security Resources Board, so that we may all be confident of their inclusion in the complete coverage of this tremendously vital subject by the Commission.

We bring these matters to your personal attention at this time, because we are genuinely concerned over what the Nation's petroleum situation is now, and what it is to become, from the standpoint of national defense, in the event the Government fails to move promptly now. We sincerely hope you will find your way clear to support our views and that you will take early steps to meet the problem by implementing the actions indicated above.

Respectfully,

DEWEY SHORT,
Chairman, Special Subcommittee
on Petroleum.

U. S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C. May 11, 1948.

HON. GEORGE C. MARSHALL,
Secretary of State, Department of
State, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In the enclosed report of investigation of the Special Committee on Petroleum of this committee you

will find certain recommendations which pertain directly to the Department of State, and I do hope that you will find it possible within the near future to let us know of your reactions to these recommendations and of the action, if any, your Department proposes to take to implement them.

Mr. Thorpe, your Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, together with Mr. Robert Eakins, your petroleum adviser, contributed a great deal to our investigation, and we are deeply grateful to them. It is a matter of great regret to me that you were so encumbered with the great state questions of the day that you were personally unable to appear before us. From my previous contacts with you personally, I know that you would have contributed enormously.

With high personal regard, and with best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,
DEWEY SHORT,
Chairman, Special Subcommittee on
Petroleum.

U. S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., May 11, 1948.

HON. JAMES FORRESTAL,
Secretary of Defense,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In the report of our Special Subcommittee on Petroleum, a copy of which I sent to you a few days ago, there are several specific recommendations which relate directly to the National Military Establishment, including items as the establishment of a stock-piling program, the full development of Elk Hills, the creation of additional petroleum reserves, additional storage facilities for the armed forces, a reconsideration of the exporting of steel to Saudi Arabia, the necessity for Government subsidy to support the rocket-fuel industry, and a variety of other items which, in our view, require prompt attention which we feel should be forthcoming from your office.

I wonder if you would be so kind as to let me have your reactions to the recommendations the subcommittee has submitted, together with your comments as to what action, if any, will be forthcoming—and when—to implement them.

Incidentally, you may find of interest the enclosed copy of a letter I have sent to Secretary Sullivan in regard to the development of Elk Hills. Our subcommittee hopes that you will see that funds for this development are sought before the adjournment of this Congress.

With high personal esteem, and again with my very deep and sincere appreciation for the splendid contribution you made to our study of petroleum, I am,

Sincerely,
DEWEY SHORT,
Chairman, Special Subcommittee on
Petroleum.

U. S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., May 11, 1948.

HON. JULIUS A. KRUG,
Secretary of Interior, Department of
Interior, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Several recommendations in the enclosed report of the Special Subcommittee on Petroleum pertain very directly to the Department of Interior, and I would appreciate greatly your reaction to them, together with your advice as to the action, if any, your Department proposes to take—and when—to implement the recommendations.

I should like to say here that the Department of Interior was most helpful to us in the conduct of this investigation, and I consider it a privilege to say that we are genuinely, deeply grateful for the assistance rendered to us.

Sincerely,
DEWEY SHORT,
Chairman, Special Subcommittee on
Petroleum.

U. S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., May 11, 1948.

HON. CHARLES SAWYER,
Secretary of Commerce, Department of
Commerce, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I should like to invite your attention to the enclosed report of investigation of the Special Subcommittee on Petroleum of this committee, in which it is recommended that a complete reexamination be given to the advisability of exporting steel to Saudi Arabia.

May I have the benefit of your reaction to the subcommittee's recommendation, together with some evidence as to the action your department contemplates taking in this respect?

You will also note that the committee commented directly on the necessity for providing steel to the petroleum industry by Government controls if necessary. I should welcome your views on this point also, as well as your observations on other recommendations in the report which pertain to your department.

At this time I should like to commend highly the former Assistant Secretary of Commerce, Mr. David K. Bruce, who gave excellent testimony to our subcommittee and contributed a great deal to our deliberations.

With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely,

DEWEY SHORT,
Special Subcommittee on Petroleum.

U. S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C. May 11, 1948.

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON,
Chairman, Interstate and Foreign
Commerce Committee, House of
Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CHARLIE: I do hope you will find an opportunity to acquaint yourself with the suggestions contained in the enclosed report of my subcommittee which has just finished its study of petroleum in its relation to national defense.

The enclosed report comments on only two items specifically and wholly within the province of your committee and with which you may wish to concern yourself later. They are, first, the establishment by law of the Interstate Oil Compact Commission as a permanent organization, and second, certain suggestions in respect to the establishment of the three 10,000-barrels-a-day synthetic fuel plants with which you have been concerned in recent months.

I attach great weight to your views on this important subject of petroleum and would welcome any suggestions you may have after you read the enclosed report.

Cordially,

DEWEY SHORT,
Chairman, Special Subcommittee on
Petroleum.

U. S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., May 11, 1948.

HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL,
Chairman, Merchant Marine and Fish-
eries Committee, House of Repre-
sentatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR ALVIN: I am taking the liberty of enclosing an additional copy of the report of the Special Subcommittee on Petroleum, of which I have been chairman, for the purpose of inviting your attention specifically to page 6073 of the report, in which the subcommittee recommends early action to augment the tanker fleet of the United States.

Testimony on this subject before our committee in executive session, emphasizing its relationship to national defense, was of so compelling a nature that I am constrained to bring this matter to your personal attention. There is little question that in dealing with this problem, time is of the essence. I do hope that in the interest of national defense, your committee will see

that the House of Representatives moves promptly and vigorously into this field with the least practicable delay.

In saying this I defer, of course, to your great store of information in this very complicated field, and the subcommittee will appreciate any suggestions or recommendations you may wish to offer in respect to this or any other of the recommendations submitted in the enclosed report.

Cordially,

DEWEY SHORT,
Chairman, Special Subcommittee on
Petroleum.

U. S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., May 11, 1948.

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Appropriations for Armed Services, House of Representatives.

MY DEAR CHARLIE: The enclosed copy of letter from Chairman ANDREWS of the Armed Services Committee to Chairman TABOR of the Appropriations Committee is self-explanatory.

I merely want to call your attention, as an old friend of the Armed Services, to the enclosed report of our special subcommittee which made a rather exhaustive and unbiased study of petroleum as it relates to our national security. I hope you will find time to give it your discriminating perusal and I know that you will assist us always in promoting defense of our country.

Sincerely yours,

DEWEY SHORT,
Chairman, Special Subcommittee on
Petroleum.

U. S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, D. C., May 11, 1948.

HON. JOHN L. SULLIVAN
Secretary of the Navy,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am pleased to forward herewith a copy of the report of the Special Subcommittee on Petroleum of the Armed Services Committee of the House which has recently completed the study of petroleum in relation to national defense.

Your particular attention is invited to page 6061 of this report wherein the naval petroleum reserves are discussed. There you will find that the subcommittee has recommended to the Congress that a complete development of Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 1 be undertaken immediately, and it is urged that you initiate steps to secure the necessary funds to carry out this development program. It is our view that these funds should be made available before the present Congress adjourns.

In anticipation of your action, I have forwarded a copy of the subcommittee's report to the Honorable JOHN TABER, chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, with the request that the Congress appropriate sufficient funds to carry out this program.

Very truly yours,

W. G. ANDREWS, Chairman.

U. S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, D. C., May 11, 1948.

HON. JOHN TABER,
Chairman, House Appropriations
Committee, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. TABER: You will recall my letter to you dated February 19, 1948, wherein I pointed out that the Special Subcommittee on Petroleum of the Armed Services Committee of the House had recommended that sufficient funds be made available to permit the Navy to continue its exploration for oil in Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 4 (Alaska). This request was made prior to the completion of the full program of hearings because of the immediate requirement for this money.

The subcommittee has now completed a rather comprehensive investigation of the general oil situation, which includes Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 1 (Elk Hills), Calif. The subcommittee believes that this reserve constitutes a very valuable source of oil strategically located on the west coast for use in the event of a national emergency. However, the field is not developed to the point where the oil is readily available nor can it be until it is fully developed. Therefore, it is the conclusion of the subcommittee that the Appropriations Committee of the Congress should recommend the appropriation of sufficient funds to carry out this development program.

In this connection, I am enclosing a copy of the subcommittee's report and your particular attention is invited to the penultimate paragraph of page 6061 which relates to this subject.

With very best wishes, I am,

Very truly yours,

W. G. ANDREWS, Chairman.

HOLDEMAN REALTY,
San Antonio, Tex., April 9, 1948.

HON. DEWEY SHORT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SHORT: I just read an article in our morning paper, heading: "Gas ration again bobs up." In this article is the statement, "SHORT declared the situation is so serious in view of the tense international situation the subcommittee may recommend restoration of gasoline rationing." Then you state, "We may be forced to it."

I would like to ask, just what do you mean, "you may be forced to it"? The shortage of crude oil and the shortage of gasoline as propagated by certain interests is nothing less than treasonable, unconstitutional, and a program to keep constitutional Americans out of the oil-producing and refining business in these United States of America.

Of course, these major interests and the politicians associated and working with them can produce oil in some of the foreign countries for less money and even ship it into the United States cheaper than we can produce it here under present conditions, and part of their program is to beat the landowners out of their possibility of royalty income, at least until they, the certain interests, get good and ready to let them participate by holding large acreage tied up for one of the purposes to keep the so-called independent operators from producing and refining and delivering to the public.

There is more oil in the United States, yes, even in just a portion of the States of the United States, than the whole world can use legitimately—what I mean without just burning it up by setting fires to it. All that is needed is to let red-blooded constitutional Americans produce and refine this natural resource, without interference of our constitutional rights, by political and major interests, unconstitutional methods, backed up by decisions of unconstitutional courts.

The main thing you Congressmen are going to need be afraid of in the future is your voting laws that are contrary to the Constitution of the United States and the people's rights.

Some of which are rationing, rent control, building control, proration of crude oil production, and all other laws trying to and telling the people what they can and cannot do. Labor acts, telling a citizen how many hours he can and cannot work a man or woman, the wage he has to pay, etc. All unconstitutional and you and all other Congressmen know it, if you do not you certainly are not fit to be in the Congress of the United States of America.

The mess of labor laws, laws pretending to control labor unions, etc. There is not one iota of need for any labor laws, neither for regulating labor unions, all that is needed

to stop picketing and strikes is to have men at the head of our United States Government who will in part at least fulfill the oath taken when sworn into their office and to perform as an American who believes in and will do his duty as a representative of the people, according to the duty before him as outlined by the Constitution of the United States of America. When a man or woman pickets another's place of business he is overstepping his rights as an American citizen and there is only one place for him or her—locked up where he or she can sit down and picket for the remainder of his or her life, but in a place where it will not prevent some loyal American carrying on as intended and privileged under the terms of the Constitution of the United States.

We, the constitutional Americans, have stood just about all this traitorism we can take and from now on will do our utmost to get rid of all Congressmen who are afraid to do their duty as sworn, or who are just plain traitors, be they Communists or some other kind of nists. Such men as Wallace, Lewis, and hundreds of others are not Americans, and if someone, just an individual, would do just one-tenth what any one of these men has done against our Government and the peoples' rights, well, you know very well what would happen.

You are a Representative from Missouri. Well, I was born in Missouri, a descendant from people who came to this country before it was a United States of America, helped in the building of this country and have no patience with any traitors or with pussyfooting as is being done by many of our men in high office of the United States Government.

If you think the United States is short of petroleum you might do well to inform yourself properly. If you do not know and do not want to find out, then you may be one of the bunch.

Sincerely,

J. H. HOLDEMAN.

U. S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., May 5, 1948.

MR. JAMES H. HOLDEMAN,
San Antonio, Tex.

DEAR MR. HOLDEMAN: There is, of course, little point in engaging in an extended argument such as your letter of April 9 could properly provoke. But I cannot withhold this comment:

Even a slight familiarity with my voting record in Congress for the past 16 years, only a brief survey of my many debates on the floor of the House of Representatives, a casual understanding of the views of my congressional district, would make patently absurd any allegation that I am one who has sought controls by the Government over any segment of the American economy.

The fact is, few men in the Government today have moved more consistently than have I in direct opposition to a large Federal Government, expensive bureaucracy, and extensions of Government controls.

So your rather abusive letter to me is sadly misdirected. It is unfortunate that you did not attempt to determine some of these facts before going to such efforts to identify me with attitudes and actions which have been anathema to me for many years.

And, as for facts in respect to the oil situation, it may be helpful to you to know that the Special Subcommittee on Petroleum, of which I have been chairman, has received testimony from over half a hundred oil industry, Government, and armed services leaders on the very subject as to whether there is an oil shortage and what should be done to meet the present oil problem. This testimony was received almost daily throughout January, February, and most of March of this year. It comprises over 2,500 pages of transcript—all of it from men who have spent their adult lives in the oil busi-

ness, men who are determining our military strategy today, men who conduct our foreign relations in oil. They are highly responsible men, men highly placed in the major and independent industries, men fully qualified to know whereof they speak, men who have demonstrated their knowledge of this complex subject.

After an exhaustive study of the testimony and statistics submitted by these men, I and the other 10 members of the Special Subcommittee on Petroleum, who collectively represent over 3,000,000 people from New York to California, have agreed unanimously, regardless of political party, that the Nation cannot safely drift along on this important question. Without entering into the details, I may say that there is absolutely nothing in our record of hearings from the leadership of the oil industry to support your view that we have enough oil here, discovered and undiscovered, to supply the world. On the contrary, the evidence is quite conclusive that this Nation, requiring above all other nations in the world an adequate supply of petroleum to function properly, now faces serious, basic decisions on oil which must be promptly resolved. The question of petroleum facing us today is not, as you say, whether we are able to supply the world. The question is: what we must do to insure that our own immediate needs can be met—and more important, but unfortunately rarely considered, how we can insure an adequate supply of oil for our Army, Navy, and Air Force in time of war.

Without further comment, I suggest that you write to the clerk of the House Committee on Armed Services for a copy of these hearings, read them yourself, then reach your own conclusions as to the state of the Nation today in respect to petroleum.

And then you, too, will have the facts. Then you, too, will discover that we are today some two to three million barrels a day short of what we will need in the event of war. Glancing over the views expressed in your letter, I suspect that your lack of acquaintance with such facts, with which our hearings abound, has had something to do with the nature of your comments to me.

Sincerely,

DEWEY SHORT,
Chairman, Special Subcommittee
on Petroleum.

AMERICAN AUTOMOBILE ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D. C., May 10, 1948.
HON. DEWEY SHORT,
United States House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SHORT: As chairman of the Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services, which reported last week on the petroleum outlook, you and every member of your committee deserve congratulations on a thorough, realistic and workmanlike job.

On March 18, the executive committee of the American Automobile Association adopted a resolution urging that the President appoint a committee to investigate all phases of the petroleum situation and to make recommendations for a national oil policy that will safeguard the vital interests of the Nation.

Now that your committee, after lengthy hearings, has recommended the setting up of a commission, it is to be hoped that speedy action will result. There is enclosed for you herewith copy of a letter sent today to the President of the United States in support of the recommendation of your subcommittee.

The Commission recommended in your report differs somewhat from the type of independent committee we had in mind, but, as stated in our letter to the President, the important thing is to get an all-out study under way now. Your report recognizes that military impacts will undoubtedly affect many elements of the national economy, and we are most happy to note that in this con-

nection provision is made for public representation on the Commission. Most certainly we hope that in setting it up, consideration will be given to the important role of highway transportation, not only in a peacetime economy, but as a major defense asset as well.

Yours very truly,

R. J. SCHMUNK,
President.

AMERICAN AUTOMOBILE ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D. C., May 10, 1948.
THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: On March 18, the executive committee of the American Automobile Association adopted a resolution urging that the President appoint a committee to investigate all phases of the petroleum situation and to make recommendations for a national oil policy that will safeguard the vital interests of the Nation.

A copy of this resolution was transmitted to you by telegram and we received a reply from John R. Steelman saying that the proposal was being given sympathetic consideration. We received similar responses from interested departments of the Government, but as yet nothing specifically has been done to activate a committee of the kind we suggested.

Hence, we are greatly interested in the recommendation contained in the report on petroleum, made last week, by a Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives, headed by Representative DEWEY SHORT, Republican of Missouri. This report was highly pessimistic as to the petroleum outlook, both from a national defense standpoint and from the standpoint of the health of the national economy.

It urged that you direct the National Security Resources Board to set up a commission to investigate and report on the Nation's oil problem and to present to Congress a rounded-out national oil policy. While the commission suggested by the subcommittee would differ somewhat from the type of committee recommended by the AAA, we feel that the important and urgent thing is to get the study underway now, and we therefore heartily endorse the subcommittee's recommendation.

Under the recommendation there would be included on the commission representatives of the public, and in this connection we submit that it is of the utmost importance that highway transportation be represented.

Yours respectfully,

R. J. SCHMUNK,
President.

U. S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., May 14, 1948.
MR. R. J. SCHMUNK,
President, American Automobile Association, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SCHMUNK: Thank you very much for your kind letter of May 10, 1948.

On behalf of the members of our special subcommittee of the armed services to study petroleum, I wish to express appreciation for the complimentary things you say about our oil report. We are naturally very much pleased with the fine reaction from prominent people and organizations all over the country to the study we have made.

It is gratifying to know that a great organization such as yours, which is well acquainted with this complex and vital problem, is fully aware of the crying need for an over-all study to establish a permanent national oil policy that will safeguard the interests of our Nation.

While your association might differ with our subcommittee on the kind of commission to be set up by the National Security Resources Board to study the oil problem, we certainly agree with you that the important

thing is to get the study under way. The imperative need is for quick and positive action, particularly so far as our national security is concerned.

With kind regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

DEWEY SHORT,
Chairman, Special Subcommittee on
Petroleum.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOFFMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

THE LABOR SITUATION IN ST. PAUL, MINN.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, while worrying about Russia, why not do a little on our own account?

A LITTLE WORRYING ON OUR OWN ACCOUNT

The railroad strike which, if continued, would have sent many of us hungry to bed, the coal strike which, had it persisted, would have kept many of us shivering from the cold, are over—temporarily. But the daily press tells us that armed goon squads in Detroit are preparing to, by force, as similar squads did in 1937 and since, keep men and women, who must work if they would eat, from their jobs, and, incidentally, if resisted, crack a few heads.

In far-away California, workers in the fields are threatened with violence if they attempt to harvest vegetables to be shipped east to feed us.

In city after city, by force, packing houses which process the farmers' cattle and hogs so that you and I may have meat, lard, and a half dozen byproducts, are keeping those whose services are necessary if the industry is to continue to serve us, from their jobs.

The morning press states that in South St. Paul, Minn., some 200 angry non-strikers who want to work crowded into the office of Governor Youngdahl and demanded that they be given protection which the police were unable to give. Twenty-one officers endeavoring to open packing-house gates were knocked to the ground by the strikers, and the press reports that previous appeals for protection to Governor Youngdahl, who is one of Stassen's ardent supporters, were unavailing.

Youngdahl is reported to have said that he would not mind pushing a few of the scabs around. That is only rumor. Let us hope it is not true—that the Governor makes that plain.

It might be suggested to Mr. Stassen, who is criticizing the Taft-Hartley Act, that he go home and talk a little to his own Governor about law enforcement and violence, the destruction of property and labor relations generally. No doubt such a talk would be politically embarrassing to Candidate Stassen. It might offend his CIO supporters, but people generally would approve, for they are not in favor of disobedience to civil law.

That country papers are not fooled by Stassen's suaveness, his verbal gymnastics, or his ability to avoid direct, clear

answers to questions, is shown by a typical editorial of May 6 from the *Allegan Gazette* published in Allegan, Mich., by a son—of whom I have the honor to be the father.

The editorial reads as follows:

STASSEN USED F. D. R.'S TECHNIQUE IN OHIO

For the past few years Senator ROBERT A. TAFT has been the strong man of the Republican Party. While the rest of the potential GOP Presidential candidates were standing around doing their stint in political side shows with dampened fingers in the wind to see which way the winds of political expediency were blowing, Senator TAFT was hard at work on a more stable, better Government.

As a result of his efforts the Taft-Hartley labor law was passed. It was a Republican measure passed by a Republican Congress. Naturally, TAFT made some enemies, mostly among labor leaders who saw the act as a threat to their powers.

Stassen went to Ohio intending to use this feeling against TAFT in the industrial centers in his fight for delegates.

To put it bluntly, Stassen—supposedly a Republican—sought the Democratic and labor vote in his quest for GOP delegates.

He didn't meet with any marked success, but in the opinion of the *Gazette* it is a sneaking, sniveling way to get delegates. Some call it politics, but it is not party politics—and it just goes to show that a man who fights for his country, his party, and his beliefs, even has a fight on his hands in his home State when a fellow party candidate seeks success by using opposition party votes.

Stassen is using the Grand Old Party exactly as Roosevelt used the Democrats—simply as a vehicle in which he plans a ride to power—and it's "to hell with the party" as far as he's concerned. (L. W. H.)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MUNDT asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he expects to make later in the day in the Committee of the Whole and include certain extraneous matter and newspaper clippings.

PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS AT THIS POINT

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. 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 Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it is not an accident—it is no mere matter of chance that the people of the State of Georgia are staunch believers in liberty, States rights, and individual freedom.

Founded in 1733 by Lord Oglethorpe, Georgia was 43 years old when she and 12 other British Colonies in the new world proclaimed the United States of America a free nation. Since 1776 when independence was claimed through that famous document, down to this good day, Georgians have regarded liberty as a divine blessing, carrying with it the obligation and responsibility to defend it.

Typical of the Georgian's gratitude to Almighty God and of his love of liberty and independence, are the opening words in an order of Gov. Samuel Elbert appointing three public officials in the year 1785, while the recollections of the struggle for independence were fresh in the

minds of the people. This public document began with these words:

The people of the State of Georgia, by the grace of God free, sovereign, and independent.

While we do not begin our public documents with those words today, nevertheless it does not embarrass the people of Georgia today to acknowledge our gratitude to Almighty God for liberty, nor to assert that we are, by His grace, free, sovereign, and independent.

While there are in some sections of our country being developed hotbeds of communism and subversive activities, unmistakable evidences of which we have seen in this Capitol within a matter of hours, Georgia is endeavoring to instill into the youth of her rising generation the lessons of civic responsibility, and the duties and obligations of citizenship, which go hand in hand with freedom and liberty.

It is a matter of pride to me that there are in Washington today nearly 1,000 boys and girls from the Fifth Congressional District of Georgia, who are here to participate in the annual exercises honoring those fine boys and girls all over the United States, who constitute the school safety patrol. I think that this recognition of their work with the police departments of their respective cities is a great inspiration and incentive to good citizenship. Early in life they are being given opportunity to make a contribution to safety and law enforcement, and their acceptance of this opportunity is most gratifying.

I ask the indulgence of the Members of the House today that I may extend to these boys and girls from the Fifth District of Georgia a hearty welcome to the seat of our National Government. They are accompanied on this visit by officials of the city of Atlanta, of Fulton County, of De Kalb County; by Chief Herbert Jenkins and officers of the Atlanta Police force; by Chief Neal Ellis, Sheriff Bud Foster, and officers of the Fulton County Police force; by Sheriff W. L. Broome, of De Kalb; by Fulton County Commissioners Charlie Brown, Tom Camp, and R. L. Doyal; by Mrs. L. H. Axelrod, president of the Atlanta Parent-Teachers Council; by Mrs. Z. V. Peterson and Mrs. Warren H. Bradley. Also accompanying these boys and girls on this trip are Capt. Marion Riley, Fulton County Police force; Sgt. Nich Eason, Fulton County Police force; Assistant Chief Kohler, East Point, Ga.; and Officer Paul Smith and J. L. Carney, of the Atlanta City Police force. This is a fine group of boys and girls, who in just a few more years will take their places of adult responsibility in the ranks of America's good citizens.

Last year only about half this number of our boys and girls came to Washington for these ceremonies. This trip has been made possible this year for nearly twice the number through the contributions of time and money of many public-spirited citizens and groups of our district. One of our public-spirited citizens of Atlanta, Mr. William A. Cetti, turned in a total of \$1,655 toward the expenses of this trip, which was contributed by civic-minded, public-spirited citizens and organizations, including the At-

lanta Federations of Trades, Painters' Council and Local Unions, Fulton County Employees' Union, Fraternal Order of Eagles, electrical workers' union, iron molders' union, sign painters' union, paperhangers' union, plumbers' and steam fitters' union, Cascade Heights Service Station, elevator constructors' union, fire fighters' local union, carpenters' union, sheet metal workers' union, Williams Printing Co., street railway employees' union, brickmasons' local union, Fulton County local union, ironworkers' local union, machinists' local union, and bakery workers' local union. Individual contributions also were made by public-spirited citizens, and a substantial contribution by the Decatur Order of Elks.

It gives me pleasure to welcome these members of the school safety patrol, and those officials and friends who have accompanied them, without whose presence and care the trip would not have been possible. I express the sincere hope that this visit will be enjoyable to them in the fullest sense of the word, and that they will return in safety, carrying with them a better understanding of the workings of our National Government, and a renewed devotion to her free institutions.

PALESTINE-JEWISH STATE

Mr. ISACSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ISACSON. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, May 15, 1948, is a historic day for the Jewish people of the entire world. Tomorrow after hundreds of years of dispersion, the Jewish people are going home. The Promised Land becomes a reality for the homeless Jews who now line the seaports of the Mediterranean, their faces turned toward the Holy Land. For them it means that they will return to the land of Israel, where for them there will no longer be any homelessness.

I am aghast at the efforts being made even at this late moment by the administration to prevail upon the pioneers in Israel that they do not set up their Jewish state. It is testimony to their courageousness that disregarding all the monstrous pressures that are being put upon them that tomorrow, May 15, that Jewish state will be set up. The Jewish people are not the derelict objects of charity. They are a proud people. They ask that they live in peace and dignity as a nation among nations, and be permitted to take their place in the world as a member of the family of nations. I raise my voice in salute to the new Jewish state—Eretz Yisroel.

I raise my voice in praise of its heroic defenders.

I raise my voice and call out that our own administration recognize this new state and forthwith raise the embargo against supplying it with arms.

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?

There was no objection.

CONSENT CALENDAR

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order on Tuesday next to call the Consent Calendar.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of next week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

PALESTINE JEWISH STATE MUST BE RECOGNIZED BY THE UNITED STATES

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, Americans of all faiths and beliefs must have derived great satisfaction—as I did yesterday—when the Jewish State was proclaimed in Palestine. I felt as if my eyes had witnessed the unfolding of a glorious chapter of Biblical history. Twice before, the Jewish nation had risen and fallen. And now it was born again, almost within our vision.

This latter day miracle could not have been accomplished by a people less loyal to their dreams and convictions than the Jews. A Jewish poet once wrote:

Give us a stone on which to rest our heads; then we shall dream of home.

Perhaps in this single line, may be found the reason why the Jewish people have struggled so ardently for their promised land. A Jewish homelessness for 19 centuries, multiplied by the almost continuous persecution of Jews during this period, has made the idea of a national home an omnipresent dream in the minds of the Jewish people. Today, that dream is a reality. The Jewish state has been reestablished in the land of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.

The United States cannot be indifferent to the great political event which unfolded itself yesterday in the Holy Land. Nurtured in the finest traditions of our own American democracy, the Jews of Palestine have created the only true democratic state in the Middle East. If for no other reason than our ideological kinship with this newest democracy, our Government should extend the hand of friendship to the Jewish state in Palestine which is still in the throes of its birth pangs.

But there are other reasons why we should welcome the new Jewish state and accord to it our benevolent recognition. The Jewish national home in Palestine had received the strongest sup-

port of the American people ever since its creation in 1917. President Wilson stated in behalf of our Government in 1919:

I am persuaded that the Allied Nations, with the fullest concurrence of our own Government and people, are agreed that in Palestine shall be laid the foundations of a Jewish commonwealth.

This declaration was followed a few years later by an official recognition of the Jewish National Home in Palestine by the United States in the Anglo-American Convention of 1924. Two congressional resolutions, adopted by both Houses of the Congress, affirmed American sympathies in favor of the ideals of Zion. Statements of support for Jewish aspirations in the Holy Land were issued by every American Chief Executive since President Wilson. Six months ago, the American delegation to the General Assembly of the United Nations led the fight at Lake Success for the establishment of a Jewish state by advocating the adoption of the partition plan for Palestine.

All these facts and events have contributed toward a traditional American policy of interest and friendship for Jewish national aspirations in Palestine. Recent military events in the Holy Land, coupled with yesterday's official proclamation by the Jews of Palestine announcing the existence of the Jewish state, cannot be lightly regarded by a government which now faces world events with a more realistic outlook than ever before. The partition of Palestine was ordained by the United Nations. It is now a fact. The Government of the United States should accept this fact—which it helped bring about—by extending hearty felicitations to the Jews of the world on the occasion of the fulfillment of their dream of Jewish statehood. I feel sure that most of my distinguished colleagues in Congress, as well as the overwhelming majority of the American people will want to join in these sentiments.

I know of no people more deserving of statehood. I know of no people who have made such outstanding contributions to world civilization and to the welfare and progress of every land in which they lived and live, and yet went on dreaming of and fighting for national renaissance in their own historic land.

There was a time when the United States of America could feel rightfully proud of its attitude, policies, and action on behalf of the Jewish people. In years gone by, we opened our own gates to Jewish immigration without any discrimination. But more than that, our Presidents have appeared time and again as the champions of Jewish rights in the world. Wherever Jews were persecuted, they knew that they could look to Washington for protection and sympathy. Wherever anti-Jewish persecution took place, the United States could be counted on to step in and raise its voice in defense of the Jewish people.

During the last few months, the Government—though not the people of this land—seems to have deviated from the path of clear and full-fledged support for the reestablishment of the Jewish state in Palestine. At a time when the Jewish

people, massacred by the millions and brutally persecuted in Europe, needed our help most, I am afraid we failed them. Considerations of oil, great power rivalry, and imperialist interests proved to be stronger with our Government than basic humanitarian principles, and commitments and obligations, freely and publicly undertaken by us.

I, for one, have had very great doubts all along with regard to the interpretation of our national interest in the Middle East as adopted by certain circles in the State Department. I could not help feeling that what the United States should have been interested in in the Middle East, as everywhere in the world, was the creation and furtherance of democratic communities, and not the freezing of the present reactionary, feudalistic, and backward set-ups.

When I consider our interests in the Middle East from a long-range viewpoint, I say to myself that, politically, we would want the lands of the Middle East to practice democracy as we do here. Socially and economically, we would want them to develop in a manner which would improve the local conditions of life and open up both the resources and the markets of the region. In other words, however we look at it, American interests, seen from a long-range view, dictate speedy modernization of the Middle East in all spheres of human endeavor.

Now, even people who know very little about that crucially important area of the world know that thus far there is only one vanguard of progress and modernization in the Middle East, and that is a Jewish state in Palestine. In recent weeks, Jewish Palestine has shown that, small as it is in size and population, it possesses not only the greatest industrial, economic, and cultural potential but also the most powerful military potential in the Middle East.

The creation of a Jewish state in Palestine is not only a great historic event which will provide a solution for one of the greatest tragedies in the world but is also a very hopeful development in world politics from the American point of view. Our mistaken policies have already done considerable damage to our prestige and to the prestige and authority of the United Nations. Let us not repeat this mistake. Let us see things straight. And when we see them straight we shall be happy that at long last the Jewish state in Palestine has become a fact. Let us welcome the Jewish state into the family of nations and establish relations of lasting friendship with this vanguard of western civilization in the Middle East. United Nations obligations, moral obligations, and spiritual obligations demand that the Government of the United States recognize the new Jewish state, Israel.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight of Monday next to file any rules it may desire to report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record, and further ask that I may include certain extraneous matter in the remarks I expect to make in the Committee of the Whole today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time in order to announce the program for next week.

It is expected that the rule making in order the anti-Communist bill will be adopted and that general debate will be concluded on the bill today.

On Monday the only order of business will be the memorial services. I take this opportunity to express the hope that as many Members as possible will be present for these services.

I have arranged for the calling of the Consent Calendar on Tuesday; and, of course, the Private Calendar will be called on Tuesday. I understand there is an omnibus bill on the Private Calendar that we may be able to dispose of on that day. Then, if general debate on the anti-Communist bill, H. R. 5852, has been concluded, and I trust that it will be, we will take up the reading of that bill for amendment.

As for the program for the balance of the week, as near as I can determine it now, we have as unfinished business before the House the bill H. R. 3642, the military installations bill. It is also expected that a rule will be granted on House Joint Resolution 161, providing for the World Health Organization. We also hope to take up House Concurrent Resolution 129, having to do with the investigation of the island possessions in the Pacific; House Resolution 591, making in order consideration of the bill S. 1006, amending the Mineral Leasing Act; and H. R. 2588, the postal service bill, pertaining to the operation of Government-owned motor vehicles. In addition, other rules may be called up, possibly including the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BILL, 1948

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 582 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill (H. R. 5852) to combat un-American activities by requiring the registration of Communist-front organizations, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to

exceed 5 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Un-American Activities, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the substitute amendment recommended by the Committee on Un-American Activities now in the bill, and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the 5-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of such consideration, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and the amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] and yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution provides consideration of H. R. 5852, a bill to combat un-American activities by requiring the registration of Communist-front organizations, and for other purposes.

If this rule is adopted—and I am sure it will be—it will provide consideration of a bill which is urgently needed to protect the United States and the American people from the threat of slavery under the Russian totalitarian system of government.

Russia has made it plain that nothing will satisfy the lust for power and the greed of her dictator except the complete enslavement of the entire world. The Russian war machine has crushed many of the smaller countries of Europe and imposed the Communist dogma upon them. The armed might of this Nation, which is growing, and which will continue to grow each day, is a warning to Russia that her military tactics will avail her nothing toward establishing communism in the United States. But she is relying on another Communist tactic in her attempt to dominate America—Russia is trying to destroy the foundations of our Federal Republic by boring from within. At present we have defense against this Communist infiltration, but this bill provides us with considerably more.

This bill will make it a crime to conspire or to engage in any activity looking toward the establishment of a totalitarian dictatorship in the United States to be under foreign control. It would deny Government employment to Communists. It would require Communist and Communist-front organizations to register with the Department of Justice. It would compel Communist organizations to label their mail with the word "Communist" and it would require them to describe themselves as Communists in every radio broadcast sponsored by them. In other words, one of the provisions of this bill is similar to the Federal laws which require manufacturers of poisonous substances to label their product "poison."

An organized campaign against this bill has been in progress for the past

several months. Members of Congress have been deluged with printed cards and form letters originating in two or three different cities. The cities of which I speak have always been known as the hotbeds for subversive activity, and I am not surprised that the opposition to this bill originates there. It is undeniable that some opposition has arisen to this bill. Some of this opposition comes from loyal Americans who are misinformed about the purposes of the bill; but let us inquire into the nature of the greater portion of this opposition. From what quarter and from what kind of people does this opposition come? The most casual knowledge of human nature tells us that it comes from those whose activities would be restricted by the bill. Well, let us see who those people are. Their identity is more or less obvious from a cursory reading of the bill.

The bill makes it a crime for any person to conspire or attempt to set up a totalitarian dictatorship in the United States if such dictatorship would be under foreign control. It is obvious that this bill will be opposed by all those who advocate the overthrow of this Government.

But these opponents of the bill have not even the courage and honesty to come out in the open and say, "I oppose this bill because I am a Communist, and this bill will restrict my activities." Of course, they do not say that. Honest men could be expected to state their opposition to a measure in an honest, forthright manner; but you could not expect such honesty from those whose activities this bill seeks to restrict. My point, in a nutshell, is this: Communists are ashamed to admit they are Communists—like lepers are ashamed to admit they are lepers. Even the Communists recognize communism as a loathsome disease, and they are ashamed of their affliction. That is the reason most of the opponents do not state the true reason for their opposition—they are ashamed of it. As you would expect, the opponents of this bill criticize it as "unconstitutional" fascistic and arbitrary. They rely upon hackneyed generalities in an attempt to influence some loyal Americans against the bill. Our action here today will show whether Congress has been bamboozled by these Communist tactics.

But let us consider some of the generalities that have been offered in opposition to this bill. First, its critics say it is unconstitutional. In answer to that objection, I would like to point out that some of the greatest constitutional lawyers in the country have passed on this bill, and they have held that it is constitutional. Now, these Communists might have advance information on how the Supreme Court will decide on this bill—they may have information about the Court and its members which is not available to me—but I agree with the constitutional lawyers—who are guided by past interpretations of the Constitution—I believe the bill is constitutional.

Now, as for the bill being fascistic. I think we can take that criticism with a grain of salt. Communists label everybody a Fascist who opposes communism.

and I am not surprised they have applied the label to this bill.

Another criticism offered to the bill is that it vests within the Attorney General the arbitrary power to prosecute, try, and judge persons violating the provisions of the bill. When I heard this objection to the bill, I was not only surprised—but also mildly amused. Here are the people who have long advocated the persecution and harassment of businessmen through administrative processes. Here are the people who wanted to continue forever the control measure under which Government bureaus would prosecute, try, convict, and punish businessmen. These people who wanted to see the free enterprise system crushed—and our Nation's businessmen bankrupted—through a systematic persecution under the New Deal—these people say this bill puts too much power of discretion in the Attorney General. To this objection I would say that the New Dealers who built the present administrative guillotine for businessmen should have remembered the fate that befell Dr. Guillotine. He learned that a knife cuts both ways—and now the New Dealers are being taught the same lesson. Their invention of the bureaucratic system is going to be used against the closest allies of the New Deal—the Communists.

Under this rule, the bill may be debated for 5 hours. This is a most generous amount of time in view of the present pressure of other business, but the Rules Committee realized the importance of this bill, and recognized that a good many Members would want to express themselves on it.

The Rules Committee was asked to divide the time equally between those favoring the bill and those opposing it. In harmony with the weight of precedent, and in view of the general sentiments of the Members, the time has been allotted in the usual manner; one-half to the chairman and one-half to the ranking minority member of the Committee on Un-American Activities. However, the Rules Committee has been assured that fair distribution of the time will be made by those in control of it, and those opposed to the bill will be given ample time to express themselves.

Points of order against the bill have been waived to protect it from parliamentary technicalities.

I think a great majority of us are in general agreement with the purposes of this bill, and I am sure we all appreciate the tremendous amount of work the members of the Un-American Activities Committee have put into this bill. They have conscientiously devoted themselves to their task, and I think they deserve the gratitude of the American people for the remarkable job they have done.

I doubt that there are more than a handful of Members who will vote against this resolution, and thereby try and prevent consideration of this bill which is so urgently needed to protect the American way of life.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, considering the action of the House yesterday with respect to House Joint Resolution 342 directing all executive departments and agencies of

the Federal Government to make available to the committees of the House and Senate information and confidential reports in their files and the vote thereon, I fully realize that anything I might say will not change any votes on the rule or bill now before us for consideration.

Personally, I regret exceedingly that the chairman of the Rules Committee has seen fit to try to besmear the fair name of three large cities. I want to say to him that the people of these three large cities were, and are now, just as patriotic and loyal in the First and Second World Wars as the people residing in the gentleman's district in Illinois. Though the cities may have a large population of citizens of foreign parentage, they have clearly proven their loyalty and patriotism and I feel it is unfair for the gentleman to make such statements.

I also resent the statement that only those who are in favor of overthrowing our form of government will oppose this resolution and regard it also as unfair, unjustified, and unwarranted.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I regret I cannot yield. I have promised time to many Members. I cannot even make the speech I had expected to make because there is not sufficient time. In view of the limited time for debate, therefore, I am obliged to forego much that I wanted to say and will confine myself in giving briefly the underlying reasons as to how and why this resolution and bill comes before the House.

Mr. Speaker, I was in hopes of giving the House an authoritative résumé of the factual history covering the creation of the Committee To Investigate Subversive and Un-American Activities in 1935 and its activities up to the present. At that time it was evident that Hitler's stooges and paid agents, under the leadership of Sylvester Viereck, Pelley, the Nazi Bund, and many others were active in their attempts to create discord in America. The working Nazis and Fascists in our country then were the real danger to our democracy and it was borne out by the report of the investigation made by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], chairman of the first investigating committee. On his committee's recommendations, Congress adopted two measures to safeguard our interests.

Shortly after the expiration of the life of the McCormack committee—it had been authorized to investigate during the Seventy-fourth Congress—it was ascertained that un-American and subversive, and even seditious, activities were continuing. I advocated the passage of a second resolution to extend the investigation and succeeded in having the Committee on Rules to report it favorably and the gentleman from Texas, Mr. Martin Dies, was appointed chairman of the second committee. He pledged himself to the then Speaker, to me, and to the House that he would fearlessly continue the work begun by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]. But, unfortunately, instead of investigating the Bund, Nazi, and Fascist activities, his committee devoted itself to investigating labor organizations and var-

ious departments. At that time there was no hysteria against communism.

But, as J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the FBI, stated, yes, and as has been stated by the proponent of this bill, the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the Nazis and Fascists are just as dangerous to the welfare of our country as are the Communists.

I was fully aware of this and consequently demanded that Mr. Dies' committee begin investigating—as was intended—the activities of the Nazis and Fascists in the United States. This was in 1937, 1938, 1939, and before we were forced into preparing our defense against the fast approaching danger of fascism and nazism in our own country.

Gen. "Wild Bill" Donovan was urged to make an investigation as to the spending of the millions of dollars by Paul Goebbels, Hitler's propaganda agent in the United States, in Mexico, and in Central and South American Republics; and the various organizations that were formed and financed by the Nazis to create fifth column in our country.

The failure of Mr. Dies' committee to devote itself to investigating these many-fold seditious activities on the part of the Hitler hirelings and quislings was the reason I was obliged to point out the failure of the committee to perform its duties as contemplated by the resolution. I have continued to insist that the Fascists and all subversive activities as well as communism should be investigated.

Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, the committee, even after Mr. Dies ceased to be chairman, has followed the same course and, instead of investigating Nazi and Fascist activities, continued to investigate labor unions and Government departments, and overlooked the activities of those who had cooperated with George Sylvester Viereck, the German-American Bund, and other organizations that were spreading subversive propaganda. It was the investigative work of the Federal Bureau of Investigation at that time that was responsible for the indictment of many persons for alleged seditious acts and convictions were later obtained.

Consequently, I still continued to insist that the committee should investigate all un-American activities, not excluding in any way the so-called communistic fronts. To me all who conspire and work to aid our enemies and create discord in our country should be investigated and their activities brought to the attention of the American people. But I repeat, unfortunately, the Committee on Un-American Activities, with the exception of one short hearing as to the Nazi activities, has devoted itself to assailing and attacking thousands of progressive, patriotic, and loyal organizations and citizens. This, it appears to me, is being done to destroy organized labor.

It seems to me that we are following closely the pattern and policies of Hitler, who, with the aid given him by the I. G. Farben cartels and by other industrialists in Germany, brought about the overthrow of Germany. The industrialists who financed Hitler were made to believe and did believe that their interests would be amply safeguarded by a Fascist government, under which they would be

able to destroy the then to them annoying labor organizations. They succeeded with Hitler by making communism the issue and it seems to me that the pattern of that policy is being duplicated in this country.

Mr. Speaker, ever since the end of the war propaganda has been carried on in this country by certain militaristic gentlemen and by a large group of industrialists who seek to blind the American people from the real danger of the Fascist-minded groups in our country. I concede that, after the Pearl Harbor attack, some of the Fascist-Nazi subversive activities ceased. But the activities of the Committee on Un-American Activities continued with full force against the communistic fronts and today they are still continuing in their efforts and have succeeded in creating, with the aid of the brass hats and the Wall Street industrialists, a war hysteria which is costing our country billions upon billions of dollars as well as great anguish and fear to our people. Because of this existing fear and hysteria, we have before us this bill.

It has been my hope and the hope of the American people that, after defeating the Nazis and Japs, peace would be established, and how much better and more humane it would be if we would devote ourselves to aiding the United Nations to attain the peace for which the masses of the people all over the world are seeking and praying. Naturally, the people are opposed to any activities that may bring about a third world war because we are still bringing back the 300,000 young men who gave up their lives fighting for democracy and to bring about freedom and peace to the world.

Six months ago, the Republican leaders, having no issue to present to the people in order to obtain their vote, decided to make communism the issue for the Presidential campaign and have endeavored to insinuate and even charge that the Democratic Party is receiving support from groups you have designated as communistic fronts.

Although I am not completely in accord with some of President Truman's actions, I surely looked with real satisfaction and pleasure when he clearly demonstrated to the country that neither he nor the Democratic Party, in any way, condones or seeks the support of any party that is not wholeheartedly in favor of our democratic form of government. President Truman issued an Executive order urging every department to eliminate anyone connected in any way with any communistic front. This naturally has taken the wind out of the sails of the Republican program. Nevertheless, to offset this action you have decided, in desperation, to utilize the Committee on Un-American Activities to obtain publicity in order to hide the activities of the Fascists and keep alive your original aim to feed the American people with the dangers of communism.

The Republican candidates for President, Mr. Tamm and Mr. Dewey, have gone on record against these activities and against such unfair tactics as proposed in this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, up to this time I have devoted my remarks in briefly giving the

history and activities of the three committees of the House that have been engaged since 1935 in investigating alleged subversive activities against our country and I have given my honest opinion of the actions of the three committees and the underlying reasons that have impelled the introduction and consideration of the proposed legislation before us. I wish to assure the membership and the country that I am as much opposed to communism as is any other Member of this body and I am confident that my 42 years' service in this House will prove not only my loyalty but will attest to my continuous efforts in the interest of democracy and our democratic form of government which, as I have frequently stated, excels that of any other government in the world.

Mr. Speaker, I shall now direct my remarks to the pending bill, H. R. 5852, to combat un-American activities by requiring the registration of Communist-front organizations, and for other purposes.

Mr. Speaker, the bill of my esteemed colleague the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] is not ripe for consideration on the floor of this House. It is proposed major legislation on which no hearings have been held and with implications which neither the public nor this House of Representatives has had adequate opportunity to study and appreciate. It is, in my opinion, a revolutionary bill. It is a bill which, if enacted, will threaten the freedom of speech and assembly of every American citizen. It is a bill which can be used to destroy hundreds of legitimate and useful organizations, and to render impotent the political, social, and economic will of their members and of millions of citizens generally. It is a long step toward fascism in this country.

I have seen thousands of bills come to the floor of this House, and some of them were "lulus," but never have I seen a bill that was more dangerous or more threatening to American democracy.

This bill permits the Attorney General to suppress organizations by requiring them, on the basis of vague standards, to register as Communist organizations. These standards permit the imputing of guilt by association and a blacklisting for the mere holding of views. Suppression of free speech and free assembly by this device violates the first amendment to the Constitution, just as much as a statute which directly prohibits speech or assembly under threat of criminal penalties. The Supreme Court has repeatedly said that free speech cannot be abridged by either direct or indirect means. In *Thomas against Collins*, the Supreme Court said:

As a matter of principle, a requirement of registration in order to make a public speech would seem generally incompatible with an exercise of the rights of free speech and free assembly.

Yet this bill comes to us without the public committee hearings which are designed to help shape proposed legislation, to reveal constitutional and policy defects, and to subject it to the test of public reaction.

The Legislative Subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities

has held hearings only on the general subject of what action should be taken against communism. It has not held any hearings on this particular bill. Yet there are all kinds of provisions and possibilities in the bill which go far beyond any questions relating to communism. Let me give you just one small example.

Under section 13 of the bill the Attorney General is given certain powers to compel testimony and the production of records by use of subpoenas. The Attorney General could, under the very loose standards of the bill, use this subpoena power to discover the membership of any and every labor union. Now, here is certainly a great legislative departure. Every Member of this House is aware that labor unions have always insisted, as a matter of self-protection and even of self-preservation, on the right to keep their membership rolls private. Yet here, with a sort of backward, thoughtless sweep of the hand we abolish that right. Has labor been consulted? No. Has the House Committee on Education and Labor been consulted? No. Has the public been informed and given an opportunity to react? No.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is, and I quote from its title, intended "to protect the United States against un-American and subversive activities." There is nothing I am more wary of than offers of protection. Some people would protect us to the point where we are perfectly safe—in jail. Some of the most dangerous threats to our liberties come from persons who would give them lip service.

This bill, Mr. Speaker, proposes something entirely foreign to the American constitutional system. It permits an administrative officer, one who is always a leading figure of one political party—the Attorney General—to outlaw organizations of American citizens. And this is not just a far-fetched possibility. If the Attorney General should employ the criteria which have been used again and again by the very committee which sponsors this bill, he would, like that committee, find that hundreds of liberal groups are subversive.

The Washington Post has very accurately described the power the bill would give the Attorney General. I quote:

It is an authority to stigmatize whole groups of citizens as disloyal, to inflict on them, without trial, extremely stringent penalties, and effectively to limit their freedom of expression. Under the terms of the bill, an Attorney General might well feel warranted in classifying Henry Wallace's third party as a "Communist political organization" or a "Communist-front organization." Either classification would be tantamount to proscription.

Mr. Speaker, I never thought I would see the day in this country when a man of one party could proscribe a whole competing party.

Despite the brief time that this bill has been available to the public, it has already been denounced as a threat to our way of life by many organizations and societies representing millions of people from all walks of life and from all sections of our country.

I implore the Members of the House, Mr. Speaker, not to subject us to ridicule

by hurrying this half-baked bill through to a vote; not to endanger the liberties of our people not to discredit our congressional processes; not to violate the Bill of Rights. Let us not, after all these years, reproduce the foul spawn of an earlier period of hysteria—the Alien and Sedition Acts enacted as a result of the Jacobin Jefferson movement.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I will merely make this observation: This measure would clearly nullify the fundamental freedoms granted to all persons by the Bill of Rights and would constitute a vast bill of attainder as well. It would deny to all Americans the right of political speech and assemblage. It would subject to fine and imprisonment vast numbers of people for no other reason than disapproval of their views by the Attorney General and would establish a police state with the abhorrent principle of guilt by association in place of a political democracy rooted in America's historic tradition of individual liberty.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks and include therein a small number of the many telegrams and letters I have received, not from persons and organizations in the three cities of which the gentlemen spoke disparagingly, but from all over the United States, from outstanding men who love this country, who believe in our form of government, and who have no connection with any subversive activity or organization. I have hundreds of them.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object to the inclusion of these various communications, I wonder if the gentleman will tell us how many communications he expects to put in the RECORD.

Mr. SABATH. As a rule I do not abuse the privilege. I will put in a dozen. I have about 3,000 of them, but I will put in about a dozen.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object in order to ask the distinguished gentleman if there is anything in this measure that would interfere with the right of workers to fight for wage increases.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I actually believe this measure is aimed at organized labor more than it is the Communists. I think this measure will perhaps drive the Communists underground and will create more Communists, unfortunately, than we have now. This measure, in my opinion, is aimed at organized labor.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, under the permission granted me, I insert a few of the telegrams sent me in opposition to the bill, as follows:

CHICAGO, ILL., May 11, 1948.

Hon. ADOLPH J. SABATH,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The Chicago Teachers Union, representing 7,200 public school teachers in Chicago

affiliated with the American, Illinois, and Chicago Federations of Labor, respectfully requests that you oppose the Mundt bill. The teachers union believes this bill is un-American and dangerous to the liberties of loyal American citizens.

JOHN M. FEWKES,
President.

MUSKEGON, MICH., May 2, 1948.
Representative ADOLPH J. SABATH,
House Rules Committee,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We, the people of greater Muskegon, gathered to commemorate this historic May Day, request defeat of the un-American Mundt bill, H. R. 5852.

JAMES P. CARROLL,
Chairman, Muskegon May Day Celebration Committee.

DALLAS, TEX., May 6, 1948.

Hon. ADOLPH J. SABATH,
Minority Leader of House Rules Committee, House Office Building:

Our members appreciate your support against the Un-American Subversive Activities Control Act, H. R. 5852, and trust you will keep this bill from leaving the Rules Committee. Regards.

C. J. MESKE,
International Representative, ILWU-CIO.

WINNETKA, ILL., May 13, 1948.

Hon. ADOLPH J. SABATH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Commend opposition to Mundt-Nixon bill. Strongly oppose this bill on grounds that unless treasonable action as defined in the Constitution is proved against those individuals and organizations involved this bill violates their constitutional rights.

VIRGINIA S. DEANE and RUTH LINNELL.

RICHMOND, IND., May 3, 1948.

Hon. ADOLPH J. SABATH,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Demand that you testify against Mundt bill. This bill (H. R. 5852) will utterly destroy our Constitution and bill of rights and would establish a police state in America. This bill which is called subversive activities control bill is actually aimed at everyone who believes in democracy. It must be defeated.

VIRGINIA BOND LARKEY.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., April 29, 1948.

Hon. ADOLPH J. SABATH,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

The Mundt bill, H. R. 5852, would make illegal support of almost any type of social reform and thus constitutes a dangerous attack on civil rights. Therefore urge you to deny this bill a rule.

ALEX FREUND,
Philadelphia Chapter, Civil Rights Congress.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 29, 1948.

Hon. A. J. SABATH,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Speaking for 30,000 members New York State Progressive Citizens of America insist you refuse to report out Mundt bill to House floor. Bill is monstrously unconstitutional. Attempt to stifle free thought. If passed would in effect make advocacy of peace, housing, health education, price controls, a criminal offense. Unless you want home-grown fascism you must speak out against it.

PAUL J. KERN,
Chairman, New York State Progressive Citizens of America.

INDEPENDENT PROGRESSIVE PARTY

OF CALIFORNIA,

San Francisco, Calif., May 4, 1948.

Hon. ADOLPH SABATH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

(Copy of telegrams sent to Representatives HAVENNER and WELCH.)

We, the members of the San Francisco County council of the Independent Progressive Party, representing 16 clubs, protest the so-called Subversive Control Act of 1948, H. R. 8852.

This bill aimed at Communists in reality strikes at labor progressives everywhere, to nullify freedom of speech and organizations fighting for peace.

We demand that you speak out in the Rules Committee and in the Halls of Congress and vote "No" on the Mundt bill.

FRIEDA SALZMANN,
County Director.

Mr. Speaker, I commend to the reading of the membership and to the country an editorial appearing in the Chicago Sun-Times, of May 7, entitled "Controlling Subversives," as follows:

CONTROLLING SUBVERSIVES

The Communists are appropriately outraged by the subversive activities control bill, written by the House Committee on Un-American Activities. Nobody need worry much about that. Since Communists themselves have no regard for civil liberties wherever and whenever they take power, their hypocritical championship of civil liberties where and when they are out of power should not fool anybody.

In considering this bill, however, Congress must take many things into account. The bill would declare the Communist Party and Communist-front organizations (to be defined by the Attorney General) as a menace to the country. All members of the party, and the officers of the front organizations, would be required to register. If they did not, the party and organizations would be illegal.

One point to be considered is that this approach has seldom proved to be an effective way to deal with communism. Sponsors of the bill argue that they are not outlawing the party, only requiring its members to register. But can you imagine the members of a conspiratorial movement meekly filing their names with the Attorney General? Real conspirators would never comply with the law. They would simply go underground.

As Gov. Thomas E. Dewey said at Portland Monday, in opposing Harold E. Stassen's proposal to outlaw the Communists, Canada, Italy, and even Russia itself found that merely declaring the party illegal or driving it underground didn't dispose of the movement.

There is another consideration far more important, which should weigh heavily with Congress in studying this bill. Regardless of what it might or might not do to the Communists, what would it do to the theory and practice of political freedom?

The American doctrine of civil rights, founded in the Constitution and developed over many years by the Supreme Court, holds that all citizens have the right to free speech and assembly—which implies free political action—so long as they offer no "clear and present danger" of substantive evil to our society and the lawful processes of democratic government.

The subversive activities control bill would make it a crime for any person "to perform or attempt to perform any act with intent to facilitate or aid" in bringing about a totalitarian dictatorship under foreign control.

While specific acts and conspiracies to overthrow our Government should certainly be outlawed—in fact, already are outlawed under other statutes—this language goes

much further. So far as the wording of the bill reveals, it would make even a speech or a vote cast for certain candidates a crime, even though the speech or the vote presented no real danger of overthrowing the Government.

Congress should carefully consider if there is any safe way to hit the subversive citizen without hitting others, too, except through the conspiracy statutes already on the books. If a subversive element is driven underground, the Government must be prepared with agents to hunt it underground. These agents can grow to multitudes, in proportion to the whisperings that suspicious and eavesdropping neighbors may invent about the use to which honest, law-abiding citizens put their basements or attics, their typewriters, automobiles, or ham-radio conversations. History shows that the most outrageous crimes against citizens have come from the agents of governments entrusted with the responsibility of protecting governments from alleged conspirators. It was these outrages upon the homes, papers, and persons of citizens that made mandatory the inclusion of the Bill of Rights in our own Constitution.

Communists and their fellow travelers deserve to be exposed, to be kept in the light of day. But a law which seeks to accomplish this by reviving dangers that would impair our doctrine of civil liberty is too big a price to pay.

We say: Let the Communists and fellow travelers talk, and let America answer them. Let the Communists and fellow travelers vote, and let America vote them down. Punish conspiracies to seize power, outlaw acts of revolution or violence—but don't undermine the freedoms on which our democracy rests.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CHADWICK].

Mr. CHADWICK. Mr. Speaker, I take advantage of this opportunity for an observation which may merit expression. Like so many of you, I am being inundated with communications about this Mundt bill. Many of these I can identify by signatures now familiar to me after 2 years in this House; I notice that these good people turn up at about this stage of each new piece of legislation which is, or can be construed to be, designed to bolster up the national discipline of this country of ours. They are dependably against legislation like that; in fact, they constitute one of the principal reasons why such legislation is necessary.

What concerns me far more are letters from people whom I know to be well-intending and responsible, but who proceed upon the assumption, first, that the information they happen to have about such legislation is both comprehensive and exhaustive; that their current ideas on the subject are by way of being the final authoritative conclusion; and that they are communicating with a Representative who knows nothing about the subject, or if he does, he knows it all wrong.

Just how to answer communications like these latter, I confess floors me. Like so many others among our colleagues, I make an honest effort to reply personally to my constituents; because I think that is part of my duty as a Representative. But how does one respectfully convey, to another free-born American citizen, the idea that he or she had better get his or her own mental house in order before he

or she undertakes to dictate a course of conduct for others, particularly sworn public officers, to pursue?

Since I am about to be relieved of the necessity of being on the receiving end of correspondence like this, I am seriously considering making an application to the Rockefeller Foundation, or somebody, for an endowment to organize a national radio college of the air to educate constituents when to write to their Congressmen, and why.

No persons will be permitted to listen to the course who do not admit that they already possess more detailed and accurate information on all subjects of national legislation than do their elected representatives. This is to be no course for mere kibitzers; this one by the terms of its very foundation is for hardened old back-seat drivers who really know their stuff. Nor will we welcome any listeners who seriously question their own infallibility.

And to the group, so carefully selected and so screened, and to no other, we will—Mr. Rockefeller, that is to say, and the executive secretary of the program, which will of course be myself, at a proper annual compensation—propound one question, one starkly simple and simply stark question, which will be phrased as follows: Have you read the act about which you feel the urge to guide the man whom a majority of the people of your district elected as your constitutional representative?

Now, I estimate conservatively that 499 out of every 500 of my selected and blue-ribbon auditors will answer that question with an entirely honest and sincere, "No, but!" Under our rules—the Granick-Chadwick convention—the "but" will be eliminated; the answer will be registered as "no;" and an attractively printed certificate will be issued to the 499, attesting that they have automatically eliminated themselves as congressional correspondents on that subject.

The successful participators will be awarded one complete set of the Encyclopedia Britannica, a copy of the Agricultural Year Book for 1943-47, a concise statement of the name of their Congressman, correctly spelled, with his correct Washington address, and 13 cents in United States stamps, because their expression of views, whatever they may be, will be worthy of quick and effective transmission to the addressee.

Such addressee, the average Congressman, will be vastly aided by whatever expressions this system produces; because he himself will have been kept too busy answering letters from less well-informed constituents to have had a chance to read the legislation himself. Armed with the wisdom so conveyed, and now fully equipped to discharge his constitutional duty, he will repair to the floor—stimulated by the urgency of the bells, warning that another vote is impending—and take his place in the serried, if not harried, ranks of the Members; keeping a weather eye on the majority, or minority, leader, as the case may be and fortunately is; and when his name is reached, he will answer with a decisive "aye," or perhaps "no," depending on various considera-

tions, including among others his traditional devotion to supporting the committee, contempered with his recollection of what happened to the oleo bill.

Thus the end result will be another vindication of the processes of democracy; the Nation will wage on; the well-informed constituent will finally discover that his Representative took his advice or else he did not; and the foundation will, I hope, see to it that the regular monthly honorarium is duly forthcoming.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I assure you that we feel no weakness in our cause that requires us to jockey for position in order to obtain the last word in the debate. Irrespective of when we speak on the issue, I know that time and events and the American people will vindicate the position we take on this rule and on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is the most far-reaching proposal that has ever been before the Congress of the United States. It definitely will change the form of government under which we have lived for over 150 years. Despite the fact the proponents of the bill will seek to make communism the issue, what is really the issue here is the Constitution. What is really involved here is whether or not we intend to preserve our Bill of Rights. The question before the House is whether or not we shall have the courage to defend the democratic traditions of our Nation and the democratic foundations on which our Government is based, despite the hysteria which is mounting every day to the accompaniment of the fast beating of war drums.

As the debate develops, I am absolutely confident that it will be established to the satisfaction of the Members of the House that this bill, beyond any doubt, violates the first amendment to the Constitution. It definitely violates the constitutional prohibition against guilt by association. It definitely is a bill of attainder, not in one respect but in several respects. It is an attempt to change our fundamental laws: that guilt must be established beyond a reasonable doubt to an arbitrary rule that guilt can be established by substantial evidence. It bypasses the age-old guaranty of a trial by jury. In fact, it makes a mockery of the time-honored trial by jury. It does violence to the constitutional guaranty of due process.

It most assuredly substitutes for the doctrine of guilt by judicial determination a doctrine which is alien and repulsive to our democratic system, and that is the doctrine of guilt by legislative determination and by executive decree. It is significant that the doctrine of guilt by legislative determination, against which our Constitution has laid down specific prohibitions, and the doctrine of guilt by executive decree, against which Americans rebelled and established this Republic, is a doctrine and a method adopted by both Mussolini and Hitler in order to seize power and to destroy the last vestiges of democracy in Italy and Germany.

I have before me two books. One deals with Mussolini's laws and the other is a compilation of Hitler's edicts. A comparison of various sections of the bill with Hitler's edicts and Mussolini's laws reveals a most astounding similarity. Fundamentally, the one similarity which has been a lesson to the people of Europe is that fascism always makes the Communists and the constitutional rights of the Communists the first objective of its offensive. That was the lesson of Fascist Italy. That was the lesson of Nazi Germany. Consequently, we must face the issue squarely, and that is that the defense of the constitutional rights of the Communists and of the Communist Party is, in the final analysis, in the light of the history of Fascist advances, the first line of defense of the democratic rights of all the people. History has proved that if the people of Italy and the people of Germany had defended the constitutional rights of the Communists and of the Communist Party there would have been no successful fascism, there would have been no successful nazism, and there would not have been imposed on this world World War II.

Let us go a step further. Not only does this bill make the Communists its first object of attack, but like all other brands of fascism—

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Not at this time. I want to complete my statement. But, like all other brands of fascism, this domestic brand of fascism advances behind an anti-Communist attack and reaches out and destroys the rights of all those who disagree with the views of those who are today seemingly in power. Yes; this bill can be used against a consumers' group; it can be used against a labor union; it can be used against a tenants' group; it can be extended against any group that has incurred the disfavor of those who are today in the saddle and riding hard and roughshod over the life, peace, liberties, and economy of the American people. It can, and it will in all likelihood, be used against independent political movements, particularly the Wallace movement, which is today making the fight for the preservation of peace. This is not the first time that this legislation has been attempted and under similar conditions. It is indeed amazing how history repeats itself. Back in 1798 we had a similar situation. Then, too, a republic had been established by revolution, the Republic of France, and then, too, under the administration of President Adams, the war party became a bipartisan combination, and every effort was being made to plunge these United States into war against a country that had been our ally.

As against that bipartisan war party a new party was being established by Thomas Jefferson. He, too, was called names, and his followers were called names. Jefferson was called a Jacobin. The Jacobin Party, as you well know, was the leading revolutionary party of Republican France. Jefferson's patriotism was also impugned. He was called a Frenchman, a lover of Republican France. Jefferson and his followers were

called foreign agents. The followers of Jefferson were subjected to that kind of treatment from the press and from the profit patriots of that period.

In order to make certain that the fight for peace be smashed and to make certain that the political resistance movement, the new party that was being built by Jefferson, could be hamstrung into submission, and that it be intimidated into abandoning its struggle for peace, the bipartisan war party in Congress enacted the alien and sedition laws of 1798. Again, how amazing. Examine those alien and sedition laws, and you find a vast similarity with this bill. Take particularly the sedition law of 1798. There the same foreign-agent technique is used. There you will find language that guilt would arise if the person aided a foreign power hostile to the interests of the United States. Under that broad language, the Jeffersonians who wanted peace with France were dragged into jail, and the new Nation was subjected to a reign of terror. Writs of habeas corpus became of little avail to those who were fighting for peace and democracy. Then, too, it was war against peace, the new political party for peace against the bipartisan war party, and alien and sedition acts against freedom and the Bill of Rights.

Today, with this bill, we have the same situation, an attempt to destroy a new political party that is being established in this country under the leadership of Henry Wallace, and to substitute, above all, fear in the place of freedom, so as to guarantee the success of the bipartisan war policy. I know many will succumb to hysteria and others will give us the usual flag-waving and Red-baiting, but let us look back in retrospect: 1798-1948, 150 years. The men who opposed the alien and sedition acts, Livingston, Madison, and Jefferson—they constitute the bright constellations in the democratic firmament of this Nation; but those who imposed on the American people those tyrannies of which this bill is a monstrous lineal descendant have been cast into oblivion, ignominious oblivion, relegated there as mankind always relegates puny creatures that would destroy mankind's freedom.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox].

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, it is here that we find the line which divides the right from the left. It is here where the goat and the sheep separate. There is no basis in law, logic, or in fact for the argument that the Mundt bill violates a right of the citizen. Mr. Speaker, our safety rests upon the preservation of the Union. Communism is our deadly enemy, and against communism the full strength of the Nation must be arrayed. Here in this bill we are only attempting to bring into the open the domestic agents of our foreign foe, which is a function of Government upon which Congress has the right to call. The object is to unmask the traitor who conceals his identity.

Mr. Speaker, there has not at any time been brought to this body a case which, in my opinion, was quite so well prepared as the instant one. The com-

mittee studying this question and sponsoring this bill drew upon every source from which it was believed help could be obtained. There was an array of talent that testified before the committee that could not be excelled. Great constitutional lawyers, historians, and others appeared, and, with the exception of the testimony, as I recall, of the well-known Ben Davis, Communist, of the city of New York, all were, generally speaking, in accord.

Mr. Speaker, we are confronted with a deadly foe. There are people in this country who are seeking to destroy our Government, and to them I would say that he who takes advantage of the freedoms guaranteed by the Constitution to undermine and destroy our Government is nothing less than a traitor and a scoundrel. Here in this—our America—there is no room for party or for man who does not carry the flag and march to the music of the Union. The question here raised is an important one, and if Members would examine the record of the testimony taken by the Committee on Un-American Activities, I am confident that they would not only find themselves enthusiastic supporters of the proposal but determined opponents of those who seek to defeat its passage.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RANKIN. I attempted to interrupt the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO]. If I understood him correctly, he said that if Stalin had been unimpeded or communism had been unchecked in Europe, it would have established freedom throughout Europe. As a matter of fact, it would have closed every Christian church and destroyed every free government in Europe.

Mr. COX. If the agents of Stalin here in America doing his work are not suppressed, he will in the end have completed the job of sovietizing the world.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Celler].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, this bill has been disingenuously worked out. There is much concealment in apparently innocent words. It will destroy the purposes of its authors and sponsors. It is a sort of blunderbuss. It points a blast of buckshot over so vast an area that it can well destroy the civil liberties the proponents ineptly pretend to protect.

The bill involves a congressional ipse dixit or fiat, more like a totalitarian Diktat, whereby anyone believing in communism, sincerely or otherwise, becomes per se an agent of a foreign power, and thus is guilty of the charge of being a conspirator to overthrow the Government.

The proponents anticipated and fear this charge, because they expressly deny it on page 6 of the report wherein they say:

This legislation does not constitute a fiat.

But that denial will not wash. The framers of the bill are worried about its

constitutionality, and well might they be. They avoid declaring the Communist Party as outlaw and illegal. That they admit would be palpably unconstitutional. Instead, there is used a subterfuge. They try to get a foot in the door by having the Congress by fiat declare all Communists are agents of a foreign power. There is no proof. No benefit is to be given to the accused by trial by jury to determine this. A judgment may be rendered administratively. The Attorney General is judge, jury, and accuser. To be a Communist ipso facto is to be a foreign agent. There are sincere believers in the principles of Marx and Engels. They are not the agents of a foreign power, but the bill conclusively says they are such agents, and there is no gainsaying the congressional conclusion. Congress, in effect, says:

"When I open my mouth, let no dog bark."

We are reminded of the French King, who said:

"L'état, c'est moi."

If the above congressional declaration is not a fiat, I do not know the meaning of the word. Do you for one moment think that what the Congress, at the urgent behest of the Committee on Un-American Activities, cannot do directly the Supreme Court will allow to be done indirectly? Do not flatter yourselves. Yes. I say to the one who propounded the question a moment ago, it is possible if Congress could by fiat declare certain groups the agents of foreign powers, and therefore within the ban of the law, Congress could bring in a bill and say by fiat any group—on good grounds or coffee grounds—is illegal and their operations criminal. If this bill is constitutional, then the Congress could say by fiat that the members of the third party, the followers of Wallace, are following an illegal direction and must be banned as illegal.

Congress could then say by fiat, with equal logic, that all trade-unions are illegal and their operations must be banned. We are indeed treading on dangerous grounds, and I appeal particularly to the lawyers in this distinguished body to be careful and to scrutinize and screen not only the words of this act but their import and repercussions.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, how much time have I remaining?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] is recognized for 6 minutes.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I have never heard such flagrant misrepresentations of a bill since I have been a Member of Congress.

It is amusing to me to hear men who never hit a lick of work with their hands in their lives stand up here and predict

what this measure will do to the laboring man.

This bill is one of the greatest protections the laboring people of this country ever saw. Mark my words! The honest, patriotic, American laboring men are going to support it, when they realize what it provides.

I want to show you some of the propaganda that is being sent out against this bill.

Here is one from the Communist Daily Worker:

Act today! Democracy is at stake.

That is the headline. And then under that headline they go on to attack this bill and the statement is made:

It is sponsored by the notorious Representative KARL MUNDT.

Now, I have been called notorious many times by this gang, but this is the first time I have known them to take out after the gentleman from South Dakota in those terms. Again, on the other page—I will not read it all, it is not fit to read—it states:

It will hold over the head of every American the possible loss of his citizenship if his social views anger the FBI and its sinister police chief, J. Edgar Hoover.

I have known Edgar Hoover for more than 20 years. I have never heard him referred to as a sinister police chief before. There is no more patriotic American under this flag than Edgar Hoover, the Chief of the FBI. Remember this is from the Communist Daily Worker.

Now, here is another one. This one is amusing, amazing, and astounding. It takes me over the coals. First it says: "Do you want to go to jail because you want world unity for peace?"

Intimating that if you want peace this bill will condemn you, which is so nonsensical that I am surprised anybody would fall for that crazy statement.

It predicts such punishment if, "You want a third party?"

Why, this bill does not interfere with your having a third party. The truth is that probably you will have four or five parties before the election is over.

Or it says if "You support the Palestine partition?"

This bill is not interfering with those who want to go to Palestine. I am in favor of every one of them being given a one-way passport if they want it.

Or it says if "You strike for higher wages?"

Not a word in this bill would interfere with the right of workmen to demand an increase in wages.

Or if "You oppose UMT and the draft?"

Why, there is not a word in this bill that refers to the UMT and the draft. Or if "You protest a Jim Crow army?"

Mr. ISACSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ISACSON. I would like to know exactly what you meant by saying that those who advocate the partition plan should be given a one-way passport to Palestine.

Mr. RANKIN. I said, "If they want to go." I do not yield any further. I will get to the gentleman in a moment.

I said if they want a passport they can get it, so far as I am concerned.

Then it says in blazing headlines: "Does your organization disagree with RANKIN's idea of Americanism?"

It goes on to say:

Then it must register as a foreign agent, must turn over its membership list to the FBI, must label itself a Communist-front organization in all publicity, publications, correspondence.

Every Member of the House knows there is not a word of truth in that statement.

It goes on to say:

Unions refusing to sign Taft-Hartley affidavits would come under this clause.

This bill has no reference whatever to the Taft-Hartley Act.

Mr. WALTER. May I ask the gentleman whether or not that matter he is reading from came from the Daily Worker?

Mr. RANKIN. No. I am going to tell you in a moment where it came from. That is most important. I will get to that in a moment.

The document states:

Jail sentences are provided for men and women who go on strike, if their union does not measure up to the standards set by J. Edgar Hoover.

Every intelligent Member of the House knows there is nothing of that kind in this bill.

Then it says in screaming headlines:

Sounds incredible—but its true. These laws are now pending in Congress. The Thomas-Rankin committee has already proposed this legislation under the guise of controlling subversive activities.

And this pamphlet is signed:

Provisional Committee for Democratic Rights. Cochairmen: LEO ISACSON, VITO MARCANTONIO, ADAM C. POWELL.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of discussion about a great many things this morning besides H. R. 5852, the legislation on which you are about to be asked to grant a rule. I certainly hope that the roll call on the rule will overwhelmingly demonstrate to the country that the size of the opposition to this legislation to curtail communism is in no sense as great as the noise which has emanated from the Communist camp in opposition to it.

I have been interested in some of the comments made by those opposing this rule and this bill. In the first place there was a brazen effort made here this morning to compare Thomas Jefferson and W. Z. Foster as Americans of the same stamp and type. One of the speakers said that what Foster was trying to do now in having a Communist Party in America was analogous to what Thomas Jefferson was trying to do at one stage of American history.

Mr. Speaker, may I point out that Thomas Jefferson was a great apostle of liberty and freedom. Foster is the leading apostle of communism, tyranny, and sovietism in America. It is like trying to compare an owl with a lizard to compare Thomas Jefferson and W. Z. Foster; one the apostle of freedom and liberty, the other the apostle of tyranny and totalitarianism. While I am not a Democrat, Thomas Jefferson was a great Democrat and I resent any attempt to drag in the dirt of communistic slime a great American name like that of Thomas Jefferson by voicing it in the same sentence through comparing him with present-day American Communists.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, we have listened today to that age-old Communist libel which is taking place on every Communist radio in Europe today—that those who oppose communism are practicing the tactics of fascism. I wonder if we cannot now explode that myth for once and for all at the very beginning of this debate. Communism came into power, as you and I know, in 1917 in Russia. It then established a totalitarian aggressive form of dictatorship and began infiltrating into the neighboring countries around Russia. Fascism and nazism both grew up originally as offsets and as attempts to resist communism. Those countries took the wrong tactics, and, instead of doing as we propose to do in this legislation, exposing the operation of Communists to public view, they organized Nazi and Fascist groups, trying to protect themselves against the aggressive forms of communism. Then eventually they took on the same techniques and the same practices and the same devices and the same programs as communism, until today communism and nazism and fascism have become indistinguishable one from the other.

The best proof in the world why this legislation is not fascism in concept is because things Fascist in concept are also Communist in practice, and those supporting this legislation support neither communism nor fascism nor nazism. May I say in addition, Mr. Speaker, that this is not only my opinion that these three isms are analogous and indistinguishable. We have the word of J. Edgar Hoover in testimony before the House Committee on Un-American Activities, where he pointed out that today in the world as a whole, nazism, fascism, and communism are part and parcel of the same godless atheistic aggressive totalitarianism. One is black in color, one is red, and one is brown, but all are basically the same and fundamentally connected. You also have the word of the Congressional Library study which made an elaborate analysis with public funds, and published many reports for you, in which it was pointed out that nazism, fascism, and communism are one and the same. We have the word of the House Coordinator on Information, who published a document, which is in all your offices, in which he pointed out 15 or 16 reasons why communism, fascism, and nazism are the same. So, above all, good friends, do not listen to this loud wail from the camps of the

Communists, when they allege that in this legislation what we propose is something Fascist in nature, because the only people in America endeavoring to do anything Fascist in concept are our Communists of today who play hotfoot with Communists all over the world and with nazism, fascism, and communism working together to promote their common beliefs and reliance in dictatorial devices and practices.

I urge the adoption of this rule by an overwhelming vote in order to tell America that Americans are still on guard in this Republic, and to let the country know now that this legislation is going to be approved overwhelmingly.

(Mr. SABATH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include editorials.)

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

Mr. RANKIN and Mr. MARCANTONIO demanded the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken, and there were—yeas 296, nays 40, not voting 95, as follows:

[Roll No. 65]

YEAS—296

Albert	Cole, N. Y.	Halleck
Allen, Calif.	Colmer	Hand
Allen, Ill.	Combs	Hardy
Allen, La.	Cooley	Harless, Ariz.
Andersen,	Cooper	Harness, Ind.
H. Carl	Corbett	Harrison
Andresen,	Cotton	Hart
August H.	Courtney	Harvey
Andrews, Ala.	Cox	Hays
Andrews, N. Y.	Cunningham	Herter
Angell	Curtis	Heselton
Arends	Dague	Hess
Arnold	Davis, Wis.	Hill
Auchincloss	Dawson, Utah	Hinshaw
Bakewell	Deane	Hobbs
Banta	Devitt	Hoeven
Barden	Dolliver	Hoffman
Barrett	Domengeaux	Holmes
Bates, Mass.	Doughton	Hope
Beall	Durham	Horan
Beckworth	Eaton	Hull
Bender	Elliott	Jackson, Calif.
Bennett, Mich.	Ellis	Jenison
Bennett, Mo.	Ellsworth	Jenkins, Ohio
Bishop	Elsaesser	Jensen
Blackney	Elston	Johnson, Calif.
Bland	Engel, Mich.	Johnson, Ill.
Boggs, Del.	Evins	Johnson, Ind.
Boggs, La.	Fallon	Jones, Ala.
Bolton	Fellows	Jones, N. C.
Bonner	Fenton	Jones, Wash.
Bradley	Fernandez	Jonkman
Brehm	Flannagan	Keating
Brophy	Fletcher	Keefe
Brown, Ga.	Foote	Kerr
Brown, Ohio	Fuller	Kersten, Wis.
Bryson	Fulton	Kilburn
Buck	Gamble	Kilday
Buffett	Garmatz	Kunkel
Burke	Gary	Landis
Burleson	Gathings	Larcade
Busbey	Gearhart	Latham
Byrnes, Wis.	Gillette	Lea
Camp	Gillie	LeCompte
Canfield	Goff	LeFevre
Cannon	Goodwin	Lemke
Carson	Gossett	Lewis, Ky.
Case, N. J.	Graham	Lewis, Ohio
Case, S. Dak.	Grant, Ala.	Lichtenwalter
Chadwick	Grant, Ind.	Lodge
Chapman	Gregory	Love
Chelf	Gross	Lucas
Chenoweth	Gwynne, Iowa	McCormack
Chipperfield	Hagen	McCulloch
Church	Hale	McDonough
Clason	Hall	McDowell
Coffin	Hall	McGarvey
Cole, Kans.	Edwin Arthur	McGregor
Cole, Mo.	Hall	McMahon
	Leonard W.	

McMillan, S. C.	Potts	Smith, Maine
McMillen, Ill.	Poulson	Smith, Ohio
Mack	Preston	Smith, Va.
MacKinnon	Priest	Smith, Wis.
Mahon	Rains	Snyder
Maloney	Ramey	Spence
Manasco	Rankin	Stanley
Mansfield	Rayburn	Stefan
Martin, Iowa	Reed, Ill.	Stevenson
Mason	Reed, N. Y.	Stockman
Mathews	Rees	Stratton
Meade, Ky.	Reeves	Sundstrom
Merrrow	Regan	Taber
Meyer	Rich	Talle
Michener	Richards	Teague
Miller, Nebr.	Riley	Thomas, Tex.
Mills	Rivers	Tibbott
Monroney	Rizley	Tollefson
Morris	Robertson	Towe
Morrison	Rockwell	Twyman
Morton	Rogers, Mass.	Vall
Muhlenberg	Rohrbough	Van Zandt
Mundt	Rooney	Vinson
Murray, Tenn.	Ross	Vorys
Murray, Wis.	Russell	Vursell
Nicholson	Sadlak	Wadsworth
Nixon	St. George	Walter
Nodar	Sanborn	Welch
Norblad	Sarbacher	Wheeler
O'Hara	Sasser	Whittington
O'Konski	Schwabe, Mo.	Wigglesworth
Owens	Schwabe, Okla.	Williams
Pace	Scott, Hardie	Wilson, Ind.
Passman	Scott	Wilson, Tex.
Patman	Hugh D., Jr.	Wolcott
Patterson	Scrivner	Wolverton
Peden	Seely-Brown	Wood
Peterson	Shafer	Woodruff
Phillips, Calif.	Short	Worley
Pickett	Simpson, Ill.	Youngblood
Poage	Smathers	
Potter	Smith, Kans.	

NAYS—40

Blatnik	Havener	Lynch
Bloom	Hedrick	Madden
Buchanan	Heffernan	Marcantonio
Carroll	Hollifield	Miller, Conn.
Celler	Huber	Morgan
Crosser	Isacson	Multer
Delaney	Javits	O'Brien
Dingell	Karsten, Mo.	Pfeifer
Douglas	Kean	Price, Ill.
Eberharter	Kelley	Sabath
Feighan	Keogh	Sadowski
Folger	King	Somers
Gordon	Klein	
Gorski	Lesinski	

NOT VOTING—95

Abbitt	Gallagher	Meade, Md.
Abernethy	Gavin	Miller, Calif.
Anderson, Calif.	Gore	Miller, Md.
Bates, Ky.	Granger	Mitchell
Battle	Griffiths	Murdock
Bell	Gwinn, N. Y.	Norrell
Boykin	Harris	Norton
Bramblett	Hartley	O'Toole
Brooks	Hébert	Philbin
Buckley	Hendricks	Phillips, Tenn.
Bulwinkle	Jackson, Wash.	Ploeser
Butler	Jarman	Plumley
Byrne, N. Y.	Jenkins, Pa.	Powell
Clark	Jennings	Price, Fla.
Clevenger	Johnson, Okla.	Redden
Clippinger	Johnson, Tex.	Riehman
Coudert	Judd	Rogers, Fla.
Cravens	Kearney	Scoblick
Crawford	Kearns	Sheppard
Crow	Kee	Sikes
Davis, Ga.	Kefauver	Simpson, Pa.
Davis, Tenn.	Kennedy	Stigler
Dawson, Ill.	Kirwan	Taylor
D'Ewart	Knutson	Thomas, N. J.
Dirksen	Lane	Thompson
Dondero	Lanham	Trimble
Donohue	Ludlow	Welch
Dorn	Lusk	West
Engle, Calif.	Lyle	Whitaker
Fisher	McConnell	Whitten
Fogarty	McCowan	Winstead
Forand	Macy	

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Lanham for, with Mr. Buckley against.
Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Dawson of Illinois, against.
Mr. Ploeser for, with Mr. Powell against.

Mr. Thomas of New Jersey for, with Mrs. Norton against.
Mr. Davis of Georgia for, with Mr. Kirwan against.
Mr. Johnson of Oklahoma for, with Mr. Forand against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Gavin with Mr. Lane.
Mr. Macy with Mr. Byrne of New York.
Mr. Miller of Maryland with Mr. Fisher.
Mr. Judd with Mr. Bates of Kentucky.
Mr. Kearns with Mrs. Lusk.
Mr. Coudert with Mr. Whitaker.
Mr. Crawford with Mr. Hébert.
Mr. Dondero with Mr. Harris.
Mr. Jenkins of Pennsylvania with Mr. Redden.
Mr. Jennings with Mr. Bell.
Mr. Riehlman with Mr. Engle of California.
Mr. Taylor with Mr. Miller of California.
Mr. Welch with Mr. Dorn.
Mr. Mitchell with Mr. Lyle.
Mr. Griffiths with Mr. Donohue.
Mr. Crow with Mr. Murdock.
Mr. Bramblett with Mr. Norrell.
Mr. Anderson of California with Mr. Fogarty.
Mr. Butler with Mr. Davis of Tennessee.
Mr. Hartley with Mr. Gore.
Mr. McConnell with Mr. Hendricks.
Mr. D'Ewart with Mr. Jackson of Washington.
Mr. Dirksen with Mr. Granger.
Mr. Clevenger with Mr. Kee.
Mr. Scoblick with Mr. Abernethy.
Mr. Gwinn of New York with Mr. Battle.
Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Kennedy.
Mr. McCowen with Mr. Abbott.
Mr. Knutson with Mr. Johnson of Texas.
Mr. Kean with Mr. Kefauver.
Mr. Clippinger with Mr. Whitten.
Mr. Phillips of Tennessee with Mr. Trimble.
Mr. Plumley with Mr. Winstead.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CIVIL SERVICE ACT

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 4236) to amend the Civil Service Act to remove certain discrimination with respect to the appointment of persons having any physical handicap to positions in the classified civil service, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and ask for a conference with the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. REES, LOVE, and MURRAY of Tennessee.

IMMIGRATION ACT OF 1917

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 3566) to amend subsection (c) of section 19 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. FELLOWS, GRAHAM, and GOSSETT.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 110) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act with respect to certain agreements between carriers, insist on the House amendments, and request a conference with the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. WOLVERTON, HINSHAW, LEONARD W. HALL, LEA, and CHAPMAN.

IMMIGRATION ACT OF 1917

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, a few minutes ago the House sent H. R. 3566 to conference. Certain conferees were named by the Speaker. In sending the list to the Speaker, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee made a mistake as to the seniority of members on the subcommittee. He has conferred with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT], one of the conferees named, and with his consent, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that he be excused from service and that the gentleman from New York, the ranking minority member of the subcommittee [Mr. CELLER] be named in his stead.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

H. R. 6556

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means may have until midnight tomorrow night to file a report on the bill H. R. 6556.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order for a minority report to be filed on the bill H. R. 6556 by midnight tomorrow night.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING NEXT TUESDAY

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns next Monday it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock on Tuesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VAN ZANDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article appearing in the Washington Times-Herald concerning the one hundredth anniversary of the Washington Monument.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. SADLAK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial and an article.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to vacate the permission I received yesterday to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a magazine article, and ask that I be permitted to extend my remarks and include a speech and a magazine article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

AGRICULTURAL LEGISLATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 654)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, referred to the Committee on Agriculture, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I wish again to call the attention of the Congress to the need for agricultural legislation. This need arises in large part by reason of the approaching expiration date of some of our wartime statutes. Furthermore, there is need for continued improvement in our permanent legislation designed to maintain a sound and prosperous agriculture.

It is now nearly 3 years after the end of the fighting in the Second World War. Most of the farmers of the United States are in an excellent economic position. Cash farm income last year reached a record high level of more than \$30,000,000,000. Farm mortgage debt has dropped 25 percent since 1941. The standard of living of most farmers, which rose steadily in the years before the war, has continued to improve.

This situation is in sharp contrast with what happened after World War I. Eighteen months after the end of fighting in that war farm prices had begun to fall; they dropped 50 percent within 1 year. Soon, farm mortgages were being foreclosed all over the country. The long, agonizing agricultural depression had already begun.

To a certain extent the strong position of American agriculture today is a result of high domestic demand and the very great need abroad for our agricultural products following this war. To a very large extent, however, our farmers can properly attribute their present prosperity to the sound and far-reaching agricultural legislation which was enacted in the years before the war. This legislation was necessarily modified to meet emergency conditions during the war, but it still constitutes a sound legislative base for continuing agricultural prosperity.

As we look ahead, it should not be our purpose to overturn the sound legislative base, in which our farmers have expressed their confidence time and time again, in order to start down some new path. Instead, we should concentrate our

attention on necessary extensions and improvements in the programs we already have.

The fundamental national policy underlying our agricultural legislation has been and should continue to be one of organized, sustained, realistic abundance. A policy of abundance includes some factors that lie outside the field of agriculture. The maintenance of high levels of employment and the maintenance of export outlets are prime essentials. At the same time it should be recognized that continuing abundance is possible only if we maintain a strong agriculture—strong in physical resources and strong in human resources.

To carry out this policy our various agricultural programs have been designed to achieve these principal objectives:

Sound and lasting economic well-being for our farm population, with parity of prices and income in relation to the rewards in other fields of human effort.

An agriculture that will supply all the kinds and quantities of agricultural products needed for domestic consumption, for sufficient carry-over stocks, and for export under present and rising standards of living.

Use of our basic agricultural resources, soil, water and forests, in such manner as will insure their permanent maximum productivity.

Improved levels of nutrition and living for all our people.

Ever-increasing efficiency in production and distribution.

A better living for small farmers, tenant farmers, share croppers, and farm labor.

The nature of the steps we should take at this time in order to continue our progress toward these objectives is clear.

First, the Congress should enact legislation providing on a permanent basis for a system of flexible price supports for agricultural commodities.

A vital part of the legislation under which our present price-support programs are carried on expires December 31, 1948. In my last two messages on the State of the Union I have urged that the Congress extend appropriate price-support legislation.

The Congress has not yet acted, and today farmers do not know what levels of price support or what methods of support will apply to large portions of many crops already planted or to others which must soon be planted. Even less is known about the policy which will apply to next year's crops or to milk and other livestock products for which farmers must plan their output long in advance.

In recent years we have learned the value of price supports as a means to assure the maintenance of farm income in the face of uncertain market conditions, and to adjust production to current market needs without disastrous results to farm prices.

The present price support legislation was directed toward expanding farm production during the war. Its results were nothing less than remarkable. Dur-

ing World War II farm output was increased approximately one third, as compared with an increase of 10 percent in World War I. Since hostilities ceased, output has continued at record levels, which has enabled the United States to give essential aid to the recovery of free nations in many parts of the world.

Now we must look ahead to a farm price support policy geared to our improved farm economy. Many shifts in production will have to be made, and flexible price supports will help us make them in an orderly manner. This will require authority to make prompt adjustments in support levels in line with current and prospective supply and demand conditions. It will also require flexibility in the choice of methods or programs that are designed to be most effective for individual commodities, that avoid waste, and that help bring about needed adjustments in production, distribution, and consumption.

Second, I urge that the Congress give full support to the continuance and expansion of our program of soil conservation.

For many years we were prodigal with our soil. In recent years we have made great progress on the slow process of rebuilding. But we are still far from our objective. Too much of our cropland now in use is being eroded. Much of our pasture and range land is still being overused. Our saw-timber supply is being used half again as fast as it is being replaced. Our streams are muddy, and as a result the useful life term of many of our dams and reservoirs is being shortened by unnecessary deposits of silt. We have not yet conquered the flood menace on most of our rivers.

On all these fronts we have a tremendous responsibility to do more than we are doing to conserve our soil, water, and forest resources. The programs we have instituted in the past decade have represented great steps forward. But I must point out that our past efforts will be wasted if we fail to continue and intensify our programs now and in the future. I urge the Congress to provide in full the funds needed for these programs.

Third, I recommend that the Congress continue and strengthen programs to assure adequate consumption of agricultural products.

Earlier Congresses have provided for an extensive research and marketing program designed to improve the distribution of farm products and develop new uses for them. This is a sound program, and should continue to be strongly supported.

Furthermore, the Government has taken steps to encourage export markets for a number of important commodities. Such actions are being taken, as they should be, in cooperation with other countries. Primary examples of this policy are the various trade agreements which have been made under the terms of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act and the international wheat agreement now before the Senate for ratification.

We must continue these measures to assure strong normal markets for agri-

cultural commodities. At the same time the health of our people requires us to consider other methods to move products into consumption. Our present school-lunch program is an example of such a program, which is providing better nutrition for millions of our school children. In addition, I believe that we should start now to develop a practical program to use agricultural surpluses to improve the diets of low-income families, and have it ready on a stand-by basis in case of need. We must never again allow our people to go hungry while agricultural surpluses are going to waste.

Fourth, we need to consider other means for assisting farmers to meet their special problems. For example, we must support and protect farm cooperatives. We must continue to work toward a sound system of crop insurance.

Furthermore, we should assist the improvement of living standards in rural areas. I have recommended measures to provide better health services to farmers and farm communities. I have recommended measures to improve the housing standards of farm families. I have recommended that the Government assist the States to furnish adequate primary and secondary education for all children—and this will have especially beneficial results in rural areas. Rural electrification should go forward as rapidly as feasible, to bring the benefits of electricity to more farms.

All of these measures will aid our farm families to maintain a standard of living befitting their essential position in our society. They will be of special importance to the millions of small farmers whose incomes are below a reasonable standard, even in this time of general agricultural prosperity.

All the measures I have recommended are essential for the future welfare of American agriculture. They should be enacted as promptly as possible.

It must be our firm purpose to maintain an increasingly healthy, productive, and prosperous agriculture in the United States. This is a basic requirement for progressive advancement of the welfare and prosperity of our own Nation. It is also a vital element in our contribution to world recovery and peace.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, May 14, 1948.

SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BILL, 1948

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, after consultation with the members of the Committee on Un-American Activities, I ask unanimous consent that of the 2½ hours to be allocated on this side of the aisle, a total of 45 minutes may be allocated by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] with the last 30 minutes of the over-all time reserved to the committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to yield 45 minutes of the time allotted to me to the gentleman

from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] in behalf of the opposition to this measure, reserving the last 20 minutes of the time allotted to me.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5852) to combat un-American activities by requiring the registration of Communist-front organizations and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 5852, with Mr. WADSWORTH in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule and pursuant to the order of the House, the gentleman from South Dakota is recognized for 2½ hours, and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Wood] is recognized for 2½ hours, of which over-all time the gentleman from New York has been allotted 45 minutes by each side, making a total of 90 minutes, with the last 45 minutes of the total time to be reserved to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], and the last 25 minutes of the total time of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Wood] to be reserved to himself.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. NIXON] will have charge of the time on this side of the aisle. I respectfully ask the Chairman to recognize the gentleman from California to allocate the time on this side.

Mr. NIXON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McDOWELL].

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Chairman, 10 years ago the Special Committee on Un-American Activities was established by the House of Representatives. Over the years it has done many things. It has been the recipient of much praise, and it has been the recipient of much criticism. Two years ago the Committee on Un-American Activities became a permanent standing committee of the House of Representatives. Over the 10 years there have been many distinguished Members of the House of Representatives on both sides of the aisle who have served with great brilliancy and distinction on this committee. But over the years only one Member who was on the original committee is now to be found still on the committee. That Member is its present chairman, the gentleman from New Jersey, Hon. J. PARNELL THOMAS. In the 10 years that Mr. THOMAS has been engaged in this highly important and vital work in these critical times he has probably become the most outstanding expert on political subversive activities in the history of the country. Last January, while he was on duty and at work as a good Congressman on an assignment that took him to Latin America, he became seri-

ously ill aboard ship. Since that time he has been making a very slow recovery. It was Chairman THOMAS' fondest hope to be here today to take part in the debate on the business that is now before the House. Until yesterday he still had hopes to be here, but his doctors forbid him to be present today. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein the remarks of Hon. J. PARNELL THOMAS, dictated this morning with reference to this matter.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The statement was as follows:

REMARKS OF HON. J. PARNELL THOMAS, CHAIRMAN, COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES, ON H. R. 5852

Before you today is the first legislative proposal ever to be reported from the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

It is an important proposal. It calls for the enactment of major legislation. And it is submitted to you at this time as the result of a unanimous committee conviction that it is an urgently needed bulwark to our national security.

We have called this legislative proposal a bill to protect the United States against un-American and subversive activities. Actually, it is a Communist Control Act, aimed at coping with the foremost menace to democracy today.

The open manifestations of Communist treachery and aggression in one foreign country after another since World War II should have convinced even the most naive of our citizens by now that the Communist movement is an inherently violent and traitorous conspiracy that respects no geographical boundaries or barriers. The international coordination of the Communist conspiracy, under the central, dominating leadership of the Soviet Union, has also been exposed in almost daily examples from abroad.

The executive branch of our Government has belatedly recognized the seriousness of the Communist aggression. It has admitted that the march of Red fascism is a threat to our own national security. Yet in building up a bulwark against Communist aggression, our Government has concentrated so completely in the field of foreign policy that defenses to the problem as it exists within our own borders have been almost forgotten.

The Communist Party of the United States is nothing more nor less than a fifth-column arm of the Soviet Union. There is not even a grain of logic in building up our defenses to Communist aggression from abroad only to allow thousands of Soviet Union agents to operate at virtually free will and under the protective cloak of secrecy within the United States. Communism, at home as well as abroad, is an evil and destructive force. In the interests of our national security, we need a defense policy aimed at curbing this totalitarian menace wherever it is found.

H. R. 5852 should go a long way toward providing our Nation with a fair yet adequate defense against the Communist fifth column within our borders. The bill was formulated by the Committee on Un-American Activities with great care and serious thought. Reflected in this bill, also, is the valuable experience with Communist operations which the committee has accumulated since 1938, when Congress created the Special Committee To Investigate Un-American Activities. It is a lasting tribute to this body that it had the foresight and the vigilance to establish this committee. For such foresight, 10 years ago, has meant that our Government never has and never will be caught flat-footed by the Communist fifth column.

I was one of the two Republican members of the committee when it was created 10 years ago, and I have served upon it continuously since that time. During those years, I saw it expose one new evidence after another of deceit and fraud and intrigue by the Communist Party of the United States. Although its career has been turbulent, I feel that the work of the committee over the years has had a tremendous influence upon the destiny of our country. It has served as the principal check against subversives here, whether from the extreme left or the extreme right.

Today, when more positive action is required against a Communist fifth column in the United States, the committee is ready to outline the course of action, through the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1948.

I became convinced of the need for eventual legislative measures to combat Communist subversion after World War II. When authority to report legislation to the House was given to the committee in January 1945, we immediately began considering formulas whereby this devious enemy could be reached through legislative means.

Last year, when the Republicans organized the Congress, and I was appointed chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities, I set up a special subcommittee on legislation which was authorized to make a thorough study as to how best to proceed from a legislative standpoint in combating communism in the United States. The work of that subcommittee was extensive and thorough. It heard over 100 witnesses—outstanding witnesses—our best constitutional lawyers, historians, Government officials, columnists, professors, and other qualified persons who could enlighten the committee on the difficult question of proceeding in a constitutional way, through legislation, to meet the Communist threat.

On April 30, our committee unanimously reported out H. R. 5852. I consider it to be one of the most carefully drawn bills ever to be reported to the House of Representatives. It is not a witch hunter's manifesto. It is a sane and effective approach to a problem which is entirely new in the field of legislation.

Since this bill has been reported, the Communists have launched one of their greatest campaigns. They have brought into play all of their fronts, their dupes, their stooges, and their innocents, in an effort to confuse the people concerning this bill. It is natural that they should, because if this bill is enacted, it will spell the death of the Communist Party of the United States, with headquarters in Moscow. It will spell the end of Stalin's meddling in the internal affairs of the United States.

You will hear various challenges thrown against the bill to the effect that it is unconstitutional, that it violates the basic rights of the individual, that it will create a police state, that it will bring about fascism. That is all a lot of poppycock.

This bill merely asserts the right of a free and democratic people to protect themselves and their Government from destruction.

Mr. NIXON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, it shall be my purpose to run through the major provisions of the bill for the benefit of the Members of the House and those in the galleries and the country who are interested in the contents of this legislation, so that you can have before you early in the stages of the debate exactly the purposes and provisions of this measure.

As has been stated, this is the first legislative measure to come from the House Committee on Un-American Activities,

in the history of the existence of our committee. It packs into its legislative paragraphs all of the experience, all of the studies which we have been making in our committee for some 10 years.

We have held long hearings on this question, some four or five hundred pages of hearings on the question of how best to work out a piece of legislation which will deal with the activities of Communists in America. Those hearings have been printed and have been made available to all Members of the House. I am sure most of you have read them and studied them, because they have been out for several weeks.

There are those who think we should outlaw the party completely. They pointed out, with some good reason, that the party which has been demonstrated by events up to now to be under the control and domination of a foreign power, has no right to function in the United States. So they suggested that we pass legislation banning it from the ballot, barring it from the mail, making it illegal, outlawing it entirely.

We called as witnesses on that subject some of the best authorities on communism in America, including what we consider the best, J. Edgar Hoover of the FBI. If you will read his testimony, you will see why he, charged as he is with the enforcement of subversive violations in this country, testified against outlawing the Communist Party by legislation. He pointed out numerous reasons which I shall not reiterate today in full, except to mention one or two of them, one of which is that it would tend to drive further underground a movement which is already too far underground in American public life. The second is that in places where the party has been outlawed by definition or name, that outlawing has proved ineffective. Our good friends to the North, the Canadians, tried it twice, and in both instances it failed, and they have repealed the outlaw legislation and are now moving in the direction which we point in H. R. 5852, which is an entirely different procedure and approach to the Communist problem from that of outlawing it or barring it from the mails or eliminating it from the ballots.

This approach is the approach of the policy of disclosure. It is the method recommended by J. Edgar Hoover. It says, in fact, to the Communists of America: "You claim to be a Communist Party. We know you are not a Communist Party because a political party in this country is never under the domination of a foreign power. We know you are under the domination of a foreign power. We know that you work in collusion and cooperation with Communist Parties all over the world; that you are not an indigenous, legitimate, American political organization at all, but you happen to be the American flank of a worldwide Communist conspiracy, taking its orders from Moscow, being directed from Moscow, and carrying out a program which is acceptable and accountable only to Moscow."

We say further, in effect:

"Since you claim to be a political party, we will write the rules of the game making you function as a political party. We will require you to act in

the open like a political party; require you to accept the responsibility of a political party; require you to do what political parties have to do in the State of South Dakota and in many of our States, register the names of the people who belong to your party."

If you are a Republican in South Dakota, you are proud to register the fact with the county auditor. If you are a Democrat in South Dakota, you are required to register your name with the county auditor, even though you are not proud of the fact that you belong to a party so frequently in the minority. But, in all events, members of our political parties register their names in the county auditor's office so that people know who they are. If they do not register they have no status in the party. So we say to the Communists in America: "Since you claim to be a political party, stand up and be counted, register your names with the Department of Justice. Let the people know who you are."

That is all. There is nothing unconstitutional about that. It has been done in a great many States. We require the lobbyists to register in Washington, and, at best, the Communist Party is a lobbying institution; at worst, it is a conspiracy against our form of government. But under any definition certainly it is perfectly constitutional to require Communists to register. Then we say that since you claim to be a political party there is no reason why you should not be required to report to the Government where you get your money and how you spend your money, who contributes the funds and who gets the benefits therefrom just as the Republicans and Democrats are required to do under our election laws. Since you claim to be a political party why should you not have that responsibility which we Republicans and Democrats have?

Certainly there is nothing in the Constitution of the United States which says there shall be a certain rule applying to the political activity of any group but the Communists, that Communists shall be exempt because they belong to a party which crushes out all legitimate forms of election machinery, so we will not make the laws applicable to Communists in this country. That would be absurd. But we do say that we will treat them like the Republican Party, we will treat them like the Democratic Party, and if they can prove that they are operating as a political party, they shall have the same rights to propagandize, the same rights to collect contributions, the same rights to go to the polls as any other political party in America.

We also apply the same provisions which we apply to the Republicans and Democrats to the propaganda and the printed material of the Communist Party. We say that no longer can you sneak through the mails disguised by some fancy, high-powered, euphonious name as patriots, when actually you are engaged in the subversive process of burrowing, undermining, disrupting, and corrupting America; you have got to come out in the open. When the Republican National Committee or the Demo-

cratic National Committee engages in propaganda or publicity they put the imprint of the party on the pamphlet. We require under the election machinery of this country anybody engaging in campaigns to identify political propaganda as to its source. We say in this bill that all material sent through the mail, all of the programs emanating over the radio sponsored by the Communist Party, or any of the front organizations controlled and financed or dominated by the Communist Party, must be compelled to identify the program or propaganda as to its source. There is nothing unconstitutional in that.

The sad-eyed, the soft-hearted, bewildered, and befuddled folks who still think it is liberal to promote tyranny in America have a hard time finding anything unconstitutional about bringing into the picture the Communist Party and applying to it the same rules of registration and the same rules of identification and the same rules of revelation that are applied to the legitimate political parties.

We cannot combine the Communists in the same kind of language with legitimate and regular political parties, because we are dealing with a conspiratorial subversive element masquerading as a political party. Consequently, it takes special laws to deal with a special problem, and that special problem is the fact that in this free Republic we henceforth propose to permit these subversive organizations to function only if they comply with the rules and regulations set down in this legislation.

It is interesting that the opposition to this legislation has carefully and studiously avoided getting themselves into conflict with the precise provisions of the bill. They cannot find much fault with them, so they raise a lot of straw men everywhere. They say this is an attempt to outlaw anybody who proposes to support the Jewish state; this is an attempt to outlaw the Masonic Lodge or the Catholic Church; this is an attempt to outlaw a labor union. It is not any such thing. The provisions of the bill clearly point out what is included. The only thing this bill outlaws is conspiracy to overthrow the American Government for the purposes of establishing herein a totalitarian regime dominated by a foreign power. That is outlawed by this bill, and if the Communists engage in that kind of conspiracy they and their leaders will be in violation of the law and will be, and should be, subject to a 10-year sentence in the penitentiary and a \$10,000 fine.

In other words, it transfers into a peacetime era one of the devices and tactics and techniques which have long been recognized as treasonable in America in time of war, an effort to sell your country down the river, to subjugate it to the rule of a foreign power. Russia? Yes; but any other foreign power as well. It would mean that the German-American Bund and its leaders would have been in violation of this law prior to Pearl Harbor, that the Black Dragon Society of Japan operating in California before Pearl Harbor would have been in violation of law. We of the Committee on Un-American Activities believe that a diligent, alert Department

of Justice will be able to demonstrate in a court of law that some of the leaders of the Communist Party in America are today trying to deliver this country lock, stock, and barrel to the men of the Kremlin, trying to establish here a totalitarian government subject to the control and the domination of Soviet Russia, and if our hunch can be established as a matter of fact in a court of law by legitimate judicial procedures, those men we have in mind will go to jail for 10 years and perhaps pay a fine of \$10,000 as well because that kind of conspiracy, that kind of treachery, that kind of treason is made illegal by this bill in time of peace in America. That is the only thing that is outlawed.

The Communists say, "You are trying to outlaw us." When they make that statement, then the Communists confess that our hunch is correct and that they are engaged in that kind of conspiracy. This will give us a chance to demonstrate at long last in a court of law if Communists are or are not engaged in a conspiracy. If they are not, they are not touched. If the shoe does not fit they do not put it on their foot. If it fits, we nail it on with iron cleats so that they cannot get it off. It is the sense of guilt which they have in their own minds that causes the Communists so greatly to fear this legislation.

We of the Committee on Un-American Activities submit that a free country has within the framework of its charter of freedom, its constitution, the power and the authority to protect its freedom in time of peace or war against those who would destroy the foundations of the temple of democracy in America. We go no further than that.

We do say that there are certain privileges which are to be denied to the members of the Communist Party, that its record is so bad, is so blatantly un-American, is so viciously antidemocratic, is so closely identified with other Fascist movements around the world, such as nazism in Germany and fascism in Italy, is so much a part of that whole sorrowful triumvirate, totalitarianism, fascism and nazism and communism, that we do not want any truck with them in positions of trust in the Federal Government. So we say that the privilege, not the right but the privilege, of employment by the Federal Government is denied to members of the Communist Party, just as it is denied to people past the age of 80 years, just as it is denied to certain aliens, just as it is also denied to practitioners of this alien concept. Nothing within the Constitution guarantees any man a job with the Federal Government. That is a privilege. It is a privilege which we deny to members of the Communist Party, just as the President of the United States, acting under the vigorous nudging by Congress, has exercised his rights under the loyalty program to deny the employment of these same radical, un-American people by the Federal Government.

There is also involved the privilege of getting a passport. It is not a right that any of us has to have a passport simply because we are citizens. It is a privilege extended us by the Government. It is

a privilege which people are expected not to abuse. You are not supposed to utilize that privilege to tear down the Government which grants you the privilege. So we deny the Communists the privilege of having passports to travel abroad in order to come in contact with the subversive forces of other countries.

In short, Mr. Chairman, while this legislation does not outlaw the Communist Party as an organization or a party it does force them to operate in the open and it outlaws activities on the part of anybody who conspires for the purpose of overthrowing this Government in peace or war in an attempt to establish here a totalitarian regime subservient to and dominated by any foreign government.

Furthermore, it requires Communist-front organizations to register their names, their officers, and their financial statements with the Department of Justice. It compels them, too, to keep in their own files the names and correct addresses of their members so that should public necessity ever require these lists can be obtained by subpoena or otherwise in order to disclose the identity of those operating through front organizations to destroy or betray America.

In effect, Mr. Chairman, this legislation requires the Communists of America to cut the umbilical cord which binds them to Mother Russia or to stand trial for treachery to the United States. If they operate as a strictly American organization, they will not be penalized by law; but if they operate as the secret agents of a foreign power in efforts to overthrow this Government and deliver our Republic to bondage to Russia they must face the legal consequences set up under this so-called Mundt bill. Let soft-headed and soft-hearted self-proclaimed liberals cry out against this perfectly constitutional method of defending and protecting our American freedoms if they will. Patriots of every party and of every walk of life will applaud and support this program for protecting and perpetuating the freedoms and liberties which have made America great and which the Communists and their dim-witted dupes would now destroy.

Mr. Chairman, we of the House Committee on Un-American Activities are proud of the great wave of popular support which has developed around H. R. 5852. In conformity with permission granted me in the House, I herewith call attention to the endorsement which the national department of the American Legion has given this legislation. The letter of transmittal and the official resolution of endorsement of the American Legion read as follows:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., May 11, 1948.

HON. KARL MUNDT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MUNDT: Pursuant to our conversation of even date with your office, I am attaching hereto a copy of the resolution approved by the national executive committee of the American Legion, meeting at

Indianapolis, Ind., May 3-5, 1948, giving full endorsement and approval to H. R. 5852.

I thought you would like to have this resolution for your information and guidance.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN THOMAS TAYLOR,
Director, National Legislative Commission.

RESOLUTION GIVING FULL ENDORSEMENT AND
APPROVAL OF H. R. 5852

Whereas the Un-American Activities Committee of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, on April 29, 1948, unanimously reported out H. R. 5852 to combat un-American activities by requiring the registration of Communist-front organizations, and for other purposes; and

Whereas in principle this bill conforms to the long-established American Legion policy of combating subversive influences: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the American Legion enthusiastically endorses H. R. 5852 and authorizes the immediate mobilization of all the resources, membership, family, and friends of the American Legion to aid in its prompt enactment by the Congress of the United States, and we further urge that the pertinent provisions of H. R. 5852 be published in national American Legion publications as quickly as possible, so that the entire membership may be immediately apprised of the nature of the bill.

In addition, Mr. Chairman, the Veterans of Foreign Wars through their national headquarters have given the Mundt bill their endorsement and they are urging its speedy and strong adoption. I do not have their resolution of endorsement with me here on the floor today, but other members of our committee will place it in the RECORD. With both the American Legion and the VFW supporting H. R. 5852, Mr. Speaker, we are not seriously concerned over the opposition of the Communists, of the wacky Wallace wanderers, and of a few Russian-worshipping Red leaders of leftish CIO unions. Other than that, opposition to this legislation is so conspicuously lacking that opponents have had to resort to flagrant forgery of names and telegrams in order to give even a semblance of respectability to the rabble resisting this bill.

Mr. Chairman, many great American newspapers such as the Milwaukee Journal, the New York Herald Tribune, the Washington Evening Star, the Washington News, and the Washington Times-Herald are supporting this legislation editorially. Such able and respected commentators and analysts as Fulton Lewis, Jr., and Raymond Moley are supporting it. The widely read and well-respected George Sokolsky has written in support of this legislation. As typical of the press of the Middle West, Mr. Chairman, in conclusion of these remarks I wish to call attention to an editorial appearing in a recent issue of the Aberdeen American-News. Let the reds of America resist, if they must, this legislation. The real Americans both in and out of Congress will give it their earnest and sincere support.

MUNDT'S RED-CURE BILL

The Periscope, widely read column in Newsweek, is authority for this information: "Representative KARL MUNDT, ranking member of the House Un-American Activities

Committee, is literally allergic to red. He says any contact with red-dyed leather or red furniture polish causes him to break out with hives * * *

The foregoing, of course, is semifacitious. But the work the South Dakota Representative is doing to curb the dangers of communism in America is deadly serious.

The bill Representative MUNDT now has awaiting House action is for the purpose of protecting America against the cheating of foreign-advised Reds who would destroy democracy.

The South Dakotan's bill would—

Isolate American Communist leaders from the rest of the world, particularly from the Soviet Union. Provide stiff penalties for any American Communist leader found guilty of conspiring against the United States.

By a policy of constant exposure, attempt to draw the support of so-called innocents away from the Communist Party and its front organizations.

Require registration of all members of the Communist Party, responsibility for this to rest on party leaders.

Require registration of all Communist-front organizations and the clear labeling of their propaganda as coming from quarters so stigmatized.

Deny Government jobs to members of the Communist Party and penalize Government executives who knowingly employ Communists.

Forbid issuance of passports to any member of the Communist Party.

Discontinue and forbid all tax-exempt status to Communist-front organizations.

Order deportation proceedings against all Communist registrants found to be aliens.

The bill does not, as charged by some of its opponents, outlaw the Communist Party.

It does, on the other hand, in the words of its author, "attempt to strike a body blow at the American cadre of the Soviet-directed Communist conspiracy."

Representative MUNDT, who has studied communism in America for 10 years and who has made on-the-spot inspections of communism in Europe since the war, contends, logically, that while spending billions to combat communism abroad, we to be consistent, must also discourage conspiracy against our Government by Communists in America.

As Raymond Moley wrote in the current issue of Newsweek, "the MUNDT bill is an excellent attempt to deal with a grave problem within constitutional limits."

The support the Red-curbing bill is getting in Congress and from the Nation's press indicates it will be approved. Having it written into law will be an accomplishment of Representative MUNDT's which will add to the security of America.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUCHANAN].

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, today this Nation is in deep conflict between proponents of national security and civil liberties. With this legislation we move into a conclusive phase. This legislation is an attempt to deal with conspiracy. I question very seriously and sincerely whether or not it is possible by legislative means to enact a law against the growth and the development of ideas. What do ideas feed upon? Discontent, dissatisfaction, fear, despair. What are we afraid of? Are we assuming a positive approach to a problem or are we trying to deal with a problem in a negative manner?

Possibly one of the best books that I have read in recent weeks is a book by

Monsignor Sheen entitled, "Communism and the Conscience of the West." Standing out in that work is a sentence that strikes me that we cannot approach this problem of communism by merely a negative attitude toward it. I want to make very clear my position in this Congress on the issue of national security. Unlike some members of the Committee on Un-American Activities, I supported the Truman doctrine; I supported the Marshall plan; and I voted for the 70-group Air Force bill. I intend to support some form of draft legislation. My position is crystal clear so far as the national security of this country is concerned.

This legislation, known both as the Subversive Activities Control Act and as the Mundt bill, attempts to meet the problem of dealing with a conspiracy, attempts to meet a problem not of outlawing communism or the Communist Party, though that is a course that is favored by many Americans, including one very prominent Republican candidate for the nomination of the Presidency, and repudiated, in fact, by other candidates for nomination on the Republican ticket. This bill deals with a theory that it is possible by the enactment of legislation to abolish ideas.

It seeks to bring out into the open communism and Communist-front organizations, under official surveillance. It writes into the bill making it a crime to attempt to establish totalitarian dictatorship in the United States.

We have tried to do this thing before in some form or other. We have had the McCormack bill, the Voorhis bill, and the Smith bill. It is a question in my mind as to just how well legislation of this character served its purposes, whether or not it has functioned in the manner the authors of the legislation desired or conceived.

This bill makes it a crime to attempt to establish totalitarian dictatorship. It provides for the registration with the Attorney General of the Communist or Communist-front organizations and their officers and members. Such organizations would be required to make full disclosure of the receipt and the expenditure of funds. Members of registered organizations would be denied passports, thus cutting the threads that bind the international conspiracy together. They would be denied Government employment. It would be illegal for registered organizations or their representatives to use the mails. It does not outlaw the Communist Party.

The greatest objection to this bill, as I see it, and the reason I will not support this legislation, is that it is too sweeping in its definitions, it is too broad and too general in its effort to include Communist-front organizations, that could conceivably be subject to false accusations or could be allied with the idea that they were subversive. It would blend and use the smear technique of propaganda. It would mean notoriety and embarrassment, and a great deal of expense to many innocent people and organizations.

I recognize the fact that voting against legislation of this character puts

one on the defensive politically. One must do a lot of explaining to his constituents as to why he would oppose legislation of this type. Weeks ago I was concerned about how the people in my district felt about legislation of this character and I sent out a questionnaire to some 50,000 persons in my congressional area. One of the questions that I asked my constituents was whether or not we should assume a firm attitude toward Russia. I know the sentiment of my congressional district. I knew beforehand, practically, just what kind of reply I would get. It did not surprise me that more than 93 percent of the replies on that question were in the affirmative, but it amazed me that I received back such a large number of replies. Almost 10,000 people replied and in 85 percent of the cases they signed their names and wrote their personal views and versions of that particular question, along with the question of the draft and the question of universal military training.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. McDOWELL. The gentleman makes the point that the bill would cause notoriety and expense and various other unpleasant things to many people. That is very obvious. That is the purpose of the bill. We are trying to expose and to cause notoriety for the Communists who are digging into America. There will be no attempt on the part of the committee to deny that.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I do not question the sincerity of the gentleman's motives and I do not question his realism so far as his attitude toward this problem is concerned, but what usually happens and what does happen is that a lot of innocent people are smeared by this technique.

Mr. Chairman, in controversial legislation of this character, there is no doubt that the committee has spent long and arduous hours trying sincerely and constructively to frame a piece of legislation which they believe will do the job. They have consulted many authorities who have expressed their views on civil liberties and who have been exponents of the guardianship of civil liberties. But I am rather reluctant to give blanket approval to legislation of this character for as someone has said that "laws are made to be broken." In the enactment of legislation of this kind, wherein the desire, aim, and objective is to outlaw or to legislate against conspiracies, it will reveal to the world that we have inherent weaknesses in this Nation wherein we are vitally afraid of criticism—constructive criticism—from within. If our efforts were devoted to promoting a stabilized economy wherein we would reach a sense of balance in our domestic, economic, and social structure, then legislation of this kind would have no place in the halls of Congress. America would show to the world that its real strength lies in our ability to produce the abundant life. That our efforts in the Congress are constructive and toward that end rather than enacting legislation of

a questionable character—legislation that is negative—legislation that represents wishful thinking. The history of legislation of this character is that it does not suppress the idea but brings in its consequences something that we do not now conceive.

[From the New York Times Magazine of May 2, 1948]

WHAT IS A COMMUNIST? HOW CAN YOU SPOT HIM? HE WEARS MANY GUISES BUT REVEALS HIMSELF IN HIS ADHERENCE TO THE KREMLIN'S LINE

(By Allan Nevins)

As charges of disloyalty are brought against such prominent Americans as the head of the Bureau of Standards, and as unnaturalized aliens accused of subversive Communist activities are seized for deportations, many thoughtful citizens wonder if the country is entering upon another Red scare. Their memories hark back to the days when a New York mob wrecked the office of the Call, when veterans and "wobblies" clashed in the Northwest and when the *Buford* sailed for Russia with 249 radicals aboard.

We want no recurrence of such events. Yet as we look at the headlines, certain difficult questions are forced upon us. Just what is a dangerous Communist, and how can he be identified? How can precautionary measures be taken without imperiling liberals?

A salient difference between the anti-Red movement after World War I and that taking shape today needs to be pointed out. The principal root of all such movements is fear; fear usually mixed with prejudice, and heightened by hysteria. But the fear that had such baleful results in 1918-21 took a very different shape from whatever apprehensions are cropping out in this country today.

In the earlier period fear sprang chiefly from a sense of national disunity. Americans realized uneasily in 1918 that they had not yet created a closely welded Nation. The war had revealed, indeed, a decided lack of homogeneity. The conflict had therefore been accompanied by a harsh intolerance of dissent. Ex-President Theodore Roosevelt and others had carried on a crusade against "hyphenates"; the Government had condemned Socialists for their opposition to the war, and put Debs in prison. Peace brought an irresistible demand for laws to restrict immigration. It brought, too, a pronounced fear that economic and political radicalism would produce violent internal cleavages in the United States. Nobody worried about an external attack, but millions were apprehensive that the Reds (all bogies are given vague names) would foment class divisions so as to endanger orderly government and the economic structure.

Today few are troubled by ideas of domestic disruption. It is the external rather than internal peril that takes first place in men's apprehensions. National unity, as the Second World War showed, has grown steadily in recent decades. The "hyphenates" almost disappeared between the two conflicts. The New Deal did much to satisfy discontented elements of society. Socialists strongly supported the war effort. Nowadays the groups which wish a really violent new swing to the left are small, and the party which would like to subvert our governmental system can hardly muster a corporal's guard. But, to our dismay and anguish, we are faced with an external threat. We are engaged in a cold war with Russia, we are pouring out billions to sustain western Europe and China against her aggressions, and we are maintaining large armaments to meet possible attack. The threat may be exaggerated, but it exists.

The result is that we fear the Communist and Red, not as possible agents of an internal explosion, as in 1918-20, but rather

as agents to aid a foreign attack. We fear the agitator much less and the accomplice much more. This fact gives new form to the question, What is a dangerous Communist? It renders an answer to that question somewhat easier and makes attack on liberalism inexcusable. It is extremely difficult to answer the broad question, What is communism? Communism may refer to a political party which in this country is tiny and despised. It may refer to a set of principles which have had a thousand different exponents from the days of the Essenes to those of the Cominform. It may refer to a general movement which at various times has embraced very diverse sects. It may refer to an anticipated state of society which differs from practical communism of 1948 as light differs from darkness. But there is no such difficulty in answering the question, What is a dangerous Communist? The last 20 years have helped greatly in that matter.

In 1918-20 Russian communism was a new force in the world, and being new, plastic, and largely untested by realities, it had a natural appeal to considerable bodies of aspiring men. Since it had replaced Czarist Russia it might be represented as a liberating force. To be sure, much was heard even then of the crimes and oppressions of the Bolsheviks. They might be excused or palliated, however, as a natural reaction against the old autocracy or as precautionary in character.

For some years after 1918 communism naturally made a strong appeal to young idealists in particular; to youths who believed that the world could be regenerated in happier form. A wide spectrum of radicalism appeared, ranging from the fiery red of convinced revolutionists to the light pink of fuzzy-minded social reformers.

But today the situation is completely different. A believer in Russian communism can take no shelter behind hazy idealism. He is a believer in a police state of the most ruthless character, with a system of secret arrests, dictated convictions, purges, and concentration camps. He believes in a system which has killed, imprisoned, and exiled many millions where czarism killed and jailed thousands. He believes in an imperialist type of aggression which has destroyed the freedom of a dozen nations; converting them, as with the Baltic states, into mere provinces, or into vassal lands where minorities rule by terror. The appeal of Russian communism to the aspiring is gone.

A quarter century ago, in short, the believer in Russian communism and utopian communism might be identical. Any optimistic young reformer might fancy that he embraced Lenin and Sir Thomas More together; he might believe that the communism of Plato and that of Trotsky had much in common. A multitude of people all over the world, including laborers, students, intellectuals, and social workers, did to some extent confound the two faiths.

In our time, however, a clear line can be drawn between the disciple of Russian communism and the disciple of utopian communism. Anyone who admires the iron regime of Stalin has bidden farewell to the dreams of Robert Owen and William Morris, and to the moderate Marxism of Kautsky and the Fabians. Russian communism is at the opposite pole from all true liberalism.

It is vital in the present situation for us to understand this. And to understand it we must have a clear perception of the great difference between the theories held by the liberal on the one side, and the Communist on the other.

True liberals of all shades of opinion, including orthodox Socialists, agree to the fundamental principle that majority rule shall be loyally accepted so long as it respects the basic rights of minorities. No matter how much the Wilsonian liberal detested Harding's type of reaction, no matter how deeply Norman Thomas' followers abhorred

Coolidge's policies, they yielded full obedience to the Government.

The Communist, however, rejects this principle. His party doctrine is Communist rule or general ruin. To him an opposition victory at the polls is simply the signal for conspiracy, sabotage, and secret subversion. As a minority, the Communists give no deference to any majority; they reject all the rules of the democratic game; they concoct plots, infiltrate at all weak points, cripple every machine they can touch, and stand ready at any moment to seize power by force.

The problem of coping with such elements is therefore simplified. We are not concerned with a movement; we are concerned with a militant minority, alien in allegiance. Unceasing vigilance is essential and in certain areas of government activity it is necessary to insist on a security check. We cannot let the armed services, our State Department personnel, or the agencies concerned with atomic energy, be invaded by men who may become secret agents of a foreign power. We have the example of Canada's spy ring to show what may be the penalties of laxity. But precautions regarding these limited sectors of national activity are not difficult to take; the records, associations, and expressed ideas of employees or prospective employees can readily be tested.

It is also true that certain precautions are necessary elsewhere. We have said that the general national unity in this year of 1948 stands at a high level. It must not be forgotten, however, that the Communist is not now greatly concerned with the general national unity of this country. He is seeking for the weak spots. He strives to enter the labor union, the discontented slum area, the groups of impressionable youth. Here he can be combated in two ways: by exposure of his aims and methods, and by the counter-encouragement of true liberalism. It is ironic nowadays to recall that in 1918-20 the groups most fiercely attacked were our Socialists. Today these Socialists, accepting the fundamental democratic premises, are among our staunchest opponents of communism. As we fight the Communists, we need to cherish the liberals of all schools and views.

In short, no real basis exists for such a "Red scare" as appeared just after the first World War; a scare which soon left our country heartily ashamed. Our worries about the internal situation then were greatly exaggerated; today such worries do not exist. The number of really dangerous Communists capable of betraying the United States to benefit the Soviet Union is small; their intelligence is open to question, for they certainly include a large proportion of mere crackpots; while their general influence is slight. Once certain areas of government are thoroughly protected, we may feel safe about the national situation in general. Such bodies as the Thomas Committee on Un-American Activities can be useful if they help guard these areas; they can be utterly pernicious if they follow the Mitchell Palmer Red-hunt tradition.

If we are to have a careful policing of governmental agencies—and it is certain that those offices and departments which deal with national security must be policed—we should at least have the work done with a careful regard to all parts of our Bill of Rights. It is the fundamental charge against the Thomas committee, not that it has acted clumsily, but that it has shown inadequate respect for the basic liberties written into our Constitution. Today even Great Britain, normally so slow to act in such matters, is purging her governmental services of Communists and their tools among the fellow travelers. But it is noteworthy that Britain has set up no body similar to our Committee on Un-American Activities.

If we grasp these facts, it is easier to approach the question, How can we deal with the dangerous Communists without hurting useful radicals and liberals? It is easier to

answer because we can approach it without any sense of panic. One reason why our internal situation is so healthy is that radicals and liberals have been allowed free scope for expressing their opinions; another reason is that from 1929 onward many of their more valuable ideas were adopted and applied.

Repressive activities always defeat their own end. They arouse widespread antagonism, foster the extremist doctrines at which they are aimed, and create martyrs and a martyrology—the most powerful agencies of propaganda known to history. We need not worry about the Socialists; they are the fiercest opponents of Soviet ideas. We need not worry about the utopian Communists; they can't but detest the Russian perversion of their ideals. We need not worry about liberals, who are the bulwark of our own system.

The more freedom of opinion and discussion we have, the better, for it will drive home to everyone some truths which still need enforcement. Fifteen years ago Harold J. Laski, declaring that capitalism and communism were running a race for the allegiance of the masses, stated that each had certain tests to meet. Capitalism had to remove the fear of insecurity which haunted the worker's life. It had to abolish competing imperialisms. Above all, it had to cut away the jungle growth of vested interests which impaired its efficiency and its social equity. As for communism, wrote Laski, it had to put an end to the perpetual postponement of consumption for the sake of a future which never arrived. It had to terminate the dominating grip of one party and its small cabal of leaders, introduce truly representative institutions, and permit political freedom.

While Mr. Laski thought that communism had the better prospects, we can now see that in this competitive rivalry the capitalist states have made by far the better showing. In one western democracy after another, and particularly in Britain and the United States, effective measures have been taken to remove the fear of insecurity. The power of the vested interests has been healthfully diminished. Imperialism has been almost completely abolished, and where it exists it has taken on a greatly improved character. Meanwhile, in Russia, the era of consumption plenty still recedes, while the tyrannical grip of a small oligarchy of rulers has been tightened, not relaxed. In nearly every respect in which it is possible to compare the recent development of capitalist democracy with that of Russian communism, the advantage lies manifestly with the former. These are facts which free discussion, and only free discussion, can bring forth.

Repression is an indispensable part of the Soviet regime; it is not needed in the United States, and is hostile to every American tradition. Precautions against treason we may well take, and we can always punish individual violations of our statutes; but beyond that no arm of the Government can afford to go. We may well recall the words of Charles E. Hughes at a time when a sweeping attempt to deny radicals their rights simply because they were radical had carried away the New York Assembly: "I count it a most serious mistake to proceed, not against individuals charged with violation of the law, but against masses of our citizens combined for political action, by denying them the only resource of peaceful government; that is, action by the ballot box and through duly elected representatives in legislative bodies." If we restrict the security check to its proper and very narrow areas, and elsewhere guarantee free opinion, free speech, and a free vote, we are safe.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to announce the arrangement as to the division of time, because some of the Members were not in the Chamber at the time the arrangement was

made. I want it to be clear to those who are seeking time that we have arranged an unusual procedure for allocating time in this debate.

Due to the fact that this resolution has the unanimous support of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, and because there was no demand for time to speak in opposition from the minority party, the Democrats, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] said that he and his associates would like time to oppose it. Therefore, we have arranged for people in opposition to the bill to get their time through the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO], who has 90 minutes available for that purpose. He is leading and organizing the opposition. Those who desire time to support the bill can get it either from the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Wood] or the gentleman from California [Mr. Nixon]. Those desiring to oppose the bill can get their time from the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

Mr. SADOWSKI. How much time would that give the proponents?

Mr. MUNDT. It gives the proponents less time per man under the provisions of the rule than it gives to the opponents.

Mr. SADOWSKI. That is not the question I asked. I said, How much time would that give the proponents?

Mr. MUNDT. I gave you your answer. It gives less time per man to those of us supporting the Mundt bill than it gives to the opponents of the legislation.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LYNCH].

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chairman, I assume that anyone who speaks in opposition to this bill will be more or less characterized as a Communist. In my own district, red is not a very popular color. All I can say is that coming as I do from a parochial school, educated under the liberal tutelage of the Jesuits at Fordham, I do not believe anybody with my background, my name, and my face could be adjudged a Communist.

I shall have to resort to a story that is an actual one, where a member of my political party was a candidate for the assembly in our State. He had a beautiful Irish brogue, which it was concluded would not be particularly good in certain sections of the district. It was suggested that he just appear and not talk too much. So he went before a crowd and he said, "My name is so and so. If you like my face, vote for me. If you don't like my face, don't vote for me."

I am afraid that is what I will have to do after I have finished with my remarks on this bill today.

However, there are other things besides political considerations which we must consider. I am opposed to communism just as strongly as anybody in this House, as you can readily judge, yet I feel that communism is an economic theory and that you just cannot legislate against an economic theory. What we ought to do is not to try to legislate against a result. We ought to try to legislate against the cause that produces the result. If we have Communists in

this country—and we have—if we have those who are going along with some communistically controlled organization—which we have—I think we can very largely lay that entire situation to ourselves; and, as I say, the legislation should be directed not against the result but against the cause.

What is the cause? There may be many throughout the country and in my own particular district in the city of New York, where perhaps we have unfortunately more now than we had before of those who are inclined to go along with the communistically dominated groups. The actual cause, in my opinion, has been entirely economic. We have not taken care of those veterans who have come home, who have been married, who must, perforce, because of housing shortage, live with their in-laws instead of establishing their own homes. That is an obligation that I think we, as Members of Congress, are more or less responsible for, and instead of legislating against communism as such, we should legislate in favor of housing that is going to dissipate the thought of joining these communistic organizations.

In addition, we have a situation as far as rent is concerned in New York. We have people today who are contributing to organizations that apparently are not in anywise connected with Communists but fundamentally I know there is a connection. But those people are belonging to and contributing to those organizations for one reason only, that is because they do not have adequate protection, under the laws of our country, against an increase of rents that unscrupulous landlords in New York City and elsewhere are imposing upon tenants who have no other choice than to live in the place where they presently reside.

There is another thing that we should have done. Instead of spending our time today trying to eradicate the result, we should be spending our time upon eradicating the cause, and we still have an opportunity.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. LYNCH] has expired.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. LYNCH. We also have a situation in respect to the increased cost of food and other commodities. I do not know whether price control was the right answer or not. I felt that it was. The majority of this House felt it was not. But because of the unreasonably high prices today, we have housewives who are going out and joining these organizations with the intent, not of becoming Communists, but for the reason that they think—wrongly so, but still they think—that in those organizations is to be found some cure that will bring down the price of the cost of living.

Turning our attention to the bill as it is now before us, I want in particular to call your attention to one paragraph and that is in connection with the Communist-front organizations which appears on page 22 of the bill, and reads that any organization is a Communist-front organization whose "views and policies

are in general adopted and advanced because such views or policies are those of a Communist political organization, a Communist foreign government, or such world Communist movement."

There is not a labor organization in the country that has not advocated certain reforms such as housing, such as legislation attacking prices, but that the Communists have tied themselves onto those reforms suggested by these labor organizations, having no connection with communism; and yet under this bill those organizations or people who belong to the labor organizations would be outlawed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. NIXON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McDOWELL].

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Chairman, may I assure the gentleman from New York [Mr. LYNCH] that I am very sure no Member of this House or any person in the State of New York would consider him a Communist or anything but a good old-fashioned New York Democrat. In some of the things that the gentleman said, however, in opposition to this bill it appears to me that the gentleman's logic is just exactly backward: Laws are made to be broken. If that were so, what is the use of passing laws? What is the use of having a Congress? Why do we pass a law against murder and rape and theft? No Member of Congress should ever rise on this floor and say that laws are made to be broken. Obviously, that is the reason the American Congress is in existence.

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to discuss the merits of this bill, for there are many more able members of the Committee on Un-American Activities than I who will do that; but I want to tell you something about the circumstances surrounding its being on the floor today.

I doubt if there is any Member of the House or the Senate who has not received letters, wires, telegrams, and telephone calls, and everything of the kind, asking, demanding, that they not pass the Mundt bill and threatening them. These messages have come in by the thousands in the last several days.

I warned the House day before yesterday that all hell would break loose here yesterday when some 7,000 Communists, largely from New York City, were going to more or less take over the Capitol.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. McDOWELL. I yield.

Mr. LYNCH. I understand the gentleman said that I said that laws were made to be broken. Did the gentleman make such reference?

Mr. McDOWELL. I did; yes.

Mr. LYNCH. I think the gentleman was mistaken. I made no such comment.

Mr. McDOWELL. Then it was the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. LYNCH. I am not trying to place any blame; I just want to make certain that that statement is not attributed to me.

Mr. McDOWELL. I will apply, then, my remarks to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BUCHANAN. The remark I made was that somebody has said that laws were made to be broken.

Mr. McDOWELL. Well, here is a law not made to be broken, and if it is broken somebody is going to jail. But let me get back to the history of what happened here in the last several days.

In the last 48 hours wires have begun to come into the Capitol here signed by people who have been known as very substantial citizens, both Democrats and Republicans, from both the North and South, the East and the West, telling the Members of the House what was going to happen to them if they voted for the Mundt bill. One of the members of the committee got a wire from one of the most substantial men in his district, a letter, it was not a wire. It was so outrageous and so threatening that night before last he called the gentleman, way out on the west coast, and discovered that that man had not written a letter, that it was a forgery. It was written on his stationery. So working on that we began to look into things. I discovered that a telegram sent by some of the most substantial, honorable, and distinguished members of the faculty of a great northern university, a wire that was sent down here to several Members berating them for their probable vote on this bill, had not been sent by those men at all. They did not know who had sent the wire. We discovered a lady in New York City, a substantial lady whose name is familiar to this body who was supposed to have written to a number of Members of Congress threatening what would happen if they voted for the bill. When the lady was contacted she said she never heard of the letter. As a matter of fact, she said she "hopes the Mundt bill will be passed."

Let me tell the Committee something that happened here 9 years ago. I was a young Member of the House of Representatives at that time. War was approaching in 1940. The American Youth for Democracy was a complete fake, a complete fraud, a front organization for the Communist Party. The American Youth for Democracy organization, in its attempt to keep assistance from going across the water to the embattled nations over there, was doing everything it possibly could to slow down the American war effort. Those of you who were Members at that time will recall that up at the White House around the home of Franklin Delano Roosevelt there was a parade of pickets day after day calling him a tool of Wall Street, a warmonger, and all that sort of thing, and into our Capital City of the Nation poured several trainloads of young people—the American Youth for Democracy. They came to Washington in one of those futile, frustrated treks that they occasionally make down here to attempt to upset a particular course of the American Government. Because I was young, because I was skinny, and did not look like a Congressman, it was suggested by some of the most substantial and able Members of this House that I join these peo-

ple. I did. I looked like the rest of them, with no collar, no necktie, no coat, and I wandered around the city with them. I went to their meetings up here at Turner's Arena. I walked all over the Hill with them. They were led by a dopey, half-witted preacher who did not know what he was doing. Every few minutes we would kneel on the ground, he would pray, and they would laugh. I would not tell this if there was not in the Chamber at this very moment one of the most distinguished Members of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM], my neighbor from western Pennsylvania. We finally made our way into the House under the leadership of the American Youth for Democracy late in the afternoon, just about dusk. The guards somehow or other slipped up; they were not here; and I recall somebody had left the door to the Speaker's lobby open. We poured into the Speaker's lobby. They tried to get into this Chamber. The gentleman from Pennsylvania, as is his usual custom when he wants to meditate upon problems that confront him, comes over here and sits and thinks by himself. I recall that somebody grabbed a big blue vase in the lobby and began to rock it. The judge came down the aisle, opened the door, and used considerable Pennsylvania strong language when he ordered us out of there and summoned a guard. But I recall the sentence being said time after time by members of the American Youth for Democracy movement—the Communist Party: "This is where the dirty — do it."

Mr. Chairman, that is the attitude of the Communist Party. There is nothing they will not do to destroy our country. It was said here awhile ago by the gentleman from New York [Mr. LYNCH] that we should get at these things at the very beginning. That is the thing we are trying to do today. He stated that what we are doing today is getting at the end of things. It is not. It is getting at the Communist Party. We are trying to dig them out.

We have had letters, wires, telegrams, and telephone calls down here that the only way to destroy communism is to make democracy work. Let me suggest to you there was hardly any unemployment in little Finland, one of the most prosperous nations in the world. Democracy was most certainly working in Finland, and Finland is gone. Probably the most prosperous nation in middle Europe was Czechoslovakia, where people worked, where people want to work, where people like to vote, where people like democracy, where they were perfectly content and satisfied with their government. Democracy was working there, but Czechoslovakia is gone.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McDOWELL. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. The gentleman is making a very fine address and I want to congratulate him on it. I want to add a little word to his very fine answer concerning the strained logic of the gentle-

man from New York [Mr. LYNCH], when he said that we should not pass any laws against communism, but simply get at the source of it. If that is a valid argument, then we should not pass any law against kidnapping, and we should not pass any law against murder, but we should get at the source of that. In fact, if that is true, we should not pass any law at all; we should get at the source of all these difficulties. That is certainly a strange and befuddled approach to curtailing communism.

May I say also that the gentleman from Pennsylvania has made some very interesting statements about forgery that is being used in an effort to build up opposition to this bill. Let me give you an illustration I had the other day. I had a letter purporting to be written on the editorial masthead of Newsweek criticizing me for introducing this bill, stating that they were going to South Dakota and oppose me in the campaign for introducing this bill, "That you made a blunder," and so forth, and it was signed "Ann Whitney," one of the alleged editors of Newsweek. And, I naturally thought, well, they had a perfect right to be against this bill if they wanted to. Then one of the Newsweek people came to my office shortly after that, a member of that magazine, by the way, and I threw the letter over to him, and he read it, and he said, "I do not know of any editor by that name. I do not know of anybody by that name on our magazine."

"Well," I said, "there it is on your own letterhead." He said, "Let me take it along with me and check." He did. They took the pay roll of Newsweek, checked everybody on the pay roll either in the editorial department or otherwise by that name, but could not find any. It developed that this is part of the system of conspiracy and forgery that is being used. I beg the gentlemen of the House to check up on these telegrams and letters you are getting. In the 10 years that I have been here this is the first time that forgery has been flagrantly used as a device to attempt to register opposition in Washington, which actually does not exist back in the grass roots. The Newsweek case is an illustration. The gentleman from Pennsylvania had two or three instances that he reported, and he does well to call the attention of the Congress and the country to the fact that they are developing this technique of forgery which is, after all, a Communist device which the Communists well know how to use.

Mr. McDOWELL. I thank the gentleman for his splendid contribution. Forgery is merely one of the tools used: Forgery, murder, torture, everything that the Communist Party has been familiar with for more than 30 years.

Mr. Chairman, in an effort to save the time of the House, I ask unanimous consent to include as part of my remarks six pages of a brief outlining the Communist ideas, a brief that has been very carefully prepared from the files of our committee, containing 10 years of independent research of the Communist Party.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDOWELL. The brief is as follows:

With the establishment of the Communist, totalitarian dictatorship in Russia in 1917 and the announcement of its avowed purpose to destroy democratic governments throughout the world in order to replace them with a world federation of Soviet Republics, the United States finds itself confronted with a new problem in its effort to protect its national security. We find that we can no longer rely merely upon our military arms for our own defense, but must give serious consideration to the problem of interference on a mass scale in our own domestic affairs by those who are directly or indirectly the agents of this Communist, totalitarian dictatorship.

Since the founding of this Nation in 1787, we have not encountered this problem in any serious form until recently. In 1793 Citizen Edmond Genet arrived in this country for the expressed purpose of instructing this government in its proper conduct toward its then ally, the Republic of France. He actively sought to influence public men and interfere in shaping American policy. At the request of George Washington, he was promptly given his walking papers.

In 1823 the Government of the United States found itself confronted with the possibility that the then powerful government of Czarist Russia would seize California and perhaps Chile and Peru in our own hemisphere and that France might seize Mexico.

The comparatively weak and youthful American Republic under the leadership of President James Monroe responded vigorously to the challenge. On December 2, 1823, he delivered to the Congress of the United States the famous message which has since been known as the Monroe Doctrine. It declared in forthright fashion that the continents of the Western Hemisphere were "henceforth not to be considered as subjects for future colonization by any European powers." Commenting upon any efforts by European power to interfere in our affairs or those of neighboring States, the Doctrine declared "that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety."

The Communist movement was launched in the United States in September 1919 at the specific initiative of the Communist International, led by the executive heads of the Soviet Government. The launching of the Communist movement in this country was synchronized with Communist-led revolutionary outbreaks in Austria, Hungary, Germany, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Great Britain, Rumania, and other countries.

On January 21, 1924, Secretary of State Charles Evans Hughes transmitted to a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, a statement with supporting data to show "the essential unity of the Bolshevik organization known as the Communist, the so-called Soviet Government, and the Communist International" and secondly "the spiritual and organic connection between this Moscow group and its agent in this country—the American Communist Party and its legal counterpart, the Workers' Party." He characterized this party as "created by and completely subservient to a foreign organization striving to overthrow the existing social and political order of this country."

On May 22, 1930, the House of Representatives adopted House Resolution 220, Seventy-first Congress, second session, authorizing the appointment of a Special Committee to In-

vestigate Communist Activities in the United States. It was made clear at the time that the Department of Justice had neither the power, authority, nor the funds to conduct such investigations. A five-man committee headed by Hon. Hamilton Fish, Jr., of New York, conducted extensive hearings and heard numerous witnesses representing all walks of life. Its final report was issued on January 17, 1931.

In 1933 a movement developed in the United States for the establishment of commercial and diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union on its part in return for recognition, pledged itself on November 16, 1933, through a formal letter from Maxim Litvinov, Soviet Ambassador, addressed to President Roosevelt "to respect scrupulously the indisputable right of the United States to order its own life within its own jurisdiction in its own way and to refrain from interfering in any manner in the internal affairs of the United States, its territories, or possessions." From our experiences since the signing of this pledge we know that it was not worth the paper it was written upon and that if we are to safeguard our own internal security, it will have to come solely through adequate legislation strictly enforced.

On March 20, 1934, the House of Representatives adopted a resolution (H. R. 198, 73d Cong. 2d sess.) authorizing the appointment of a Special Committee on Un-American Activities to investigate "(1) the extent, character, and objects of Nazi propaganda activities in the United States, (2) the diffusion within the United States of subversive propaganda that is instigated from foreign countries and attacks the principle of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution." This committee was headed by Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK of Massachusetts, as chairman, and Hon. Samuel Dickstein as vice chairman. In view of the mounting threat from Nazi activities whose inspiration and direction emanated from the German Government of Adolph Hitler, the committee made an exhaustive investigation into such activities, published in its voluminous hearings which lasted until February 1935. As a result of the work of this committee the McCormack bill (H. R. 10094, 76th Cong. 3d sess.) was adopted requiring the registration by the Attorney General of every organization subject to foreign control which engages in political or civilian military activity or whose purpose is the establishment, control, conduct, seizure, or overthrow of a government or subdivision thereof by the use of force, violence, military measures, or threats of any one or more of the foregoing.

On May 26, 1938, the House of Representatives adopted House Resolution 282 (76th Cong., 1st sess.) authorizing the appointment of a Special Committee on Un-American Activities to investigate "(1) the extent, character, and objects of un-American propaganda activities in the United States; (2) the diffusion within the United States of subversive and un-American propaganda that is instigated from foreign countries" attacking "the principle of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution." A seven-man committee was appointed headed by Hon. Martin Dies, of Texas. Under this title the committee operated until January 3, 1945, when the House of Representatives adopted House Resolution 5 (79th Cong. 1st sess.) authorizing the present standing Committee on Un-American Activities. From January 1945 until January 1947 this committee consisting of nine members was headed by Hon. JOHN S. WOOD, of Georgia. From January 1947 to date this committee has been headed by Hon. J. PARNELL THOMAS, of New Jersey.

Under H. R. 5, the Committee on Un-American Activities was authorized not only to investigate (1) the extent, character,

and objects of un-American propaganda activities in the United States, (2) the diffusion within the United States of subversive and un-American propaganda that is instigated from foreign countries" but also to deal with "all other questions in relation thereto that would aid Congress in any necessary remedial legislation. The accompanying legislative proposals are presented to the Congress of the United States in pursuance of this mandate.

These proposals are not lightly presented. They are the fruit of 28 years of experience which the Nation has had with the Communist Party of the United States, during which time we have certainly learned to evaluate its true character and potentialities. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities and the present standing committee in the course of 10 years have held public and executive hearings with 998 witnesses covering 19,651 pages of testimony embodied in 21 volumes and has issued 48 reports. It has amassed a file including over 1,000,000 names of individuals engaged in pro-Communist activity as well as extensive files of Communist literature and data dealing with Communist organizations. From January 22, 1947, through March 31, 1948, these files were consulted by 2,499 representatives of Government agencies or employees of Members of Congress or congressional committees.

As a result of the findings of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities and flowing directly therefrom, the Congress adopted Public Law 532 (77th Cong., ch. 263, 2d sess.), introduced by Hon. JERRY VOORHIS, of California, a member of this special committee. The bill provided for the registration by organizations engaging in propaganda activities and other activities for or on behalf of foreign governments, foreign political parties, and other foreign principals. While Nazi and Fascist activities were thoroughly dealt with in these hearings and reports, the committee had the foresight to devote major attention to the Communist problem.

With the defeat of the Nazi and Fascist powers legislation dealing with foreign and un-American propaganda from these sources has become manifestly unnecessary.

From June 23, 1941, to August 14, 1945, during the period of our wartime alliance with the Soviet Union, the Communist Party of the United States of America (known for a time as the Communist Political Association) gave some slight evidence of endeavoring to abide within the limits of our understanding with that Government. There were steps in the direction of labor-management cooperation. There were few Communist-led strikes. There was a degree of support for the President of the United States and the Congress by the Communists. As we look back upon this period, we are convinced, however, that there was merely tongue-in-cheek cooperation; that the Communists were taking full advantage of the situation to secure strategic posts for purposes of information, and, in general, to serve the interests of the Soviet Union. In many cases they still hold these points of vantage.

With the close of the war, however, the attitude of the Communist Party of the United States of America was reversed completely in line with a similar reversal by the policy makers of the Soviet Government. Since then there has been a marked upsurge of Communist-led strikes, a complete rupture of labor-management cooperation by Communist-controlled unions, a continuous campaign of vilification against the American Government and its policies in the Communist press and by Communist spokesmen, an increase in Communist espionage activities, serious efforts by the Communist Party to incite civil dissatisfaction and strife among racial groups, veterans and students, scientists and similar activities.

These symptoms by themselves must be judged in relation to other events which di-

rectly and indirectly affect us as a nation. They must be judged in connection with the fact that the Soviet Union in its calculated march toward world empire has since 1940 subjugated, either directly or indirectly, a host of countries, including Poland, Yugoslavia, Albania, Bulgaria, Rumania, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, and parts of China, Korea, Germany, and Austria. We cannot be unmindful of the fact that Communist intrigue in Latin America constitutes a threat to the Panama Canal and other vital defense zones and that this threat has assumed serious proportions in Panama, Costa Rica, Colombia, Cuba, and other countries of the Western Hemisphere. All these factors must be judged against the background of the world-wide campaign of vilification and slander which Soviet and Communist agencies are directing against the United States.

In preparation for the presentation of these proposals we have consulted with perhaps the most outstanding panel of legal talent ever to appear before a congressional committee. Extensive hearings were held which delved exhaustively with every phase of the legal problem of controlling subversive activities.

Also, Mr. Chairman, the charge has been made time after time in my daily bible here, the Daily Worker, that this bill is going to create a police state here in the United States.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McDOWELL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The question of identity of people who come out against this bill has been sharply raised, and an attempt has been made to explain away the opposition as forgery and other devices. I wonder how the author of this bill will explain the fact that the President of the United States came out against this bill, and whether he ascribes that to forgery or what?

Mr. McDOWELL. May I ask if the gentleman is speaking at the moment for the President of the United States?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I am speaking of what I read in the press. The President of the United States was specifically asked how he stood on the Mundt bill, and he gave his answer, and that answer appeared in every newspaper in this country.

Mr. McDOWELL. If I recall reading the morning paper, it said that the President was opposed to the outlawing of the Communist Party. Now, for the first time since Mr. Truman has been President of the United States he and I agree on something, as I take the very same position. But I also recall reading in the morning paper that Mr. Truman was asked his opinion on the Mundt bill, and if I recall reading my paper correctly, he had no comment on the Mundt bill.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, that is correct, and to elaborate on the answer, may I suggest now to the gentleman from New York, simply because he is leading the opposition on this bill he should get no illusions that he is the permanent leader of the opposition and is speaking for the President of the United States, because the President was not asked that question. The President was asked this specific question, because the AP called me up to read the transcript: How

do you stand on the Mundt bill to outlaw communism? The gentleman from New York knows that is a loaded question. The Mundt bill is one thing. A bill to outlaw communism is something quite different. I congratulate the President of the United States on the very sensible and wise answer that he made. He said, as we have said in our committee report and as we have said in our speeches on the bill, that he is opposed to a bill to outlaw communism. So are we. He said that as far as commenting on the specific bill was concerned, he had made it a practice not to comment on bills while they were in passage through Congress. He made no comment aye, yes, or no about the Mundt bill. He did come out against the outlawing of communism, as we have.

Mr. RANKIN. He came out against attempting to outlaw the Communist Party.

Mr. McDOWELL. All this despite the fact that one of the members of the President's Cabinet took advantage of a speech yesterday, which will be discussed later by another member of the committee, to take a rotten, dirty, underhanded, foul blow at a committee of the House of Representatives.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield five additional minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. McDOWELL. I thank the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. MULTER rose.

Mr. McDOWELL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MULTER. I will straighten it out, if the gentleman does not mind.

I have been an enrolled Democrat for 27 years. I have been elected to this House as a Democrat, refusing the nomination in my district of the American Labor Party. This is quoted, if you please, in the exact language of the President in answer to the question about the Mundt-Nixon bill. After saying that he does not comment upon pending legislation until it comes to his desk, he then said this, and I quote verbatim:

But a law to outlaw a political party in the United States is entirely contrary to all our principles. I don't think these splinter parties do any harm. If there is a conspiracy to overthrow the Government of the United States, we have laws to control that.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McDOWELL. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. That is correct, and it is verbatim, but the gentleman did not read the verbatim question. I have read the verbatim question. You take that question, which was in the transcript, and the answer which the gentleman quoted, which was also in the transcript, and you have the whole story. The President was asked a loaded, leading question, which was "How do you stand on the Mundt bill to outlaw communism?"

The Mundt bill does not do that. The gentleman has read the right answer and I have read the right question.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McDOWELL. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. The President's Attorney General says that amendments to existing laws are necessary to do the job necessary to be done.

Mr. McDOWELL. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McDOWELL. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. The President did not say that he was opposed to outlawing the practices of communism, he simply said he was opposed to trying to outlaw the Communist Party. You cannot outlaw a party; it can change its name overnight.

Mr. McDOWELL. I thank the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. Chairman, in regard to the police-state angle of this bill, I have prepared here, and very carefully so, just exactly what a police state is, and I ask unanimous consent to include that at this point in my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

The was no objection.

WHAT IS A POLICE STATE?

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Chairman, it has long been the practice of the Communists to substitute vituperation and name-calling for logic and facts. Lenin, their chief prophet, was adept at this.

Characteristic of this slander device is the Communist tactic of charging your opponent with the very crimes of which they themselves are guilty. Thus the Soviet Union assails all those who oppose its imperialistic and expansionist policy as warmongering and imperialist. In the same way the Communists and their hangers-on claim that the bill under consideration calls for a police state. Under the circumstances it would be well to define just what we mean by a police state, so that we all know exactly what we are talking about.

Under a police state every man, woman, and child is under the direct or indirect surveillance of the police authorities at all times. The janitor is an agent of the secret police. Your next-door neighbor also. You can never tell whether a member of your own family is not secretly a police spy. Any chance remark you may make either at home or among your associates, the most trivial gripe, is subject to report to the state police and drastic penalty. Police spies are scattered throughout every place of employment and the slightest infraction of shop discipline is considered an act of hostility to the state punishable by the secret police.

You cannot travel from place to place at will. You have to have an internal passport and permission to go from one city to another.

Your activity and conduct is inscribed in a labor book subject to the inspection of a state official. You cannot get a job without it.

The state police are the largest employers of slave labor. In Russia it is estimated that the inhabitants of slave-labor camps run as high as 15,000,000.

A writer, a composer, or a scientist who deviates in the slightest degree

from the Communist Party line is pounced upon by the secret police and sent to a concentration camp. The secret police make no distinction in their ruthlessness against all, including members of the church, who are suspected of harboring any critical ideas.

The secret police permit their unhappy victims no trial by jury, no habeas corpus, no right to independent defense counsel, and none of the legal rights which safeguard the individual under democracy.

In other words, under a police state, the secret police is the actual power in the government, terrifying and eliminating all possible opposition and acting as the ruthless arm of an all-powerful dictator.

Certainly the characteristics I have described in no way fit conditions in the United States either with or without the provisions of H. R. 5852. They do, however, describe perfectly conditions under the kind of government which many of those who are opposing this bill advocate. The intent and purpose of this bill is to set up proper safeguards against those who seek to set up a police state in this country. It is our considered purpose that a police state shall not happen here.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McDOWELL. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The gentleman made some statement about this bill outlawing certain practices that are illegal, and referred also to laws covering kidnapping, murder, and other things like that. There is a distinction there, because it is charged that this bill is an attempt to outlaw a line of reasoning, a line of thought, a philosophy of economics, an action to bring a new philosophy into being by legal means.

Mr. McDOWELL. This bill has nothing at all to do with outlawing thought or belief or anything of the kind. This is no thought-control bill. The gentleman is reaching down into the Communist bag of tricks when he attempts to hand to the Committee on Un-American Activities that they are attempting to control thought. I remember when we went to California, when we had those Hollywood people over here, it was charged we were attempting to take over the classics of the Nation, the culture of the Nation. We were accused of attempting to control the thinking and the thought and the ideas of the Nation. It was not true. We went to California to find some members of the Communist Party, a Communist political conspiracy, and we found them; and they are on their way to jail. Every time we haul down some Communist labor leader from some place, the Communists immediately raise the cry, "They are trying to do something to labor." We are not trying to do something to labor at all. We are trying to reach down into labor and pull out the Communists that are there.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McDOWELL. I yield.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The gentleman said that I was reaching down to pull up one of the Communist's tricks. I hope

the gentleman did not mean that my thoughts and my actions and whatever action I take is dictated by the Communist group or a Communist-dominated group?

Mr. McDOWELL. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is my neighbor and my good friend and has represented his people in the good old city of Pittsburgh for many years and very ably represented them. Most certainly I have no charge of communism against him or that he is Communist-controlled. But I do say, and I repeat, that you are reaching down into the old Communist bag of tricks to pull up a weapon that does not exist. It is fantasy.

Mr. EBERHARTER. But you will say that you do not think that my thoughts follow their line of reason.

Mr. McDOWELL. Of course I do not.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, I take it that there is little, if any, sentiment embraced by any of the Members of this Congress which is in favor of a Communist-controlled Government in our Nation. Those of us who have observed in recent years the advance of this philosophy amongst nations of the earth, one by one of which have fallen under its domination, have become more and more concerned with its spread in this country. I have no fears about the ultimate fall of this Government of ours from any enemy from without because I believe we have successfully demonstrated our ability to withstand assaults from without. But those of us who have been charged with the responsibility thrust upon the committee sponsoring this bill have become more increasingly concerned throughout recent years and months with the spread of this doctrine in America and its threat of destruction from within. It has been said, and said here today on the floor of the House, that the remedy is not to undertake to reveal in the pitiless light of publicity the activities of those individuals in America who advocate the overthrow of this Government and the substitution of a communistic dictatorship therefor, but rather to get at the cause, and the cause, it is said, is poverty, bad living conditions, and bad working conditions, and perhaps discrimination in many of the economic activities of the American people. The reply to that, Mr. Chairman, as revealed by our investigations, is that in this Nation the Communist doctrine today is spreading more rapidly than in any other nation on earth, and a more determined assault is being leveled against our governmental institutions than that of any other people. And yet our people enjoy the highest standard of living conditions known to mankind anywhere in all the world today or which have ever existed in all the annals of history. Our unemployment is less, our workers and people engaged in agriculture are more prosperous, and our living conditions are at a higher level than that of any other nation now or at any period in recorded history.

Still, we find ourselves bearing the brunt of the greatest assault by the apostles of this totalitarian philosophy than any other nation on earth. Since

I have been connected with this committee I know that its members have been striving earnestly to devise some measure whereby we might be able to shore up our defenses against the constantly increasing spread of this insidious philosophy of government here without, at the same time, doing violence to the framework of our governmental structure.

From many proposals submitted to our consideration we have determined that this legislation offers the greatest measure of security against the further spread of this threat to our free institutions that we are able to find within the limits of fundamental law.

I confess that there were members on the committee who felt that this measure was not strong enough, but we tried as earnestly as we could, with all the resources at our command and the appearance of many of the best constitutional lawyers of the Nation before us, to write a piece of legislation that would not infringe against that great fundamental document that forms the basis of our organic law in America, and at the same time offer some measure of security against the further spread of this cancerous growth upon the body politic of this Nation.

I want at this time to pay tribute to the subcommittee that worked tirelessly for weeks upon weeks to aid the author in perfecting this piece of legislation. I have reference to the very able and conscientious Representative, the gentleman from California [Mr. NIXON], who was chairman of the subcommittee which conducted these hearings which embrace approximately 500 pages of testimony, and his able and conscientious colleagues on the majority side, Messrs. VAIL and McDOWELL, who gave their invaluable service and tireless efforts, as well as to my colleagues on the minority side, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON], and the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HEBERT], all stalwart patriots and great statesmen of this body.

I feel that the American people and this Congress owe a lasting debt of gratitude to those men who shouldered the bulwark of the labor that went into the perfection of this bill, along with its author, with whom they cooperated tirelessly.

Mr. Chairman, at this time I yield such time as he may desire to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON], a member of this subcommittee.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to refer to certain excerpts and messages and to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, this particular bill is the result of long study. It is the result of testimony, the result of the observations of the committee over many investigations as well as that carried on this particular bill.

The committee tried to be careful to protect the constitutional rights of the citizens. At the same time we tried to protect this great Nation of ours, this great system in America which enables

the poorest citizen to become President of the United States; which enables them to become mayors of great cities; and to sit in the highest legislative bodies of the land; a system by which a boy in his own home town can grow and prosper and be a leader in his home community; where the small merchant can become a great financier. That is the American system—the system in which we protect the rights and yet allow free enterprise; a system in which we want to protect freedom of speech, freedom of the right of assembly, and as we went along we tried to see that we did not disturb those things. Communism seeks to destroy all this.

There testified before our committee great constitutional lawyers. Among others, there was an eminent attorney from my own State who came in, not because he was from my State but by reason of the fact that he was chairman of a special committee of the American Bar Association, past president of the Florida Bar Association, and chairman of the special committee on the bill of rights of the American Bar Association.

In testifying before our committee, he showed clearly that he was not radical. He stated:

As to the first, that the full protection of the Constitution must be accorded to the members of any minority group, including Communists, is beyond question, even though such group, in the public opinion, stands adjudged as subversive, even treasonable activity. Because we differ with a Communist is all the more reason we must uphold his right to express himself. This is the very essence of our democratic system.

He also said:

But the zeal to afford protection to an individual need not blind us to the paramount need of defending our form of government which alone secures to all individuals the freedoms that communism is dedicated to destroy.

Again a man testifying as fairly as that, careful guardian of the liberties of these people, is not radical. I took the liberty of sending to him by air mail a complete copy of the bill, and asked him to give to me as a member of the committee, that I might give to the Congress, his views as to the bill and as to the constitutionality of it.

He answered by saying this:

I am in favor of the general purposes and objects and requirements of the Mundt bill, H. R. 5852, as amended. It is carefully drawn and in my opinion, constitutional. The Communist threat here is dangerous and should be checked before it becomes greater.

That is the actual opinion of a distinguished constitutional lawyer who heads one of the great committees of the country, Hon. Robert R. Milam, of Jacksonville, Fla.

There has been a lot of misunderstanding about this particular bill. If you could have seen the various suggestions that have been suggested for incorporation in the bill, suggestions which have gone very much further than we did to outlaw the Communist Party or to put in other curtailments, I am sure you will agree that in our attempt to keep the bill fair and constitutional we have worked out a great piece of legislation.

This is good legislation. If you will take time to go carefully into the bill on page 23 you will find there some of the objectives of the bill set forth. Here is what it states:

Sec. 4. (a) It shall be unlawful for any person—

(1) To attempt in any manner to establish in the United States a totalitarian dictatorship the direction and control of which is to be vested in, or exercised by or under the domination or control of, any foreign government, foreign organization, or foreign individual.

Can anyone find fault with legislation which seeks to curb and to prevent the establishment of a totalitarian dictatorship in this country, subservient to a foreign government? That is just exactly what is set forth. I read further:

(2) To perform or attempt to perform any act with intent to facilitate or aid in bringing about the establishment in the United States of such a totalitarian dictatorship;

(3) Actively to participate in the management, direction, or supervision of any movement to establish in the United States such a totalitarian dictatorship;

(4) Actively to participate in the management, direction, or supervision of any movement to facilitate or aid in bringing about the establishment in the United States of such a totalitarian dictatorship;

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERSON. I yield.

Mr. OWENS. I am bothered by a few of these things; for instance, where it reads: "To the extent to which it supports or advocates the basic principles and tactics of communism as expounded by Marx and Lenin." Would not that simply be an invitation to the people of the United States to read Marx and Lenin in order to determine what their doctrines might be?

Would it not be better, do you not think, to make one solid statement of all these things, such, for instance, as the statement I have written down here: "Any organization in the United States that is a constituent part of the world Communist movement or to attempt to establish a totalitarian dictatorship as defined in the bill," rather than to put in all those details?

Mr. PETERSON. If they followed the same line all the time the gentleman's statement might have some merit, but from time to time they vary their tactics, they change; and the section to which the gentleman refers is a different section from the one I have read. That, however, is one of the elements which must be considered in the determination. You will notice that when you get to that portion of the bill there are different things and this is only one element that needs to be considered.

Mr. OWENS. What I mean is this, if you are going to give the Attorney General or whoever it is the power of concluding if one of those is violated, are you not giving him a legislative power that belongs here? Are not we the ones who are supposed to set out what is the violation rather than giving him the right to conclude?

Mr. PETERSON. We make the determination here of the things to be con-

sidered and it is subject to court review, as the gentleman will see.

I do not want to take up too much time, but I did want to express to the Committee and to the House the belief that this is a carefully drawn bill. Those who have served with me know that I try to be conservative, fair, and kindly. All my life I have tried to be. I have analyzed this bill very carefully. There are times in which I have not found myself in accord with some of the other committees on which I served or even with the other members on this committee, but I am thoroughly in accord with this bill. This bill is reported unanimously by the committee which studied it and studied it thoroughly and fairly. It is a good bill. I also have a distinguished friend who served in the First World War and in the Second World War also—Gen. Sumpter L. Lowry, of Tampa, a patriotic, earnest American. He wrote to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. Nixon] this letter, and I think it should in part be included in the RECORD:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN NIXON: I want to congratulate you on the fine work you are doing to stop the Communist menace in this country. If only the people would realize that this is the most important thing in the United States today, and a matter of life and death to every man, woman, and child in this country.

All the other good things we do will be of no avail unless we check the inroads of communism. . . . I hope very much you will secure an early passage of your anti-Communist bill which the House Un-American Committee has reported to Congress.

If you can be the means of passing this bill through the Congress, you will have the gratitude of the country forever.

Sincerely yours,

SUMPTER L. LOWRY.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERSON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MULTER. Can the gentleman tell us whether the committee considered what effect, if any, the declaration of principles contained in this bill would have upon those Members of this House who have offered resolutions urging that the United States and all other countries give up the veto power in the United Nations?

Mr. PETERSON. The committee went into detail on every phase that came before it. The root of the whole thing is this: It deals with the establishment of a totalitarian dictatorship, subservient to a foreign government. I pray that no Member of this House would take his orders from a foreign government or hopes to have a totalitarian dictatorship here. We all have the right to offer resolutions. We have considered many phases of this matter. We did not go as far as we could constitutionally had we wanted to do so. We tried to be fair, we tried to protect all rights. We allowed the right to court review. We must protect our great Nation against those who would destroy it. This bill will help.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this bill will pass by a substantial vote.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, I am appalled by the potentialities of the bill before us today—the bill which is described in its title as intended “to combat un-American activities by requiring the registration of Communist-front organizations, and for other purposes.”

Every time I have read this bill, and every time I have gone through the accompanying report, I have found new vistas of repression and oppression, of thought-control and of interference with the ordinary and long-accepted right of every American to believe or not to believe, to go where he pleases, talk to whom he chooses, and say what he will.

But my first and most fundamental objection to this bill is that it desecrates the letter and the spirit of the constitution by creating a category of second-class citizens, proscribed and attained for their association and their presumed ideas alone, and visited with special pains and penalties because of those associations and ideas.

I am certain that this bill, if enacted, will be struck down by the courts. It is tragic that this honorable House should so far depart from the noble traditions of George Washington, James Madison, Thomas Jefferson, Andrew Jackson, and Franklin Delano Roosevelt as to even consider it.

Mr. Chairman, there are so many valid objections to this bill that my mind is taxed as to where to begin.

Let me turn back for a moment to the Republican National Party platform of 1944, and beg this House, with its Republican majority, to attempt to justify this measure with the sentiments expressed only 4 years ago.

Under the heading of “Domestic policy” the Republican platform declared:

We shall devote ourselves to reestablishing liberty at home.

Mr. Chairman, this bill proposes to take away the liberty of 140,000,000 American citizens here at home, to prescribe limitations as to their thoughts and acts on pain of losing full citizenship rights, and to lay them open to the persecutions of a police state.

Turning to the heading, “Racial and religious intolerance,” the Republican Party solemnly declared:

We unreservedly condemn the injection into American life of appeals to racial or religious prejudice.

Mr. Chairman, whatever may have been the intentions of the committee which framed the Mundt bill, the fact is that any effort by a minority of any kind, whether racial, religious, economic, or political, to remove injustices, or to advocate new measures against discrimination, could be interpreted as a violation of this measure.

I doubt if the members of the committee which reported that bill intended anything so sweeping; but if you will only read the bill, with the conscious desire to recognize such possibilities in it, they are clearly there.

Almost any kind of political repression can be accomplished through the instrumentality of this measure by an Attorney General so minded, so long as the victim has been indiscreet enough to enter into a relation of association.

The most biting commentary I can make on this phase of the bill is taken from the concluding paragraphs of the Republican platform of 1944. Either the noble sentiments of these words were completely false, or the Republican majority of this House, by passing this bill, is deliberately breaking its solemn assurances of 4 years ago.

Listen to these words, and I am quoting from the official text:

The essential question at trial in this Nation is whether men can organize together in a highly industrialized society, succeed, and still be free. That is the essential question at trial throughout the world today.

In this time of confusion and strife, when moral values are being crushed on every side, we pledge ourselves to uphold with all our strength the Bill of Rights, the Constitution, and the law of the land. We so pledge ourselves that the American tradition may stand forever as the beacon light of civilization.

That is the end of my quotation and the concluding two paragraphs of your own party platform.

Yet in this bill, reported by the Republican chairman of a Republican committee, the Constitution and the Bill of Rights are trampled and the American traditions of freedom and liberty are flouted.

What price your platform today?

Is your solemn party pledge so soon forgotten that you will quench that beacon light you so extolled?

Mr. Chairman, a legalistic cataloging of the faults of this bill would quickly empty the floor and lull you to sleep. Mere denunciation without reasoning can only arouse in the bill's proponents equally unreasoning denunciation in turn.

Yet somehow I must convey to you the tragic import of the departure from American traditions embodied in this incredible legislative hodge-podge.

The apostle of American democracy to whom we all pay tribute is Thomas Jefferson.

In his immortal words we find the pattern of freedom in which we all glory. Time after time Jefferson proclaimed his belief in people, in the free play of ideas, and in change.

For 172 years we have successfully maintained our turbulent democracy, with its name calling, its faltering, its splendors, and its dangers, and we have established the greatest industrial power and the highest standards of living and education and of free expression that the world has ever known.

Compared to the Old World with its ancient wrongs, we are a young nation.

Part of our success has been due to the unbounded confidence with which we have faced the future.

Are we now so fearful that we resort to the very antithesis of our democratic ideals to preserve the faint shadow of representative government?

A bill of this kind is invalid on its face. It transgresses constitutional inhibitions and guarantees. It is so vague that no reasonable man of strong feeling could

be sure he is not committing a crime under some of its provisions.

As a matter of fact, it cannot be seriously believed by its most ardent supporters that this bill will become law in the Eightieth Congress. It will die in the Senate, just as the Rees loyalty bill has died there.

The danger lies in its serious offering to this House, the last great citadel of human freedom in the world.

Debates such as this stir up animosities not easily forgotten. Our national prestige suffers in the esteem of the world.

As a lawyer, and as an American proud of the American tradition of freedom, I make these specific objections to the Mundt bill:

First. Its language is so vague as to defy either compliance or enforcement.

Second. Its proposals subvert the principles of democratic representative government more thoroughly than the ill the bill proposes to remedy.

Third. If passed into law it would establish effectively the totalitarian dictatorship it pretends to fend off.

Fourth. It is an unconstitutional bill of attainder and proscription.

Fifth. It makes thoughts and associations a crime of and by themselves, in violation of the Constitution.

Sixth. It attempts to supplant judicial procedure by legislative fiat, a process repugnant to our law and our customs.

Seventh. It places in the hands of one fallible man, the Attorney General, whomever he might be, vast and unguarded powers over our liberties.

Eighth. It constitutes an unconstitutional and flagrant breach of the rights of privacy, speech, and silence.

Ninth. It opens the way to legalization of the blacklists already prepared by the Committee on Un-American Activities in the form of voluminous card files, in which mere liberal attitudes are sufficient to bring down denunciations of Communist sympathies, and makes it possible to stifle all intellectual freedom and, by easy steps, all religious and personal freedom.

Tenth. The proposed amendment to the Nationality Act, which would make it possible to take away a natural-born American's citizenship for violation of the vague and stifling provisions of the act, defies all language in its effrontery. This goes farther than the infamous Alien and Sedition Acts of 1798, is grossly unconstitutional, and desecrates the memory of the national heroes who brought this country into being and preserved it at the peril of their lives and fortunes.

Eleventh. The measure is redundant and unnecessary. Every proper safeguard for our national security can be accomplished under existing law, with perhaps minor amendments to clarify and strengthen the sedition and sabotage statutes. We have come victoriously and safely through two world wars and a world depression without any such law, and we do not need it now.

Twelfth. This bill constitutes, on the one hand, an intolerable invasion of the executive and judicial powers and, on the other, an abdication of the proper legislative powers of the Congress.

Mr. Chairman, it is fruitless to go further. All Members have received a barrage of mail opposing the bill. The opposition has come from all walks of life. You have received analyses from many organizations, some excellent, some mediocre.

What you have not received is a real report from the Committee on Un-American Activities, which conveniently slurs over the far-reaching implications of the measure.

I am particularly dismayed that the committee should not suggest in any line that we can best expose the deceits of communism by making our own democracy work fully and freely.

Even the circumstances under which this bill has come to the floor are undemocratic.

Last February the Subcommittee on Legislation of the Committee on Un-American Activities held public hearings on vague legislative proposals. Only 1,000 copies of the hearings were printed, and if copies of the hearings were sent to me, neither I nor any member of my staff can now recall it. On March 15 a bill was introduced. A few days later a subcommittee report was issued which did come to my office, but which bears only a faint resemblance either to the March 15 version of the bill or to the version now before us.

Then an amended bill was ordered reported, but we could not get copies of the report or of the bill until last Monday, May 3. The bill was given a rule on last Thursday, and I imagine it is probable that the members of the Rules Committee did not read both report and bill. Today we are debating its passage. There have been no public hearings on the bill itself. We have little to go by but our own prejudices and our own conception of law and of right.

I shall cast my vote against this bill, Mr. Chairman, with the hope that enough Members will join me to prove that this House has not forgotten the glorious past.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HAYS. The gentleman asked about the effect of this bill upon a pending resolution being considered by the Foreign Affairs Committee. Now I hope that would not carry the implication that passage of this bill will involve any action that is incompatible with favorable action on those resolutions, because whether one agrees with the bill or not, its purpose is the protection of our own Nation against subversive action from within. If our efforts with reference to the veto question involved anti-Russian rather than strictly peace purposes, there might be some relationship. I hope the gentleman will not feel there is anything inconsistent in the two actions.

Mr. MULTER. I hope there is not, but there is much language in this bill that might easily be construed that way. After all, our veto power will be given up provided Russia, too, gives it up. This business of making the UN work cannot

be unilateral, it must be a concerted effort on the part of all nations that are participating in the United Nations organization.

Mr. Chairman, I can think of no Member of this House who can more easily justify his support of this bill than I. In my district are concentrated the largest number of Communists and fellow travelers to be found in a single congressional district in this country. They are vocal and militant. They are malicious and un-American in the most invidious sense of those words. Their attacks upon me, I am advised by competent authority, subject them to indictment and conviction for criminal libel. Incitement of hatred and discord are their principal stock in trade. No one despises them or their tactics more than I. No man has or will fight them harder than I, but only in the American way and in accordance with the American tradition of fair play.

I beg of you let us not besmirch ourselves by stooping to meet foul blows with a violation of our fundamental concepts.

I owe much to this American democracy of ours that gave shelter to and later brought together two immigrant children who became my parents. It was the American way of life that made it possible for this boy of poor parents to rise above poverty, acquire an education, and eventually become a Member of the greatest deliberative body known to the world since the birth of mankind. I want to see this country grow from strength to strength, to be an even better place in which to live for your children and mine, and for those who will come after them. I want it to be the beacon light of freedom to all the world; not just for today, but forever. That is why I ask you, I beg you, please do not traduce the glorious traditions of this country by enacting this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I am enjoying my work here. I love the new friendships I have made on both sides of the aisle in my brief stay here. I want to return next year. I do not want to return if it means compromising my principles against communism and against its supporters, nor will I return if it means compromising my principles of Americanism. You know, by the very simple expedient of enacting this bill into law I can guarantee my reelection, because at one fell swoop it will destroy my political opponents, Republicans as well as Communists. I do not want to pay that price. The proponents of this bill, while attempting to prevent a one-party government, certainly in my district, will accomplish just that. The Communists and their fellow travelers will either go to jail or join the Democratic Party. God forbid that. In the meantime, what will happen to the Republicans? In my district they, too, will be compelled to make the same choice. Let me illustrate. In the list of subversive organizations I found the name of the League of Women Voters. In New York the League of Women Voters is made up in large part of those of wealth, of the Daughters of the American Revolution, and most of them, if you please, are Republicans.

Mr. NIXON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. NIXON. To what list of subversive organizations is the gentleman referring?

Mr. MULTER. The list is one which was released recently by the Attorney General.

Mr. NIXON. The Attorney General of the United States listed the League of Women Voters as a subversive organization?

Mr. MULTER. So I understand.

Mr. NIXON. Then the gentleman's understanding is completely wrong. I think that if the gentleman will check with the Attorney General's list he will find he is wrong. I am quite familiar with it.

In that connection, may I point out to the gentleman that that is just what we are trying to do in this bill. We are trying to get away from that kind of loose listing of subversive organizations. We have laid down strict standards defining subversive organizations, so that we can avoid just what the gentleman has criticized. I hope the gentleman will see fit to support the bill because of that fact.

Mr. MULTER. I have in my files letters from the League of Women Voters in New York City decrying the fact that their organization was listed as a subversive organization, and I know it is not a subversive organization.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. McDOWELL. I have in the files in my office another list of subversive organizations, issued by the Communist Party. On that list are the National Association of Manufacturers, the United States Chamber of Commerce, the Chase National Bank, the Pennsylvania Railroad, and various other organizations. So these days one has to be careful as to which subversive list he is looking at.

Mr. MULTER. I am sure, if the gentleman will look at the list issued by the Communist Party of individuals whom they will eventually guillotine if and when they come to power, he will find my name there, too.

Mr. McDOWELL. The gentleman is a good Democrat. I might add that on the list also are the Democratic National Committee and the Republican National Committee.

Mr. MULTER. I have no doubt about that.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CARROLL. I should like to ask a question of the gentleman from California [Mr. Nixon]. Did I understand correctly that this measure takes away from the Attorney General his right to proscribe under the President's Executive order?

Mr. NIXON. If the gentleman will read the bill carefully, and if he will study the Executive order carefully, he will find that the effect of this measure will be to clear the atmosphere insofar as the listing of subversive organizations is concerned, because the present legislation requires the Attorney General, be-

fore he can list any organization as being a Communist-front organization, or require publication of the fact that it is a Communist-front organization, to go through a very careful set of procedures, which are set forth in this bill, subject to court review. It is my contention that, in the event this bill is enacted into law and in the event this procedure is set up, and such would be my hope, this type of procedure would replace the present ex parte proceedings which the Attorney General is following under the loyalty order.

Mr. CARROLL. That is what I wanted to get clarification of. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. MULTER. This bill would as effectively put out of our political life those believing in it as those Communists that we all despise so heartily.

Mr. Chairman, it should be unnecessary to remind us that our Declaration of Independence and our Constitution are founded upon the divine right of man to be free, free to think, free to speak, free to act, the freedom circumscribed only by every free man's duty to respect every other man's right to be free. This right is so basic, so universal, that when we wrote the charter of the United Nations we included a covenant guaranteeing free speech throughout the world. At the Geneva Conference just closed a similar recommendation was adopted by a vote that would have been unanimous except for the opposition of Russia and some of her satellite states. Let me call your attention to what they recommend:

Freedom of information is a fundamental right, not of governments, not alone of information agencies, but of the people.

This is the language they recommend for the covenant:

Everyone shall have the right to freedom of thought and expression. This right shall include freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive, and impart information and ideas by any means regardless of frontiers.

Much as I despise Communist doctrine and as hard as I will fight against it, I think you must join with me in the fight for those who want to say what they please, and this bill will stop it. If the day comes when this country is not strong enough to stop that kind of talk, we will be sorry, indeed, for all of us. Even your committee recognized the principle of what I am expounding.

On page 6 of the report, No. 1844, we find this language:

To make membership in a specifically designated existing organization illegal per se would run the risk of being held unconstitutional on the ground that such an action was legislative fiat.

One principle of construction of law that is too well known to warrant debate at this time, is that you cannot do by indirection that which the law prohibits you from doing directly. You cannot draw a picture in this bill of the Communist Party and by refraining from calling it the Communist Party, proceed to outlaw it. If you want to do that, if you want to stop the preaching in this country of communism, much as we hate it, in my opinion you can do it only if and when you amend the Consti-

tution to so provide. The guarantee of free speech, assembly, and petition in our Constitution allows a man to get up and argue for anything he wants. If he cannot convince the majority then it is our duty to see that the will of the majority prevails.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield.

Mr. McDOWELL. The gentleman will recall that they hung a man in this country once, a man called Major Andre. He was consorting with the enemy, if I recall. The gentleman will also recall that the States of the North sent armies into the South. Treason is something else besides liberty, do not you know.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. I am sure the gentleman from New York is familiar with the historical background of the case, that Maj. John Andre was a British soldier in uniform who penetrated the enemy lines. This is another of those very specious and confusing arguments that have been attached to the debate on this bill. There is absolutely nothing to that argument.

Mr. McDOWELL. Does the gentleman from Colorado think that Earl Browder is a good American citizen entitled to enjoy the great freedoms of this country?

Mr. CARROLL. The gentleman has asked me a question and I have answered it.

Mr. MULTER. Would you hang him without a trial by court and jury?

Mr. McDOWELL. I would not hang him, but I would not let him hang my country, either, by his illegal connection with this international political conspiracy.

Mr. CARROLL. Will the gentleman permit me to respond to the question inasmuch as it was directed to me? Browder has nothing to do with your remarks when you comment on Maj. John Andre. I merely want to get you correctly in the Record so that you will be historically accurate, because you have not been very accurate so far in the debate on this bill.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. There are two propositions here, first that we are not at war with the Soviet Union and second that we have laws on the books of this country dealing with treason. Therefore the argument made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania is to say the least very specious.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield.

Mr. BRADLEY. Directing my question to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. Carroll], did I understand him to say that Major Andre was a British soldier in uniform?

Mr. CARROLL. That was the debate and the great discussion when he was sentenced to be hanged, as to whether or not he had come here in uniform. I think as a commander in the Navy, you will recall that he had a topcoat on and

he penetrated the lines. That was the decision and that was why the court sentenced him to be hanged.

Mr. BRADLEY. I thank the gentleman, but I would not consider that a uniform.

Mr. MacKINNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield.

Mr. MacKINNON. Does the gentleman from New York wish to give the impression that there is something in this bill which would affect individuals so they could be found guilty without going to court and without getting a trial by jury?

Mr. MULTER. Very definitely so.

Mr. MacKINNON. Will the gentleman kindly point that out in his remaining time?

Mr. MULTER. Read the provision which makes the Attorney General of the United States—and the gentleman who presently holds that office has my highest esteem—the absolute and complete factfinder. The judicial review that is put into this bill is merely a sop to take from those provisions the very bad feature of letting any one man or anyone whom he may appoint be a factfinder with the additional provision that his finding of fact shall be conclusive upon any court that attempts to review it.

Mr. MacKINNON. Where does that send anybody to jail? Does not the right of appeal to a court exist? Will the gentleman answer that question?

Mr. MULTER. The right of appeal given in this bill is utterly valueless because the court cannot review the facts. The only review that can be had is on the question, Did the Attorney General have the right to act? If he had a right to act under this bill, then that is the end of the review.

Mr. MacKINNON. Where does it send anybody to jail in that section to which you referred? Let us be honest about what this bill does and what it does not do.

Mr. MULTER. Does it deprive him of his right of employment?

Mr. MacKINNON. No; it does not. I am merely requesting you to point out the specific section in the bill. There is too much loose talk going on about this measure.

Mr. MULTER. If your side will give me 5 minutes, I will point out not less than 22, by actual count, bad things in this bill. May I have the 5 minutes? Apparently not.

Mr. NIXON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. McDOWELL. That will give him time to give at least thirteen.

Mr. MacKINNON. I am merely requesting you to pick out something in the bill that sends a person to jail without a jury trial.

Mr. McDOWELL. Or hang him.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. I just want to say to the gentleman that many of us have been concerned about this very difficult and delicate problem. Has the gentleman, in his concern, attempted to deal with the committee at all, to handle

the problem, or has he just decided to go against the bill and assume that the committee is obdurate and would make no effort to meet his substantial suggestions? My experience has been that the committee has considered everything that I have raised with it. It is going to offer some amendments to cover many of these points, and will consider favorably any objection to the bill.

Mr. MULTER. I have prepared proposed amendments to this bill, and I hoped I would have an opportunity to point them out today, not only amendments that would take the bad things out, but even to put some things in that would make it better and more enforceable. I am against communism and I would like to see it controlled in this country, but not by illegal methods.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. I congratulate the gentleman and I wish he had taken the trouble to deal with the committee before. I think all these things could have been settled and his suggestions would have been welcomed.

Mr. MULTER. It is my understanding that the original bill introduced contained 14 pages and it came out of the committee with some 27 pages of printed matter, and that much of that part of the bill which is now new was not considered at any public hearings. I would have welcomed the opportunity to voice my views on this bill to the committee.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The challenge has been made here for us to demonstrate that this bill makes any provision for sending a person to jail without a trial. The answer is contained right here in section 13. The Attorney General finds that an organization is a Communist-front organization. That is a finding. The only remedy left to the aggrieved party is to ask for a review before the Circuit Court of Appeals. That review is limited to what? The court cannot review any question of fact, if it finds that there is substantial evidence to sustain the findings of the Attorney General. Then, where do we go from there? That party must register. If he does not register he comes under the penalty provision of section 15. What defense has he in court when he is indicted for not having registered? The only question you leave to the court is whether or not the Attorney General has decided that he must register. If the defendant is an officer of an organization certified by the Attorney General to be a Communist organization, then he has no defense left and you are thereby making a mockery out of a trial.

Mr. MacKINNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. May I continue, please?

Mr. MacKINNON. Just one sentence.

Mr. MULTER. Very well.

Mr. MacKINNON. I suggest the gentleman completely overlooks the fact that in that subsequent proceeding, in which the jury trial would be afforded, you could always raise the question of the jurisdiction of the Attorney General in the first instance. If he made an erroneous decision, jurisdiction is lacking.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Then, the gentleman is positively in error, because he definitely has not read the bill when he makes that statement. That question is disposed of in the bill under the title of "Judicial Review."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] has again expired.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. MULTER. Are we now to say that the United Nations covenant guaranteeing freedom of thought and of speech is to be unilateral, a one-way street down which only we can travel? Is not that the Soviet way of life? Can we combat communism by following its irreligious, God-defying path?

Let your minds roam back over the history of our world. Recall the martyrs who died on the rack, at the stake, and on the gallows; recall Him who died on the cross that we might live as brothers.

I humbly and respectfully suggest to the Chaplain of this House: Reverend sir, on the day on which we are called to vote upon this bill, take as the text for your prayer the commandment from the book of Leviticus: "Proclaim liberty throughout all the land." Teach us the divine meaning of liberty; enslavement of none, freedom for all. Teach us that "all the land" means not the East, not the West, not the North, not the South, but all of the earth that God has given to His children as a place in which to live in peace, if only we will it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. VAIL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. VAIL. Mr. Chairman, with your permission I am going to digress for a moment or two from the subject matter before us today and deal with another matter that reflects upon the dignity and the honor and the good repute of this body.

Mr. Chairman, the Washington Times-Herald of today carries a United Press story over the following headline: "Probers stole Condon data Clark charges."

The story reads as follows:

Attorney General Clark has bluntly accused the House Un-American Activities Committee of "stealing" parts of an FBI loyalty report on Dr. Edward U. Condon, head of the National Bureau of Standards.

This reckless and unfounded statement is typical of our present inept Attorney General. How the Committee on Un-American Activities obtained excerpts of the Hoover letter of May 15, is a matter of public record. House Report 1753, filed with the House on April 19, 1948, by Mr. WOLVERTON, of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to accompany House Resolution 522, states on pages 4 and 5:

It is appropriate to inform the House as to how the Subcommittee on National Security was able to obtain the partial text of the letter above referred to, and why it was unable to obtain the full text.

On September 6, 1947, the following letter was addressed to an employee of the Depart-

ment of Commerce by the chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities:

"DEAR MR. —: In connection with official investigation being conducted by the Committee on Un-American Activities, I would appreciate your furnishing Mr. William A. Wheeler, investigator for this committee, any information you have available on Edward U. Condon, Director of the Bureau of Standards. Your cooperation in this matter will be greatly appreciated.

"J. PARNELL THOMAS,
"Chairman."

In response to this request the investigator was permitted to make a brief examination of a file of papers and documents, among which was the letter written by Mr. Hoover, above referred to. The investigator undertook to make a copy of this letter, but before he was able to copy all of it he was requested to discontinue, and acceded to the request. The result was that the subcommittee had available for publication in its report only that part of the letter which the investigator had been able to copy.

The Attorney General's statement at the National Press Club was a deliberate falsehood, uttered to divert attention from the desperate efforts of President Truman and the Attorney General to cover up on the Condon matter. Attorney General Clark knows the full content of the Hoover letter, and I defy him to state publicly that it exonerates Dr. Condon as a security risk.

I personally feel that Attorney General Clark should be subpoenaed by this body to appear here before the bar of the House and demand of him any information he has that the Committee on Un-American Activities was guilty of stealing parts of the FBI loyalty report, and unless he can prove this charge, that he should publicly apologize to the House of Representatives.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAIL. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BUSBEY. Will my colleague from Illinois agree with me when I say that the Attorney General at least should have known all the facts if he did not and that he not only was handling the truth rather carelessly, but he deliberately falsified for the effect it would have on the public, on this committee, and on this bill.

Mr. VAIL. I fully agree with the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, since its birth, little more than 170 years ago, our country has on many occasions faced grave danger to its national existence—danger that, without exception, was promptly and resolutely faced and conquered by stalwart Americans of the era in which it threatened.

Almost before it outgrew its swaddling clothes the new Nation, dedicated to new and broader principles of liberty and justice, was the target of attack by force of arms—attack that was repulsed and routed by hardy, courageous patriots equipped with flintlock musket and the other primitive weapons of that early day.

Throughout the intervening years each succeeding generation has faced its own problems and fought its own battles, shouldering its responsibilities bravely and contributing its share to the constantly developing strength of the new

republic and the security of the American people—building step by step the traditions we cherish and solidifying the heritage of liberty that has established America as the paradise of all the nations of the earth.

With other types of progress the weapons of war were keeping almost—the flintlock musket had given way to more accurate and effective small arms while heavy armament had been developed that possessed power to fire a projectile many miles—airplanes were beginning to dot the sky. Inventive genius was at work creating and perfecting death-dealing devices as well as the tools of peace.

We in our own generation have already borne our share of the sacrifices that throughout our history have been periodically required to maintain our national integrity—bitter sacrifices occasioned by the greed and ambition of tyrannical despots who have sought world domination and destruction of individual liberties. Americans of our generation twice have gallantly risen to that obligation and in World Wars I and II met and ignominiously defeated the aggressors in combat.

With the passing of years tremendous expansion had taken place in America. Under the free-enterprise system and the incentive to produce afforded under our constitutional form of government, giant industries had been developed, private and government-directed scientific research had proceeded apace. Inventive mechanical and scientific genius had reached the zenith of possible accomplishment by divining the secret of splitting the atom and perfecting the atomic bomb, the most powerful instrument of destruction ever conceived.

During this period America has forged steadily forward and at the close of the world wars found itself cast in a new role as the most powerful among the nations of the world.

At this stage it would seem that America was secure—that its position was impregnable and insofar as its invulnerability to armed aggression is concerned such an assumption is conceded to be true. However, our assurance of safety lies in our great national resources, our industrial capacity, our modern weapons of war, the intelligence and capacity of our manpower. We have no adequate defense against the new weapon that has been in use against us and is at this very moment gnawing at our vitals. From the days of the flintlock musket America has fought its battles on the field of honor and its defense measures have been predicated upon its past experience. Never before have we participated in what has become known as a cold war. Never before have we been forced to stand by helplessly and watch the insidious propaganda of a secret subversive organization operating underground take effect upon a questionable element of our citizenry. According to reliable sources there are over 100,000 card-carrying Communists in our country, infiltrating our social structure, working in our industrial plants and our communication and transportation systems, strategically located for purposes of sabotage in the event the temperature rises

above the cold-war stage—more than Russia contained when the Communists took over that nation of 180,000,000 people. The same sources tell us there are nearly 3,000,000 members of Communist-front organizations in our country.

Look about you for evidence of their activities, learn something about the striking Chicago packing-house workers, the riots, and who leads them. Look at the mob-scene pictures of the Roxy riot. Review the thousands of instances of Communist-directed attempts to create chaos and confusion and you will readily realize that it not only can happen here but it is already well entrenched—smug in its obscurity and freedom from punishment because of the lack of specific legislative coverage.

The Subversive Activities Control Act of 1948 supplies the remedy so sorely needed. The measure does not outlaw the Communist Party nor does it refer to it as such. It is aimed at subversive acts of commission or omission that are clearly described. It permits the Communist Party or any other similar organization to operate, but requires them to register the identity of their membership and to bring their activities to the surface. It provides adequate and proper penalties for violation of any of its provisions. I do not propose to go extensively into the provisions of the bill—you are already well acquainted with them.

I merely want to point out that in the enactment of this measure, the Subversive Activities Control Act, you will have struck a knockout blow at subversive organizations and individuals, and that again we, of this generation, have aided to keep alight in our country the torch of liberty bequeathed to us by our illustrious forebears.

Communitistic and other forms of subversive activity thrive only if their movements in preliminary stages are cloaked in secrecy. Their operations, brought to the light of day, would wither and die. That they regard the bill as the death knell to their hope of weakening our country and preparing it for an easy military "kill" by their masters is best evidenced by the hue and cry that has been raised against it, from sources that when checked are found to have their roots sunk deep in actual communism or pink liberalism. It is significant that every sound American organization approves the bill and urges its speedy enactment.

The eyes of all American patriots are upon us as we deliberate this measure. Let us be true to our heritage, and by a resounding majority serve notice upon the tricksters that America fights for its principles fairly and in the open and requires only that its enemies do likewise.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAIL. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. OWENS. I was just wondering if the gentleman did not, by his statement made concerning the Attorney General, show a fairly good reason why this bill should not set up our own agency to conduct the investigation rather than putting it in the hands of one who has proved unworthy of the trust reposed in him.

Mr. VAIL. As to that, we have always in the past had a full measure of confidence in our Attorneys General, and I believe that we shall have a full measure of confidence in the Attorney General whom I have every reason to believe will shortly succeed Mr. Clark.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, in the past year I have supported the Committee on Un-American Activities, have voted to continue that as a standing committee of the House, and have voted to support the resolutions that committee has reported to the House from time to time. It would be much easier today just to go along and support the recommendations of the Committee on Un-American Activities, to go along with what I am sure will be the overwhelming majority of the House, and pass this bill. Certainly it would be much easier for me to support a bill that has the endorsement and support of the American Legion than it is going to be to take the same position taken by the Communist Party of America.

On the 30th of April I stated on the floor of the House that I agreed wholeheartedly with the thoughts expressed by the junior Senator from Michigan when he wrote the Attorney General pointing out that there were ample laws on our statute books to prosecute those who would overthrow our Government by force or violence, or those who would conspire to overthrow our Government by force or violence. As the junior Senator from Michigan pointed out, the Attorney General now has ample power to bring into court the head of the Communist Party and the members of the executive committee. If this bill were limited only to dealing with the Communist Party as such I might swallow the doubts I have and go along with it. I have read the bill and reread it, and I have studied the report and the hearings, trying to find some justification for supporting the bill, but I have come to the conclusion that there can be no doubt about it, the bill as now written very definitely denies American citizens some of their constitutional rights. I cannot follow the dictates of my conscience and support the bill.

If the Communist Party of America were not supposed to desire the overthrow of this Government by force or violence, and perhaps they do, and I am inclined to think they do, this bill would not be here, because I do not think those that are sponsoring the bill would have brought it here unless the Communist Party was supposed to be desirous of overthrowing the Government by force or violence; in other words, if it were nothing more than a political party.

The Communist Party is recognized in my State as a political party. They have their place on the ballot. If they can get votes enough they can elect the Governor of the State of Connecticut. They can elect a Representative to this House, although I am quite sure that in the mood the House is in he would not be seated; but they could elect him. They could elect every State officer of the State of Connecticut, if they could get enough

votes to do it. As a resident of that State, living under the laws of that State, am I going to give to either this Attorney General or some other Attorney General the powers this bill provides shall be given to the Attorney General?

I am not a lawyer. I do not understand all of the involved procedure of review and what can be considered in a review and what cannot be considered in a review. But I do know from reading the language in this bill that the Attorney General is given power to do great damage to many loyal American citizens and that damage will be done long before that citizen ever gets into court if he is successful finally in getting into court. It has been done in the past, unintentionally, to be sure. I recall a fine old citizen of the community in which I live, a doctor of philosophy who was very much interested in social problems. In response to an advertisement which appeared in Harper's Magazine, which has never been listed as a subversive publication, he filled out a coupon and sent a dollar in with it. Some time later it was found that the organization to which he had written for information and literature was on the list of those organizations declared by the Attorney General a few years ago to be subversive. Harm was done to that citizen. It was unintentional, to be sure. Certainly it cost that particular citizen a great many unpleasant and unhappy moments. This bill would go a great deal further in that direction. I think one of the most priceless possessions that we have in this country are the civil rights guaranteed to us in the Bill of Rights.

Mr. Chairman, I want to make it very emphatic that the comments I have made on this bill are directed to the bill as presented to us today and not to the bill as it might be after we have considered the numerous amendments that I understand are to be offered by the Committee on Un-American Activities. The fact that those who sponsor this bill will offer several amendments to it is certainly an indication that the bill as now before us is not good legislation.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VAIL], a member of the committee sponsoring this bill, has just stated on the floor of the House that the present Attorney General was the most inept Attorney General that we have had and that he should be brought before the bar of this House and asked to apologize for the statements he made yesterday in criticism of the Committee on Un-American Activities. In spite of the opinion expressed by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VAIL], it is here proposed that we give this same Attorney General and his successors regardless of how inefficient they may be, the great powers delegated by this legislation.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, this is one of the most momentous issues that has ever come before the Congress of the United States. The far-reaching effect of this measure may mean the life or death of this Republic.

At the beginning of the Seventy-ninth Congress I secured the passage of the

rule creating the Committee on Un-American Activities. I repeat what I said a day or two ago—that this committee has done more to protect American institutions and has taken more abuse from the enemies within our gates than any other committee Congress has ever created.

We now come before you with a measure which deserves the support of every loyal American. Before I go further, let me state to you that if you will turn to the Appendix of yesterday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD you will find the first article in the Appendix is the report of this committee on communism. If you will read that report carefully, you will find that this bill is mild indeed compared with what is justified by the attempts of our enemies to undermine and destroy the Government of the United States. I hope every one of you—I do not advertise moving-picture shows—but I hope every one of you, and every one of your constituents, sees the picture called The Iron Curtain, so that you can see what communism has done to the Christian people of Europe.

The gentleman from New York a while ago went on to talk about men who had been unjustly punished, mentioning the crucifixion of Jesus Christ, the outstanding example of persecution in all the history of mankind.

These Communists that are running riot throughout the world are a part of the same old gang that constituted the fifth column of the crucifixion.

They hounded the Saviour during the days of his ministry, persecuted him to his ignominious death, derided him during the moment of his dying agony, and gambled for his garments at the foot of the cross; and for 1,900 years they have attempted to undermine and destroy, not only Christianity itself, but all the institutions that have been built on the moral precepts of Christianity.

Look what they did in Russia. They not only destroyed the churches but they killed the preachers and the priests. Untold millions of Christian men and women have been murdered, not only in Russia but in the Russian satellite countries.

In 1930, this man William Z. Foster, who is now head of the Communist Party in this country, appeared before the temporary Committee on Un-American Activities. I want to read to you his testimony, just one statement. He said:

No Communist, no matter how many votes he could secure in a national election, could ever, if he would, become President of the present Government. When a Communist heads the Government of the United States—and that day will come just as sure as the sun rises—the Government will not be a capitalist government, but a Soviet government; and behind this government will stand the Red Army to enforce the dictatorship of the proletariat.

That is the man who is leading the Communist Party in the district of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] who says he is not going to vote for this bill.

Sometime during the war, or about that time, they put Earl Browder in his place. But, lo and behold, about the time the war closed, the leader of the

Communist Internationale in Paris, a man named Duclos, passed the word to America to remove Browder and put this man Foster back in his place. And his order was carried out. And today this man Foster who made this statement controls a large proportion of that element that takes orders from this Communist Internationale, this atheistic movement, this movement of hatred for free institutions, this movement that calls itself anticapitalist, that not only overthrows the government and destroys the religion, murders the preachers, priests, and Christian people who resist, but takes the land into its own hands, administers it as it pleases, and reduces the people to the most abject slavery.

We had before our committee, Mr. William C. Bullitt, who was Ambassador to Russia in 1933. What a pity the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] could not have heard Mr. Bullitt's statement. The Government took over all the land in Russia. If you owned a home they said to you, "Move into two rooms, we are going to put somebody else in there with you. We are going to assign you so much land to work, and you are going to pay the Government so many bushels of grain as rent. No matter how much you make, here is how much you are going to pay the Government."

In 1933, they made a crop failure in the Ukraine. Those long-nosed commissars from Moscow went down into the Ukraine and took every bushel of it away from those people and starved from three to five million of the best people in Europe to death in their own homes.

In their frantic agony some of them died eating the dead bodies of their own families.

I asked Mr. Bullitt if that was true. He said:

I am sorry to say to you, Mr. RANKIN, that it is true. I have two photographs of an emaciated man and his wife standing above the carcass of their own child that they had eaten after it had starved to death.

Communism is ruthless, inhuman, atheistic, and imbued with hatred of our civilization.

If you want to turn back to the Dark Ages, then just let that crowd get control of the Government of the United States. Remember, you have more Communists in America per capita today than they had in Russia when they took over that Government, murdered the Czar and his family, and proceeded to wipe out the Christian leaders of that country.

They talk about free speech. This is not free speech they are advocating, it is free conspiracy. They want the freedom to conspire to destroy everything in New York, Pennsylvania, Mississippi, and every other State in the Union.

They talk about its being for the poor. That is one of the biggest pieces of bunk they put out.

Their money is coming from somewhere. I asked Mr. Bullitt if he ever saw a Communist who was not well dressed, well fed, and well financed? And he said he had not. Get the testimony and read it. Somebody is financing this outfit. I dare say they are the best-fed, best-financed, and best-clothed people in the district of the gentleman from New

York [Mr. MULTER]. I have never seen a Communist—and unfortunately I have seen one or two in this House—who was not well cared for.

They went over this country, picked out men who were willing to join them, took those men to Moscow and taught them how to carry on a revolution in this country. You have heard a great deal about this man Eisler, the two Eislers. I happened to be on the committee when Gerhart Eisler was brought before it, and he said:

I refuse to testify; I refuse to be sworn. I am a refugee; I am a refugee from Nazi persecution.

We cited him for contempt.

The next man who came along was a Negro by the name of Nowell; and I will say to you what I said to him before he left the witness stand. I said: "Nowell, this country owes you a debt of gratitude for the information you have given this committee."

He said they not only took Negroes from the North but they went into the South and got them and took them to a Communist school in Moscow where they taught them how to carry on a revolution. I wish you would read his testimony. He said they were taught when the word came down how to destroy the waterworks, blow up the light plants, wreck the streetcars, wreck trains, wreck bridges, burn warehouses, and do whatever else was necessary to carry on this vicarious revolution that these tentacles of the Communist Internationale were preparing for in the district represented by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] and in every other district where they reside.

I said to him: "Nowell, did you see this man Eisler here this morning?"

He said, "Yes, I saw him."

I said, "Had you ever seen him before?"

"Oh, yes," he said, "he was one of the instructors in that Communist school in Moscow when I was over there, teaching me how to destroy my country."

It became so horrible that this young Negro quit and came home and turned state's evidence; and here was this Eisler parading around claiming that he was a refugee. His brother was out in California and was just as bad as he was, if not worse. He was writing the songs to go into the picture shows to be sung to your children; and his cohorts were making the pictures and writing the scripts to poison the minds of the children of America, to undermine the moral fabric of this Nation, drag it down in wrack and ruin and subordinate it to that loathsome outfit that is unfit to govern anything, anytime, anywhere.

Mr. Chairman, my friend, THOMAS, is not here today. He is temporarily ill. I am speaking of J. PARNELL THOMAS, of New Jersey. But I want to pay him my compliment and say to you that there is not a finer American in the Congress of the United States than J. PARNELL THOMAS. When he summoned these Communists and brought them in here from Hollywood, it was not an accident. I have shown you here the petition signed by untold thousands of people, asking the Congress to do something about communistic activities in Holly-

wood. The Communist theme was being written into picture shows to be flashed before the eyes of your children.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BRADLEY. Please do not confuse all of California with Hollywood.

Mr. RANKIN. Oh, no.

Mr. BRADLEY. We have a great many good people out there and may I say also that we have a great deal of affection for the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMAS], chairman of this committee.

Mr. RANKIN. I know that, and let me say to the gentleman from California that we received petitions from his district, from the Los Angeles district, from practically all over California, asking us to make the investigation that the Committee on Un-American Activities made out there while I was home in a campaign.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Do not confuse all of Hollywood with the element the gentleman has just referred to.

Mr. RANKIN. I am not going to.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Some of the finest American citizens in the United States are in Hollywood, and they are corrupted by the element the gentleman from Mississippi is talking about. We do not like that.

Mr. RANKIN. I know that.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. McDOWELL. I can give eloquent approval to the testimony of both gentlemen from California. Not only can we take out most of California, but we can take out most of Hollywood and most of the movie industry, because there are many patriotic American writers, musicians, and movie actors out there who testified against these men who are now on their way to jail.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; they wanted this situation cleaned up.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. It seems to me that the very elements that have given notice they will destroy this Government by force and violence are entirely responsible for this legislation being before the House today.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. DONDERO. I want to confirm what the gentleman said about Nowell because he said exactly what the gentleman from Mississippi has given to the House.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, this is one of the best-drawn bills that has ever come before the Congress. I am a lawyer. I know my way around fairly well from a parliamentary standpoint. I have read

many bills in this House, I have helped to pass a great many and I have helped to defeat a great many, but this is one of the best measures that I have ever seen.

Suppose we had had a law of this kind in existence 10 years ago, at the time one of the most dangerous organizations that ever touched America was in existence, then at work all over the South, all over the West, all over the Hawaiian Islands, the Black Dragon Society of Japan, that furnished the spies, if you please, to guide the Japanese air force which destroyed our Navy at Pearl Harbor.

This bill is not going to hurt any patriotic American. On the contrary, it is going to do him good. It is going to give him the assurance that our country will be protected from these enemies within our gates.

This is the greatest country the world ever saw. We stand today at the crossroads of civilization. We are the greatest nation mankind has ever known. We have developed the finest system of government, we have developed the finest system of industry, we have developed the finest system of agriculture, we have developed the highest type of citizenship, if you please, of any nation on earth. We are the recipients of a heritage handed down to us by men like Jefferson, Washington, Jackson, and the great men of the past who carved this country out of a vast wilderness and made it the leading nation of the earth. By the passage of this measure we will carry on in that way and thereby we can keep America the leading country of the world.

God grant that we carry on the work those great leaders began.

May we, the recipients of American liberty, that proud heritage of patriotism conceived in the minds of the greatest statesmen the world has ever produced, guarded and protected by the undying loyalty of a noble ancestry, may we forever preserve and defend that liberty in our time and transmit it unimpaired to our posterity, that this grand old Republic may go down to the future with strength in her loins, hope in her soul, and the Miriam song of triumph on her lips.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I am obliged to the Republicans on the committee for allowing me this time to discuss the bill. It is not easy to oppose this bill which is before us today. It has the label "Communist" all over it in words, so as to give it a superficial public appeal and make it even harder to oppose. For I join with the vast majority of the people of my district in abhorrence of any tyranny over man's mind or spirit, Communist or of any other kind. But, we are not here to do easy things. We are sent here by the people as their representatives to do things which are most difficult, and that is why we are called Representatives. As I value the right of the gentleman who preceded me to express himself in the warmest terms on this subject, I am sure he and every other Member of the House will respect my right and that of everyone else who speaks on the bill to express ourselves

with just as much conviction without attaching labels to us.

I am opposed to this bill for three specific reasons:

First, because whether it says so in specific words or not it, in effect, and as nearly as is possible in a bill passed by this House, outlaws the Communist Party. There I take my stand with such distinguished Americans as Governor Dewey and Senator Taft, who have come out against the outlawing of the Communist Party, and in a minute I will read to the House exactly what they have said on that general subject.

Mr. NIXON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. NIXON. The gentleman does not wish to infer that either Governor Dewey or Senator Taft have come out against this bill?

Mr. JAVITS. I do not imply it either way. I only say that they have come out against the outlawing of the Communist Party, and I think I can demonstrate that this bill does outlaw the Communist Party.

The second reason for my opposition to this bill is that it makes certain sweeping findings of fact about a movement which condemn individuals without proof of individual guilt, but just because they are members, and if the House can find what it does as facts in this bill, in regard to the Communists, then it could, tomorrow, make the same sweeping findings of fact in regard to any other international movement, whether it is educational or moral or even religious, and could effectively outlaw that movement tomorrow just as it is trying to outlaw the Communist movement today.

My third ground of opposition is that this bill defines a new kind of treason and I do not want the Congress to define a new kind of treason by a majority vote when the only authority for the definition of treason is in article III, section 3, of the Constitution. If the Constitution is to be amended, it is a very thorough and deliberate process, requiring concurrence of the States, as the founding fathers sought it to be and as I and every other citizen and every minority in the United States would want it to be.

Now, to go over these points: I said that this bill outlaws the Communist Party. The provisions of paragraph 3 of section 3 of this bill require a finding that the "Communist political organization," which is affected by the bill, is under the control of a foreign government or foreign governmental or political organization defined as Communist, which has as its objective the establishment of a "Communist totalitarian dictatorship," or it requires the finding that it is one of the principal instrumentalities utilized to attain its objectives by this foreign government or foreign political organization.

Now, paragraphs (3) and (6) of section 2 of the bill state that this very objective of establishing a Communist totalitarian dictatorship is the objective of the foreign government or governmental or political organization referred to. Section 4 of the bill makes it a felony not

alone to attempt in any manner to establish in the United States a totalitarian dictatorship under foreign control, but to perform or attempt to perform any act with intent to facilitate or aid in bringing about the establishment in the United States of such a totalitarian dictatorship. Hence, any officer or any member actively interested in a Communist political organization as defined in this bill, and with the findings of fact set forth in this bill as to the objectives of such organization, will be in grave jeopardy of standing indictment and trial for felony under section 4 of the act the minute the Communist political organization registers as required by section 8 of the bill. More than that, such a person will lose his citizenship if convicted, and not only lose his citizenship but, if he is a native-born American, even lose his nationality. That is a very grave punishment, a punishment which we generally reserve for treason, and we are here creating a new kind of treason. We say to any Communist political organization, "When you register, your officers and active members are done in, they are practically prima facie guilty of a felony." If they are, do you think they are going to register, or are they going to go underground?

That is exactly why Governor Dewey and Senator Taft are opposed to the outlawry of the Communist Party, and I will read their statements to that effect. Governor Dewey in a speech reported from Portland, Oreg., on May 3, and I read the news report, said:

It is thought-control borrowed from the Japanese war leadership.

He is speaking of the outlawry of the Communist Party.

It is an attempt to beat down ideas with a club. It is surrender of everything we believe in. It is a philosophy which I shall fight to the limit of my strength.

Senator Taft said, and I quote a news report from Milwaukee on May 8:

Under our Constitution, we cannot, and should not, make it illegal for an American citizen to think communism or express his opinions, so long as he does not advocate a violent overthrow of the Government.

There are laws on our statute books, the Smith Act, the Voorhis Act, and the McCormack Act, with respect to organizations that advocate the overthrow of the Government by force or violence. You cannot substitute for the enforcement of laws new laws. If we will enforce the laws on the books today we can reach the Communists who ought to be reached, and if strengthening amendments are needed they should be made to these laws. The best proof of the pudding is that the gentleman who preceded me and other gentlemen have referred today to prosecution after prosecution for contempt against people charged with being subversive who have actually gone to jail. The fact is not that subversives are getting away with anything, the fact is that when a determined effort is made to reach those who are guilty of criminal acts they can be reached.

One other point, which I think is very important: Despite the fact that some Members come on the floor here and speak strongly for this bill, there is grave

disquiet in this House among the rank and file of the Members with respect to this bill, and it seems apparent that so far no great interest has been aroused in this measure in the other body. If this bill deals effectively with Communists, I think they in the other body are just as American as we are and would be just as exercised as we are about an effective way to deal with any menace to American liberties. We may be engaged here in a very elaborate but a very footless exercise.

I made reference to a new kind of treason. I think it is very important to speak of that. This bill does find a new kind of treason, because it makes a felony and it makes a loss of citizenship and nationality dependent upon the advocacy of a certain type of idea. That is generally the punishment for treason, those two things I mentioned. Yet here it is premised upon the advocacy of certain types of ideas.

To demonstrate the disquiet this bill has aroused among many whose opposition to communism is as clear as mine, the Liberal Party of New York, which is in part responsible for my being here, and which was organized as an anti-Communist Party, has come out against this bill. I will put its resolution in the Record as a part of my remarks.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. The gentleman referred to existing statutes as being sufficient. I call his attention to the testimony of the Attorney General of the United States at page 27 of the record where he said in answer to a question put by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HEBERT] that a disclosure statute such as is suggested here would be very helpful to him.

Mr. JAVITS. The gentleman from New York should say also that statutes are often adequate if they are administered with courage and intelligence. What the Attorney General was doing was reflecting his own inability to make these statutes do the job for which the authors of those very statutes expressly designed them.

By leave obtained when the House was in session, there follows the statement of the Liberal Party of New York made on this bill May 6, 1948:

STATEMENT OF THE NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE OF THE LIBERAL PARTY OF NEW YORK ON THE MUNDT BILL

The Liberal Party, which ever since its inception has conducted a campaign of education and organization designed to restrict Communist influence and defeat Communist objectives, here and abroad, is opposed to the Mundt subversive activities control bill recently approved by the House Committee on Un-American Activities. That measure will not effectively combat Communist influence. It will, instead, expose organizations that are neither Communist nor Communist led and influenced to dangerous restrictions and provide an entering wedge for Government intervention in a field where in the interests of our democratic institutions it ought not enter.

The Mundt bill illustrates the dangers with which a democracy such as ours may be confronted when legislation is proposed to deal with the dissemination of ideas. The pro-

ponents of such legislation, even when they are well-intentioned, have an unfounded and grossly exaggerated idea of the competence of legislation in matters such as these. Ideas, however pernicious, cannot be combated by such devices. To the extent that they create the illusion that they accomplish results they lull the people into a false sense of security and delay the adoption of measures by which the Communist conspiracy can best be dealt with.

Such legislation, in order to meet the large variety of forms to which the Communists resort in order to conceal their identity and mislead the public, must necessarily be vague and general. The Mundt bill, in its definitions of "Communist political" and "Communist front" organizations, presents these basic defects. These deficiencies are supposed to be taken care of under provisions which leave the final decision to the discretion of those charged with making the determination whether an organization falls into one or the other of these categories.

We consider such a procedure extremely dangerous. The tests to be employed in making the determination are too indefinite. With the best of intentions the enforcement agency may reach a false conclusion. Moreover, we are not convinced that the intentions will always be of the best. The practice in which some officials, including the legislators who sponsor this legislation, have indulged of labeling as Communists those with whose views they disagree has contributed to much of the strength which the Communist organizations now enjoy. The indiscriminate labeling of Communists has led many people to question the accuracy of charges even when they were directed against people who undoubtedly are Communists. Both the Communists and the Fascists have traditionally resorted to the practice of spreading confusion by labeling everyone who does not agree with them as a Communist or a Fascist.

It is true that the effect of such a charge against an organization deemed to be Communist-front would be no more serious than having it file certain financial records and membership lists. Unlike the case of Communist political organizations the membership roster of front organizations would not have to be filed with the Department of Justice. But in time of hysteria, such as is now beginning to develop, the designation of an organization as a front for the Communists may be fatal to organizations that are not Communist at all but are engaged in seeking reforms which some officials may consider communistic.

There are other provisions in the law which are less dangerous but which can have no real effect on dealing with the Communist menace.

The Liberal Party believes that that menace is sufficiently serious to require measures to counteract it. But instead of counting on legislation as a type of penicillin that will do the job other methods that are in keeping with our traditions and ideals and that can bring better results without corresponding dangers. We recommend the following as some that have not been tried sufficiently and which we believe will be more effective.

1. A campaign of education in which all organizations genuinely interested in preserving our way of life will teach the people the advantages of the democratic system and the political, social, and economic evils of the totalitarian police state which has enslaved the Russian people and now seeks to enslave, as Hitler did, the rest of the world.

2. The elimination of the weaknesses in our democratic system which the Communists, and many who are not Communists, point to as evidence that our professions belie our practices. The denial of civil liberties to minority groups, the poll tax which deprives millions of poor people of the right to vote, the failure of Congress to enact an antilynching bill, and thus give the same

protection to life as it has always been ready to give to property, and refusal to enact FEPC legislation are a few of many instances that can be cited of imperfections in our system which feed Communist propaganda and give plausibility to their claims.

3. The improvement of our economic conditions so that millions of people who are now denied an opportunity to share in the benefits of a more prosperous economy will make the underprivileged of our Nation, on whom the Communists count for a revolutionary uprising, less susceptible to Communist propaganda. Communists will be hit more by raising the national wage minimum, as has been proposed, than by all the legislation the Committee on Un-American Activities may devise. There is much more along that line that can be done to combat communism.

4. The abandonment by the two old parties of political deals with Communists would be a step in the right direction.

These are some of the steps that can be taken without prejudice to our ideals and institutions and which will be infinitely more effective than the Mundt bill or legislation of any kind devised to deal with the Communist menace.

As liberals we have a special interest in exposing the Communists and in warning the public of the dangers they present. We know that liberal ideas cannot flourish and progress toward the objectives we seek cannot be achieved if Communist doctrines should receive widespread support. Communism provokes reaction, and either extreme makes orderly progress by democratic means difficult, if not impossible. But this task for which liberals are best fitted cannot be performed if either the Communists or those who would suppress them by totalitarian methods should gain popular support.

In conclusion, we believe that our democracy is strong enough to withstand any vocal attack by Communists and their ilk. Any attempt to overthrow our Government by force, violence, or other unlawful means can well be taken care of by present criminal statutes. This is especially true if all responsible and thinking citizens do their duty in combating and exposing Communists and their false ideas. We agree with the late Justice Holmes, who said in his dissenting opinion in the Schimmer case: "If there is any principle in the Constitution that more imperatively calls for attachment than any other, it is the principle of free thought—not free thought for those who agree with us—but freedom for the thought we hate. If any provisions of the Constitution can be singled out as requiring unqualified attachment, they are the guaranties of the Bill of Rights and especially that of freedom of thought contained in the first amendment."

At the same time we wish again to emphasize with Justice Holmes that our Government and country can well deal with this problem in more vigorous terms in the case of a clear and present danger. There will be time for such action if and when our country is faced with a struggle for survival and self-preservation.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL].

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, I am very happy to concur in every phase of the argument which has been presented here by the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS]. In my opinion, the points he has raised in debate against the passage of this bill are unanswerable.

I should like to emphasize to my colleagues that this indeed is a very momentous issue. We are all aware of the possible political consequences in this election year as we are called upon to meet the tremendously important issues

involved in this bill. I am also aware of the possible inferences that can be drawn by taking a contrary position on the passage of this bill, but it is my sincere conviction that we must put aside our doubts and fears, meeting the issue in a forthright and courageous manner, irrespective of our private political fortunes. Now is the time to demonstrate our faith in democracy and our faith in the people. It has been said time and again, "that if the people are given the true light they will find their own way." It then becomes our task, insofar as possible, to provide that light. It is significant that the Republican candidates for President, and I refer to Messrs. Dewey and Stassen, have the courage to debate publicly this issue. Senator TART has given his views in a forthright manner and only yesterday the President of the United States made his position so clear that there no longer can be any misunderstanding as to his viewpoint.

Do not be alarmed that in all probability some of us again will be on the minority side of this vote. It should be evident to many of you that in the Eightieth Congress the record of the minority some day will serve as a badge of distinction and merit for those who have had the courage to represent the progressive Democratic viewpoint. Need I call to your attention that the record of the majority party is replete with instances in which bills have been sent to the Senate with an overwhelming majority vote only to come to rest and eventually be pigeonholed as a result of the mature deliberation given by that other body. For what my opinion is worth as a member of the bar and as a Representative of the people of Denver, I make the prediction that as and when this measure passes this body, it will never see the light of day in debate on the floor of the Senate or, should that happen, it will not become the law of this land.

Therefore, it should be quite clear that there is no need for alarm and notwithstanding the majority report of the Committee on Un-American Activities and the legislation which comes from that committee in the form of the present bill, there is in truth and in fact no real and serious danger to this great democracy that cannot be met at the present time by existing laws.

In this connection, the President of the United States yesterday publicly stated that he felt the present laws were adequate to control any group which sought to overthrow this Government by force and violence. This also is the viewpoint of the Attorney General who, under Federal law, is also the head of the Department of Justice. I might add that the Attorney General is specifically charged under law with the duty of protecting our internal security. I want to make it perfectly clear that if and when we become engaged in active warfare, the situation will materially change and if and when that time arises you will find me on the side of those seeking to strengthen and bolster existing legislation and, if necessary, voting to enact new laws to protect the internal and external security of this Nation.

Now as to the merits of the bill, I am in complete accord with the gentle-

man from New York [Mr. JAVITS], who states that no matter by what name or brand this bill is labeled, it is designed to outlaw the Communist political party. No matter how desirable that objective may be, it cannot be achieved under our present Constitution. The proponents of this bill admit that the Constitution forbids the outlawing of any political party. Recognizing that fundamental constitutional principle, the committee which has drafted this bill has sought ways and means to abolish the Communist Party by indirection.

I should like to take this opportunity to pay my respect to the committee for the great amount of work that has been done on this bill. I have read every page of the record, and I know how hard they have worked to come up with a good bill. I realize that it is very easy for people to criticize a piece of legislation and I wish that I could say quite frankly to the committee that I have an amendment or substitute bill which would solve the problem. I have not. I know full well how complicated this subject is and, therefore, any of my remarks are not directed against or made in criticism of the committee's efforts. I merely state that in spite of all of your fine efforts, the present bill is unworkable and unconstitutional, and I think I can prove that in a very few minutes.

The bill begins with a series of legislative findings describing totalitarian dictatorship, the world Communist movement and its methods and concluding with a statement that the world Communist movement is "a clear and present danger to the security of the United States." Then follow definitions of a Communist political organization intended to describe the Communist Party and Communist-front organizations intended to include any organization controlled by the Communist Party or consciously operated to aid or to echo the Communist Party, the world Communist movement, or any Communist government.

The next section creates a new criminal offense, that of establishing, doing any act with intent to establish, or participating in the management or direction of any movement to establish or aid in establishing a totalitarian dictatorship under foreign control in the United States.

I direct your attention specifically to section 4 (a) on page 23 of the bill, in which it is stated among other things—

It shall be unlawful for any person—

(2) To perform or attempt to perform any act with intent to facilitate or aid in bringing about the establishment in the United States of such a totalitarian dictatorship.

Let us assume that the Attorney General made a finding under the registration provisions of this bill and that he were to proscribe certain organizations as Communist organizations or Communist-front organizations. It is my contention that under the provisions of this bill that every member who belongs to such organizations could be prosecuted under this bill either for the violation of the substantive act, or as a result of an unlawful conspiracy. There is no denying that.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARROLL. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. I wonder whether the gentleman is correct in what he just said. As I understand it, a Communist organization or a Communist-front organization as defined in the act is not thereby unlawful under the penalty section. Am I right or wrong on that? I thought that there could be a Communist Party, a lawful Communist Party in this country, but that if individuals in it violated the provisions of section 2, that then and only then would their activities be unlawful. Am I right or wrong? I think either the gentleman or I are in error on that.

Mr. CARROLL. It is my understanding of the bill, and I must say to you that I have read it carefully, and have gone over the testimony of all the witnesses very carefully, that under the provisions of this bill every member of a Communist or Communist-front organization is subject to prosecution. I repeat, under subparagraph 2 of section 4, on page 24, "to perform or attempt to perform any act with intent to facilitate or aid in bringing about the establishment in the United States of such a totalitarian dictatorship."

Now what is meant by that? What do we mean by "totalitarian dictatorship"? In my opinion, a Communist-front organization and a Communist political party under the terms of this bill and the criteria set up in this bill is such a "totalitarian dictatorship."

Mr. NIXON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARROLL. I yield.

Mr. NIXON. Is it the gentleman's contention that the essence of the Communist Party and of Communist-front organizations in the United States is that they are working for the establishment in the United States of a totalitarian dictatorship under the domination of a foreign power?

Mr. CARROLL. That is what the committee has set forth in this legislation.

Mr. NIXON. Just a minute. Does the gentleman contend that that is the case?

Mr. CARROLL. Assuming for the sake of argument that that is the case, it is my contention that under the provisions of your bill your definition of "totalitarian dictatorship" was designed purposely to include the Communist Party, and that you cannot by legislative fiat or legislative criteria set forth standards which may well result in invoking the doctrine of guilt by association or which may have the effect of attempting to control the thoughts of American citizens in political, social, or economic matters. If I were charged with the duty of representing a defendant who ran afoul of this bill, it would be my job in interpreting the bill to try to relate the various sections of the bill one with another. Now this is the real point that I want to make. Under this bill you require both Communist political organizations and Communist-front organizations to register with the Attorney General. If they do not register they are subject to prosecution. If they do register they are in

effect, and it could be so interpreted, involving themselves in a very possible prosecution under section 4 of this bill. In other words, they are being required to admit their guilt. In short, they are being compelled to give evidence against themselves in a matter involving possible criminal prosecution, which clearly is unconstitutional.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARROLL. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I wish to compliment the gentleman on his statement. Does not the bill say exactly what the gentleman claims for it? On page 21, from line 16 to line 20, the bill says the test of whether an organization is a Communist political organization is that—

It is reasonable to conclude (1) that it is under the control of such foreign government or foreign governmental or political organization, or (2) that it is one of the principal instrumentalities utilized by the world Communist movement in carrying out its objectives.

Now, if you will turn to page 16, lines 19 to 25, which state what is meant by a political organization and what is meant by these objectives, it reads as follows:

The political organizations so established and utilized in various countries, acting under such control, direction, and discipline, endeavor to carry out the objectives of the world Communist movement by bringing about the overthrow of existing governments and setting up Communist totalitarian dictatorships which will be subservient to the most powerful existing Communist totalitarian dictatorship.

So, if an organization says it is a Communist political organization, it is admitting that it is trying to establish a totalitarian dictatorship, and its officers and active members would be prima facie guilty under section 4.

Mr. CARROLL. If the gentleman will permit me, therefore, to continue the discussion of this point, they are all subject to prosecution under this act. That is why I say it is unconstitutional.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARROLL. I yield.

Mr. McDONOUGH. If such an organization did exist in the United States and it was conspiring to set up a totalitarian dictatorship in the United States to overthrow the United States Government, what penalty would you propose in the statute?

Mr. CARROLL. That is the very point I am making to the gentleman. While I do not criticize this committee, because I have read the testimony of the constitutional lawyers and the great leaders, educational and religious, who are seeking a solution of this problem. My answer is that you cannot do something by indirection which you cannot do directly, as in this bill, because it is unconstitutional. You say, What would I do? That is a great problem. I can say to you as a constitutional liberal—and Senator Morse says a constitutional liberal is he who places human rights above property rights—I want an opportunity to meet the Communists in public debate. I want to sell my ideas in the market place of public opinion. I do not want any law of Congress to put a lot of

people in jail with whom I do not happen to agree. That is not the way to meet this problem.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CARROLL. I have not concluded yet. I say to you, I agree with the gentleman from New York [Mr. LYNCH]. If you really want to fight communism, you cannot do as this body has been doing for the past 2 years. You cannot pass only special privilege legislation neglecting housing, neglecting legislation designed to curb inflation, neglecting legislation which meets the needs of the people. To sell democracy our program must be dynamic, not negative. Communism feeds upon the inequalities and injustices which exist in our system of government. It is our job to remedy these defects in our system, to be constantly on the alert and moving forward always with the purpose of strengthening our democracy.

One thing we must not do is to permit the people of America to be lulled into a sense of false security by the passage of this type of legislation. Can it be said that this legislation will cure the evils from which communism springs? Does anyone here really believe that this legislation will stop the growth and spread of communism? The history of Italy and Germany should provide ample proof that this is not the way to curb communism. Actually if this bill became law, communism would be driven underground. If this bill became law the Attorney General would have to prosecute a great number of people in this Nation who hold political views which are contrary to mine. This type of political prosecution would create a tremendous well of sympathy. Let us suppose that after the prosecution, the law would be declared unconstitutional. You would be making martyrs of the very people whose actions you are trying to curb today, and you might very well give forward impetus to the growth and spread of communism which could be had in in no other way. These are some of my objections to this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield one additional minute to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CARROLL. I should like to conclude by saying this: I have read the testimony given in the hearings with extreme care. In my opinion those charged with the execution and enforcement of existing laws are not in favor of this type of legislation. I do not believe that J. Edgar Hoover is in favor of this type of legislation, nor is Attorney General Clark in favor of this type of legislation and I repeat, I purposely called the White House the other day to find out if the President of the United States would issue a statement on this important issue. And why did I call? I felt that if the Republican Presidential candidate could make a forthright declaration on this important subject, certainly the President of the United States, the titular head of the Democratic Party ought to speak on this issue involving the civil and political liberties

of the people of America. He has done so in no uncertain terms.

As the people of America begin to understand the full import of this bill, they will rise up in their wrath against any individual or group of individuals who seek to deprive them of our most precious heritage—individual freedom. It is significant that those who cry the loudest about the threat and danger of communism do the least to present a constructive program with which to cut the ground out from under those who advocate communism.

As the President's Committee on Civil Rights has said:

If the people are to govern themselves, their only hope of doing so wisely lies in the collective wisdom derived from fullest possible information, and in the fair presentation of differing opinions.

And let me close my debate with a quotation from the remarks of an outstanding jurist, a true American in every sense of the word, whose vision and leadership cannot but inspire progressive citizens everywhere:

A people indifferent to their civil liberties do not deserve to keep them, and in this revolutionary age may not be expected to keep them long. A people who proclaim their civil liberties but extend them only to preferred groups, start down the path to totalitarianism. (Justice William O. Douglas, *Altgeld Centennial*, December 30, 1947.)

With profound conviction and deep sincerity, I urge upon the Members of this body to give this legislation that deliberation and mature consideration consistent with the great responsibilities of the high office which you hold as Representatives and in the name of the people of America.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has again expired.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox].

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, it is remarkable to what extent men will go when seeking reasons for support of positions that they take. But before I proceed further, let me suggest to you, my colleagues, that you read the record made by the committee on this bill and get a new appreciation of our brilliant young friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. Nixon] and his collaborators on the bill, and find therein appreciation of the fine work being done by your Committee on Un-American Activities.

Mr. Chairman, the committee has not proposed a full employment of the constitutional powers of this House. I think the committee should have gone further than it did, that it should have proposed outlawing the Communist Party, but in the desire to avoid raising any constitutional question, the committee did not go further than to provide for disclosure.

It has been stated in the debate that the President has expressed opposition to the bill. I do not know what the President said or what provisions of the bill he had in mind when he is alleged to have expressed opposition, but his Attorney General, Mr. Clark, was before the committee and testified at great length,

and some of the suggestions that he made are embodied in the pending measure. Gentlemen have said that existing law is sufficient to accomplish all that is here undertaken, but Attorney General Clark gave expression to a contrary view. He urged the tightening of certain statutes, including the Espionage Act, and said:

I think the Congress can pass disclosure statutes, no question about it, and I think that where a disclosure statute is worded in such a way as not to contravene constitutional provisions, that it would be an effective way to combat the problem.

In response to the question, "Do I understand by that statement that you mean the answer to the problem at the present time, then, is an amendment to the Smith Act, the Voorhis Act, and the Antiespionage Act, in preference to the proposal of Mr. MUNDT?" propounded by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT], the Attorney General said:

I wouldn't say it was the answer; no. The answer is that these proposals I suggest would be helpful, and, in addition to that, I would say that the disclosure statute as suggested by Mr. MUNDT—I haven't gone into the details of his bill from the standpoint of constitutionality—but a disclosure statute would likewise be helpful.

Further along in his testimony the Attorney General said:

I take it that your over-all strategy is one of disclosure, and I think that would be very helpful.

Referring to the publicity provisions of the bill, the Attorney General said:

I think, as I said in my statement, it is one of the most potent weapons.

I should like to quote further from the statement of Attorney General Clark, but will not weary you by doing so. Let me take you to the statement of Donald Richberg, who is one of the great lawyers of the country. Mr. Richberg is known to be an outstanding liberal, and it is because some people opposing the pending bill call themselves liberals that I regard his statement to be most important. Mr. Richberg said, among other things:

The survival of our institutions depends upon preserving among the American people liberty, faith in man, and faith in God. Communism seeks to destroy these three pillars of our wisdom.

Later Mr. Richberg said:

Communism scorns a faith in God whereby men are inspired to live and work together under Divine commandments, seeking spiritual as well as material satisfaction. The Communist creed treats men as little better than animals that must be driven to work by hunger and are disciplined only by man-made laws.

Mr. Richberg demonstrates by a wealth of citations and arguments the inherent menace of any secret political organization to be so obvious that legislation eliminating some of the secrecy of such organizations is plainly justified and also clearly within the constitutional powers of the Congress. Gentlemen have said that this bill violates the guaranty of free speech and free press and on this subject Mr. Richberg said:

I don't think the right of free speech or free press or secret ballot is in the slightest

degree involved in an inquiry as to the membership of a political organization—I think in the protection of citizenship and the protection of the political life of the country, in the protection of the republican form of government which is guaranteed by the Constitution to every State in the Union, when secret political organizations menace the welfare of the country. I think they can be outlawed to this extent, and that is that they can be required to give up these secrecies which permit them to carry on unlawful projects. Congress could pass an act outlawing the Communist Party.

Mr. Richberg said further:

The Congress, without abridging freedom of speech and press, might, conceivably, pass an act prohibiting the advocacy of the political program of fraud and violence. Of course, all the befuddled liberals, who are helping the Communists to destroy their heritage of freedom, would raise a dust storm about civil liberties. It has never yet been held that the right of free speech is violated by a law forbidding incitements to crime, but perhaps I would be reckless to assert that this judicial rule will remain unchanged.

The opposition to this bill will use the Schneiderman case to bolster up the position they take, and, referring to this case which was decided while the recent war was pending, Mr. Richberg said:

The Schneiderman case came out in 1943 at a time when we were an ally of the Soviet Union, and at a time when, at least militarily, politically, and otherwise, we were cooperating with the Soviet Union, and apparently what you have said there was some indication that the Supreme Court decided to cooperate in that way also.

Other witnesses made similar references to this decision of the Court, some expressing confidence that because of changed conditions the Court would, upon the new presentation of the question, recall its decision in the Schneiderman case.

I should wish that every Member of this body would read and ponder the statement made by Mr. Richberg.

Now, let me take you to the evidence of a very remarkable man, and I refer to none other than Mr. Louis Waldman, of New York, who has been counsel for various labor unions. At the outset of his statement and referring to the question of proof required that the Communist Party advocates change by unlawful means, he discussed briefly the Schneiderman case referred to above in the following language:

The case frequently cited on that point by apologists of the Communist Party who claim that the party does not advocate social change by unlawful means is *U. S. v. Schneiderman* (320 U. S. 118). That case holds nothing of the kind.

Schneiderman, an admitted member of the Communist Party and one of its officials, became a citizen by naturalization. At the time of naturalization the Immigration and Naturalization Service apparently interposed no objection. Twelve years after, action was brought to revoke Schneiderman's citizenship on the ground that he obtained his naturalization by fraud and procured his citizenship illegally.

The Supreme Court held that in this proceeding it was really sought to attack a prior judgment of the Court. Moreover, the issue required that the Government prove its case not by a preponderance of evidence, but by evidence which was clear and convincing. Whatever may be said of the reasoning of the Court in coming to the conclusion it did in

that case, it certainly was not a holding that the Communist Party did not advocate social change by unlawful means. The dissenting opinions also are quite illuminating, particularly the opinion written by Chief Justice Stone. For affirmative determinations on Communist advocacy of social change by unlawful means, see opinion by Attorney General Biddle in the case of Harry Bridges; also opinion by Hon. Charles Sears in the case of Harry Bridges; *Whitney v. California* (1927) 274 U. S. 357; *Gitlow v. New York* (268 U. S. 652). Judge Sears is a distinguished jurist, a former member of the court of appeals, New York.

I regret that I have not the time to quote in extense from the statement of Mr. Richberg, but suffice it to say that he supports the bill as being constitutional and as being necessary. Read his statement and marvel that one person could know so much about this important question. Many of the suggestions made by Mr. Waldman and by Mr. Richberg are incorporated in the bill, as well as are suggestions made by others that testified, and there was an array of great constitutional lawyers, historians, students of government, and others that testified before the committee on this subject. I want to repeat what I have said before, that this is the best-prepared case that has come before this body during my membership, and the bill should be adopted without a dissenting vote.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, the report accompanying this bill states that the alien registration acts, the McCormack and Voorhis Acts, are inadequate "due in part to the skill and deceit which the Communists have used in concealing their foreign ties."

Are the bill's adherents so naive as to think that this same skill and deceit will not be operative to avoid entrapment under the pending bill? This bill will fail of its purpose and next year a still more drastic and still more Draconian bill will be the spawn of proscriptive minds.

Just think of this for one moment. There is not even a statute of limitations in the act. On page 24 we have this significant language:

Any offense punishable under this section may be prosecuted at any time without regard to any statute of limitations.

Ponder this. On page 40 we have penalties that involve fines of upward of \$5,000 and imprisonment of upward of 5 years. Then, significantly, on page 40 we have this statement of punishment, lines 16, 17, and 18:

Each day of failure to register, whether on the part of the organization or any individual, shall constitute a separate offense.

Thus, if an organization or an individual, say, is in 10 days' default, there could be a penalty of \$50,000 and 50 years in jail. If there is a default for 20 days, there could be a penalty of \$100,000 and 100 years in jail. To my mind, that is just barbarism, and ill befits reasonable men of a reasonable Congress.

Coercion, restrictions, proscriptions, force cannot destroy or banish an idea

or an ideology. Even bullets cannot. Only a better idea or a better ideology can do that. Repressive bills of this character always defeat their own ends. They arouse widespread hostility and create martyrs, and martyrs are the best propagandists I know. That is why the coercions and the proscriptions in this bill will fail. Bills of this character are not to go unchallenged, although the cards may be stacked against any idea of defeating it. I am proud to be labeled a liberal. As such, I inveigh against this bill. In opposing it, my assignment is difficult. I am trying to swim upstream. The bill will pass overwhelmingly, I admit. We liberals have a difficult time, like Ulysses endeavoring to steer clear of Scylla and Charybdis, the shoals and eddies of communism on the one side and the rocks and reefs of Bourbon reaction on the other. We are scorned by the one and reviled by the other. The reactionaries call us Communists, while the Communists call us Fascists. But despite the name calling, I do not propose to allow the Red hysteria now gripping the Nation to force me off the beam of reason and common sense. I shall not for one moment allow myself the luxury of condemning if not scotching communism by the terms of this bill if I thereby tend to destroy our present Bill of Rights.

Mr. Chairman, this proposed legislation is so loosely drawn in parts that its administration will destroy not only the civil rights of Communists, but of all Americans as well. It blandly provides for the punishment of persons who seek—and see page 23, line 22—“who make an attempt in any manner to organize a dictatorship.” The words “who attempt in any manner” are as wide as a barn door. It could encompass many perfectly innocent actions or lack of actions. It could be made to cover not acts alone, but speeches, and writings as well. This would be unlawful under the act: If I were to offer a constitutional amendment to set up a totalitarian state in this Nation, I would run afoul of the language that I have just read to you.

It could be made to mean that the Government could imprison an American who made a gesture, either of speech or by an article or even simply advice that is critical of the administration or existing powers in politics. The words “who attempt in any manner” could be interpreted in any way by any unfriendly judge or hand-picked official. Vague, indefinable terms like that have no place in a criminal statute. They could criminally enmesh a Communist, probably a college freshman or sophomore who mounts a soapbox to call for the election of a Red Congress—an innocent but boring gesture.

In *Winters v. New York* (68 Supreme Court, 665), the Court said:

A statute so vague and undefined in form and, as interpreted, as to permit within the scope of its language the punishment of incidents fairly within the protection of the guarantee of free speech is void on its face.

Where a statute is so vague as to make criminal an innocent act, the conviction cannot be sustained.

Herndon v. Laurie (301 U. S. 242); *Stromberg v. California* (208 U. S. 359).

Under section 10 of this bill, a member of a Communist political organization may go to jail for 2 years, merely for belonging to that organization if it has not registered. Each member is made guilty. The organization's default in failing to register is imputed to each member. Each member thus commits a separate and distinct crime, simply because of the membership.

Justice Jackson, in *Korematsu v. United States* (223 U. S. 214), said:

If any fundamental assumption underlies our system it is that guilt is personal.

You cannot impose guilt by association. I believe it is right that Communist groups, like Republicans and like Democrats, be clearly labeled as to character and source of funds, so that Americans would know where responsibility for statements and actions lie. But it is not right that Americans can lose their citizenship and rights of citizenship because they join the Communist Party, which is recognized as legal; nor is it right that those Americans be jailed for aiding the party, recognized and organized as legal.

The bill will frighten and intimidate all progressive and reform groups. The ordinary citizen will be cowed. Criticism of existing governmental abuses might bring dire punishment. People would fear to join any organization that possesses the status quo, any group that is not stand pat, and ultraconservative.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. Celler] has expired.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Smith].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I have listened to this debate all day long. One thing strikes me as quite significant and that is that no Member who has opposed this measure has offered any constructive suggestion of his own to solve the problem that we all know is before us. I say that now because that is historically true of many of those Members who have spoken against this measure in their attitude toward previous measures of like character that have come up before this and previous Congresses.

Mr. Chairman, this whole debate here today is reminiscent to me of a similar debate that took place back in the year 1939 when the Alien Registration Act was under debate in this House. I happen to have the honor of being the author of that act. I recall quite distinctly that when that bill was brought to the House I was the subject of voluminous abuse from all over the Nation—just as the Dies committee had been the subject of abuse—from the same groups and the same type of people, and, unfortunately, when the bill came to the floor, from the same ideology of membership in this House that speaks against this bill today.

Now, what happened to that bill? It is called particularly to my mind because two of the gentleman who have spoken today said:

What is the use of passing this bill? It is going to the Senate and will be put in a pigeonhole.

Well, the same thing took place about the Alien Registration Act. It did go to the Senate. It did get put in a pigeonhole and it stayed there for a year, and this bill may stay there for a year. But did the action of this House do any good? What was the sequel to the action of this House? In 1940, when the prophetic contents of that bill came to realization, Hitler spread out down through the Low Countries of Europe, and when the fifth column showed its ugly head and delivered the peoples of those countries to the dictatorship of Hitler, and when treason was rampant over Europe and over the world, in 10 days the other body took that bill out of the pigeonhole and passed it by a unanimous vote.

The same thing may happen here. We ought to realize some of the facts of life. It is time for my friends over here—and they are my friends, and I give them credit for being just as patriotic and sincere as I claim to be; I have no criticism to make of them except for their ideology—it is time for them to realize some of the facts of life. It is time for them to understand that the Communist Party International is trying to break down the democratic governments of the world. If they do not know it they must be blind, deaf, dumb, and unable to read English or any other language. That is what is going on. Why do you not wake up to it? And if you do not like this bill give us some constructive suggestions. Let us improve the bill.

We have had a great deal of argument about whether this bill was going to compel a man to confess his guilt and was going to make him guilty if he is registered. My goodness alive. Read the Alien Registration Act. It is the law today that anybody who joins any movement to upset this government by force and violence has committed a crime. I see no material difference between the existing law, and the proposal in the bill presently before us.

A good deal has been said about the constitutionality of this legislation. The same thing was said about the old Alien Registration Act when it was up here on the floor. You are destroying freedom of speech. You are doing away with the Constitution. I think we ought to start with the premise that we have a condition confronting us where we know that there are groups throughout the world and groups within our own boundaries which seek to overthrow this Government by force and violence. And when you realize that do not forget that with the Communist countries this Nation is the great pawn, this is the great Nation of wealth and resources they would rather get at than little Finland and Czechoslovakia or some of those other countries. Let us realize the facts of life, as I have said before, and let us realize that the only point of all this movement is our fear and our efforts to protect the existence of this Nation as we know it; and there comes into play

the fundamental law of nature, namely, the right of self-preservation. That is what we seek to do with this legislation. We seek to preserve the safety and the existence of our Government in this country as we have known it and as our fathers have known it before us. Is it unconstitutional to do that?

Is it unconstitutional and a violation of the rights of an American citizen or of an alien to say to him that he shall not advocate the overthrow of this Government by force, he shall not advocate revolution in this country, he shall not undertake to undermine the pinions on which this Government rests? That is the question.

Is it unconstitutional under the Bill of Rights? That is the question these gentlemen have sought to raise here today. I thought they would debate it at some length, I thought they would bring here some authority as I have done from the Supreme Court of the United States to say whether this is an unconstitutional invasion of our Bill of Rights.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Not at this time.

But no, no; all we have had has been these vague speeches that we are destroying the Constitution and throwing away the Bill of Rights.

What does the Supreme Court of the United States say about it? We have had this question up before, it is not a new one. We have several cases on it, but now I am only going to refer to one case because it is so well in line and shows the pattern of this thing, and that is the case of *Gitlow v. New York* (268 U. S. 652, 667).

This *Gitlow* case is a parallel to the Communist situation. There was a person and an organization advocating anarchy. They did not believe in any government. They did not even believe in the Communist form of government. They were prosecuted, and the case went to the Supreme Court of the United States.

The question was as to whether it was an invasion of their constitutional right of free speech to say that they could not get up on a soapbox out in Madison Square and advocate overthrow of the Government and the substitution of anarchy for democratic government. That was the very issue that was tried in that case, which went to the Supreme Court. Here is what the Supreme Court said about that:

That a state in the exercise of its police power may punish those who abuse this freedom by utterances inimical to the public welfare, tending to corrupt public morals, incite to crime, or disturb the public peace, is not open to question. Thus it was held by this court in the *Fox* case that a state may punish publications advocating and encouraging a breach of its criminal laws; and in the *Gilbert* case that a state may punish utterances teaching or advocating that its citizens should not assist the United States in prosecuting or carrying on war with its public enemies.

And, for yet more imperative reasons, a state may punish utterances endangering the foundations of organized government and threatening its overthrow by unlawful means. These imperil its own existence as a

constitutional state. Freedom of speech and press, said *Story* (supra), does not protect disturbances to the public peace or the attempt to subvert the Government. It does not protect publications or teachings which tend to subvert or imperil the Government or to impede or hinder it in the performance of its governmental duties.

It goes on from there page after page laying down a doctrine that is so obvious that we should not have to discuss it or argue it on the floor of the House today.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I am coming to the gentleman from New York and if he will withhold his question a few minutes he might want to ask me another one.

Now, the gentleman from New York and another gentleman who spoke here today inveighed against this bill because of the substantial-evidence rule and because the court only had to be convinced by substantial evidence in order to sustain the finding of the Attorney General. If you will look at the administrative law bill which we passed here a year ago you will find that this bill follows the provisions of the administrative law bill and that that administrative law bill laid down the rule that in a judicial review of an administrative finding the court could go no further in reviewing the evidence than to determine whether or not the finding of the administrative officer was supported by substantial evidence. It so happens that my good friend over there has been a great advocate of the National Labor Relations Act. You will find in that act that when the Labor Board decides a case and it is appealed to the court, the court cannot go back to determine anything other than to determine if it is supported by substantial evidence.

Why is that substantial-evidence rule written into the administrative act? It has a history. When the National Labor Relations Act was passed it contained the provision that the court could not review the evidence in a case decided by the Board if there was any evidence to sustain it. We might call that the scintilla-of-evidence rule. So it happened that the Board would decide a case even upon the slightest evidence and when it went to the Court of Appeals the court's hands were tied. Finally the courts did get up courage to decide themselves that there must be substantial evidence to support the findings of the Board. So it was written into law and so it is written into the administrative law bill, which this House passed recently.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I think the gentleman, who is an able lawyer, will admit two propositions: First, that there can be no exceptions made to the first amendment except in cases where advocacy and violence constitutes a clear violation. That has been handed down from time immemorial. Second, what the gentleman is reciting now with respect to substantial evidence is review in

civil matters. But, this is the first time that a person's guilt is established on a basis of substantial evidence in a criminal proceeding rather than guilt established beyond a reasonable doubt.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Now the gentleman is entirely off base on that assertion. The substantial evidence provision in this bill has nothing in the world to do with the criminal provision in the bill.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I would like to finish first.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I will give the gentleman an additional minute. It is true, the Attorney General finds an organization to be an organization which must register. It is true that the circuit court of appeals cannot disturb the finding where there is substantial evidence. Then the organization does not register. What is the question before the criminal court when the officers of that organization are indicted? First, did the Attorney General decide that this organization must register? Second, did the person register? Those are the only two questions, and for all practical purposes the person's guilt under the penalty provisions of the bill is resolved by the substantial evidence theory and not resolved by the principle of guilt beyond a reasonable doubt as we have established throughout our Anglo-Saxon system of laws all the way back to the Magna Carta.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Now the gentleman is entirely wrong again. I hate to have to correct so distinguished a lawyer and colleague as my friend from New York, but here is the situation. Here is what he is talking about. This law says that an organization must register if the Attorney General, after investigation, finds that it comes within the terms of this bill. Now, if the organization thinks the Attorney General is wrong, then the organization appeals to the court, and it gets its trial before the court under the regular provisions pertaining to the administrative law act that pertains to all administrative findings.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has again expired.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Now after that has been done, if the Attorney General has found that it is an organization that must register, and the parties have gone to the Supreme Court, and the Supreme Court has said the Attorney General is right under the substantial evidence rule, then if the parties in violation of the law still refuse to register, that is the crime that has been committed. When they refuse to register, after they have resorted to and gone through the whole processes of the law, and the law of the land says you must register, and they still refuse to register, then it becomes a crime and only then it becomes a crime. So, the question under the criminal law would be not whether they were subversive or were not subversive, but have you complied with the law? Have you registered as

required by the Supreme Court decision when you have litigated the thing to the end of the road, and the Court says you are wrong and you must do so-and-so, and you have refused to do so-and-so? That is the only issue in the criminal case, not the question of whether they are or are not a Communist organization, but whether they have complied with the law as laid down by the court of last resort.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WOOD] yielding me a moment to say a word about the pending bill, H. R. 5852. Because of the death of the senior Senator from Louisiana, Senator JOHN H. OVERTON, I have not been privileged to hear all of the debate today on this very important bill. As I am to go to Louisiana as a representative of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of Senator OVERTON, there is a possibility that I may not have an opportunity to vote on the bill when it comes to a vote early next week, and for these reasons I welcome this opportunity to express myself very briefly as to the pending legislation. Of course, in view of the fact that the rule bringing this bill to the floor for action was supported by the House this evening by 296 yeas and 40 nays, it is quite evident that the bill will pass the House by an overwhelming majority, as in my opinion, it should.

Mr. Chairman, in the brief moments allotted to me, I do not have the time to discuss the bill at great length nor to go into the question of constitutionality, but it seems to me that the very type of opposition to this legislation affords one a pretty good reason for supporting it. The offices of every Member of this House have been flooded with denunciations of this bill by the Communist Party itself and by various left-wing groups and organizations. Mr. Chairman, when the Communist Party and these other subversive organizations get so bold as to cry out in unison against any piece of legislation, I would be constrained from that evidence alone to consider the legislation worthy of the consideration of real patriotic Americans. In this bill we have an honest effort upon the part of the Un-American Activities Committee to present a constructive plan to halt the inroads of communism in this country. Every time anything like that is undertaken, we hear loud condemnation upon the part of the Communist Party and its fellow travelers. I think the Un-American Activities Committee deserves the thanks and the appreciation of the House of Representatives for the work which it has done and for its effort through this bill and otherwise to stop the inroads of communism in this country and to protect the American way of life. I am not unmindful of the fact that there are some people in this country who perhaps conscientiously feel that we cannot legislate on this question. But I am not in accord with that view. Communism is a menace of the greatest magnitude to our entire American economy and our way of life. It seeks to destroy property rights and human rights and enslaves mankind. As

for me, Mr. Chairman, I refuse to take the negative position that we cannot do anything about it.

Members of this Un-American Activities Committee have given long thought and study to this question and they have worked out this bill and they tell us that they think it will accomplish the desired results and I think it is our duty and our privilege to back them up and pass this bill and by so doing show to the world that we intend to do all that we can within our own borders, also to eradicate the greatest menace that has been visited upon this world. I shall support this legislation and I hope that it passes by such a resounding majority that it will be heard in Moscow. I hope that the Senate takes up the bill immediately thereafter and also gives it favorable action. This, Mr. Chairman, is an American bill, for America, and is designed to protect in this country all that we hold near and dear.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield an additional 15 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO], I yield 5 minutes now to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD], and then I yield the remainder of the time that has been allotted to me to the gentleman from California [Mr. NIXON].

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, and to have printed at the end of my remarks a substitute bill which I intend to offer when the bill is read for amendment next Tuesday.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, the so-called Mundt bill, H. R. 5852, in my opinion, is unconstitutional, and I predict that it will never become a law of our land. It will probably pass through the House by a large majority. I predict that the other body will never pass such a monstrosity. If, perchance, it should become a law—and in these days of hysteria anything is possible—the Supreme Court, in my opinion, will kill it as dead as the alien and sedition laws of 1798.

This bill should be called the Japanese thought-control bill because that is exactly what it is. It is an attempt to control the thoughts and purposes of the minds of men who refuse to conform to the political and economic pattern of the Committee on Un-American Activities' conception of Americanism, or the variable judgment of one man, the Attorney General of the United States.

This bill is a product of the hysteria which follows every war. It is a product of fear in the minds of men who doubt the strength which is inherent in democracy. While professing their faith in freedom, they deny the free play of ideas in the market place.

In this bill we move in a clever and cunning manner away from the overt-act offense outlined in the Constitution; we move away from the definition of treason as contained in article III, section 3, of the Constitution; we desert the definition of conspiracy as distinct from

a treasonable act. What is more important, we desert the protection of the constitutional procedures which are designed to strictly limit the type of evidence offered to convict one charged with treason or conspiracy to commit a treasonable act.

This bill sets up new standards of criteria for treason. The necessity to go into our Federal courts and prove by substantive evidence that a crime against our country has been committed or that a conspiracy to commit an overt act has occurred is circumvented. The careful safeguards of our Constitution to protect the accused is ignored.

This bill has many provisions which are dangerous to practically every type of group or organization in our Nation. In an attempt to correct the totalitarian evil, the authors of this bill have used vague and indefinite language. The wordage used has therefore made the purpose of the bill unattainable, the administration of the bill unworkable, and the end result will be abortive as well as dangerous to civil liberties.

I present herewith key words and phrases from the bill which are important in administrative determination of guilt, and correspondingly important in prosecution of groups or individuals under proscription by the Attorney General:

Page 21, line 4: "Any organization," apparently all-embracing.

Page 22, lines 1 and 2: "Having regard to some or all." This language refers to four considerations to determine guilt of a Communist-front organization. How can the word "some" be defined legally? Would it be one, or would it be three of the four considerations used to determine guilt?

Page 22, line 12: "Reasonable to conclude." This phrase is susceptible to as many interpretations as there are differences in judgment by human beings, be they Members of Congress, or an attorney general.

Page 23, line 22: "To attempt in any manner." This language is so general and inclusive in its meaning that it makes the burden of judicial interpretation impossible. The language is so vague and indefinite that the unlimited power of interpretation placed in the Attorney General's hands, would, if unwisely or capriciously used, endanger the liberties of any group of citizens.

Page 24, lines 3 and 4: "Any act with intent to." The words "with intent" places upon the Attorney General the burden of proof of an individual's intent; any lawyer can see the difficulty involved in proving intent.

Page 24, lines 14 and 15: "To conspire to do anything made unlawful by this subsection." My criticism of this sentence is not directed at the phraseology, but at the following point: This sentence broadens the coverage of the crime of conspiracy from its present constitutional meaning to the criteria outlined in section 4. These criteria contain all of the vague and indefinite phraseology which I have criticized. This sentence, therefore, becomes all-embracing, dependent on an individual's judgment—the Attorney General—and therefore is exceedingly dangerous. As a result of

this sentence, the clear and definite legal meaning of conspiracy becomes fuzzy; prosecution on vague charges is therefore inevitable.

Offenses under this same section 4 with its vague and indefinite terminology entail heavy fines, maximum, \$10,000; imprisonment, maximum, 10 years; and loss of citizenship, as provided and outlined in the following section 5.

Without comment on the degree of fine and imprisonment, but confining my criticism at this point to the more severe punishment, loss of citizenship, I marvel at the stupidity and viciousness contained in this section. Hysteria has, indeed, warped the judgment of its authors, for they would take away from American citizens their most precious possession, citizenship, not for committing a crime which our Constitution declares punishable by expatriation but for violating vague, indefinite, and ambiguous criteria as outlined in section 4.

We are treading on dangerous ground when we threaten the citizenship of American citizens because they may believe in some, not necessarily all, of the economic ideas of Marx, or because they advocate a few policies which may be advocated by Communist Russia.

Remember that the Tennessee Valley Authority is Government owned and operated on a nonprofit basis and the parallel operation by Russia of the great Dneiprstroy power project is close enough to the criteria of comparison set up in this bill, to convict one of guilt. Remember that an advocate of the public housing section of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill is endangered by the loose language of this bill. Remember that an advocate of free lunches paid for by Federal funds, of compulsory health insurance, such as contained in the Dingell-Murray-Wagner bill, is also placed under the "red blanket."

This proves the danger of trying to suppress ideas by law. I heartily support protective legislation against overt acts or conspiracy to commit treasonable acts, but I shall oppose any attempt to suppress, persecute, or legislate loose and dangerous laws which, in my opinion, violate the first amendment of the Constitution of the United States.

Every true American opposes communism or fascism. We intend to combat these totalitarian ideologies in order to preserve the freedoms and liberties found only in a democratic type of government.

But, we intend to fight totalitarianism—Communist or Fascist—in the American constitutional way. We do not wish to fall into the totalitarian method, "the end justifies the means," in our fight against these odious and dangerous ideologies.

It is far more important to maintain the sanctity of the Bill of Rights, than it is to make an apparent temporary gain in this long-range fight. We cannot violate the Constitution without setting a dangerous precedent, a precedent which will inevitably boomerang on every group of citizens.

The Attorney General who is faced with tremendous responsibility under the McCormack Act, the Voorhis Act, and the Smith Act as well as constitutional provisions regarding treason and

conspiracy, needs additional legislation. He so testified before the committee. I believe that because of that responsibility and because of the experience of his department including the Federal Bureau of Investigation, that valuable aid in drafting necessary legislation could be obtained from his experts on enforcement.

I have therefore prepared an amendment which I shall offer at the proper time which would direct the Attorney General to submit to the Congress: First, a draft of additional legislation needed to expose all forms of totalitarianism, Communist or Fascist, domestic or foreign; second, a draft of amendments needed to strengthen the McCormack Act, the Voorhis Act, and the Smith Act.

This is the sane, American way to proceed. It is undoubtedly the constitutional way.

The gentleman from Virginia, Judge SMITH, whom I respect highly for his ability and his long service in the House, has asked why some Member who opposes this bill does not offer something constructive. I am offering something constructive when the proper time comes. First, to ask the Attorney General, who knows more about this than anyone else, because he has the burden of trying to prove the guilt of subversive people. He has had more experience. He knows where the loopholes in the Smith Act, the McCormack Act, and the Voorhis Act are. He knows where they need strengthening. So I ask him to give us a draft of additional legislation needed to expose all forms of totalitarianism.

The President said in his statement that if it is a matter of conspiracy against the Government, we have adequate laws to take care of that. The Attorney General has said that possibly he needs some more. Now, I say to the Attorney General, just as any committee says to the departments downtown, "What do you need to make your department operate more efficiently?"

Then, when he comes up with the answer as directed. I hope to be able to offer at the proper time the substitute bill. I take in this substitute bill the complete section which defines Communist philosophy and which condemns it, and which describes the world Communist movement, all of which I am in accord with, I take all of that into it, and then I go ahead and say, "strengthen existing laws which have been brought before the people, which have been used and which have been found sufficient in some instances and possibly wanting in other instances."

"If you cannot strengthen existing laws sufficiently, give us a draft of additional legislation." No, it seems to me that is the reasonable way to go about this matter. It is not a way that will endanger the civil liberties of the people of the United States, because following the enactment of that directive from the Congress of the United States, the Attorney General will give us this draft. Then we will consider the draft and debate it and adopt it or defeat it in our wisdom.

I think that we in America stand at a point where we must decide whether we believe in democracy or whether we must

resort to repressive measures, such as those used in totalitarian countries. I think we have to show our faith in the democratic processes, and I think one of the ways of showing that faith is not to resort to totalitarian methods to eliminate from our society that which we do not believe in, that which we consider odious, that which we consider bad from every standpoint. I ask the membership of this House, when I am given an opportunity to present this substitute bill, to consider seriously if they want to go along the lines which have proven to be effective constitutionally, or if they want to embark into a field of thought, into a field of censorship of men's ideas, into a field of guilt by association; into the field of blackening the characters of the people without any chance for them to counteract that blackening of their character.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

(The bill referred to by Mr. HOLIFIELD in his remarks follows:)

A bill to protect the United States against un-American and subversive totalitarian activities

SHORT TITLE

Be it enacted, etc.—

SECTION 1. This act may be cited as the "Subversive Totalitarian Activities Control Act, 1948."

NECESSITY FOR LEGISLATION

SEC. 2. As a result of evidence adduced before various committees of the Senate and House of Representatives, Congress hereby finds that—

(1) The system of government known as totalitarian dictatorship is characterized by the existence of a single political party, organized on a dictatorial rather than a democratic basis, and by an identity between such party and its policies and the government and governmental policies of the country in which it exists, such identity being so close that the party and the government itself are for all practical purposes indistinguishable.

(2) The establishment of a totalitarian dictatorship in any country results in the destruction of free democratic institutions, the ruthless suppression of all opposition to the party in power, the complete subordination of the rights of individuals to the state, the denial of fundamental rights and liberties which are characteristic of a democratic or representative form of government, such as freedom of speech, of the press, of assembly, and of religious worship, and results in the maintenance of control over the people through fear, terrorism, and brutality.

(3) There exists a world Communist movement which, in its origins, its development, and its present practice, is a world-wide revolutionary political movement whose purpose it is, by treachery, deceit, infiltration into other groups (governmental and otherwise), espionage, sabotage terrorism, and any other means deemed necessary, to establish a Communist totalitarian dictatorship in all the countries of the world through the medium of a single world-wide Communist political organization.

(4) The direction and control of the world Communist movement is vested in and exercised by the Communist dictatorship of a foreign country.

(5) The Communist dictatorship of such foreign country, in exercising such direction and control and in furthering the purposes of the world Communist movement, establishes or causes the establishment of, and utilizes, in various countries, political organizations which are acknowledged by such

Communist dictatorship as being constituent elements of the world Communist movement; and such political organizations are not free and independent organizations, but are mere sections of a single world-wide Communist organization and are controlled, directed, and subject to the discipline of the Communist dictatorship of such foreign country.

(6) The political organizations so established and utilized in various countries, acting under such control, direction, and discipline, endeavor to carry out the objectives of the world Communist movement by bringing about the overthrow of existing governments and setting up Communist totalitarian dictatorships which will be subservient to the most powerful existing Communist totalitarian dictatorship, and among the methods commonly used to accomplish this end in any particular country are, (A) the disruption of trade and commerce, (B) the inciting of economic, social, and racial strife and conflict, (C) the dissemination of propaganda calculated to undermine established government and institutions, and (D) corrupting officials of the government and securing the appointment of their agents and sympathizers to officers and positions in the government.

(7) In carrying on the activities referred to in paragraph (6), such political organizations in various countries are organized on a secret, conspiratorial basis and operate to a substantial extent through organizations, commonly known as Communist fronts, which in most instances are created and maintained, or used, in such manner as to conceal the facts as to their true character and purposes and their membership. One result of this method of operation is that such political organizations are able to obtain financial and other support from persons who would not extend such support if they knew the true purposes of, and the actual nature of the control and influence exerted upon, such Communist fronts.

(8) Due to the nature and scope of the world Communist movement, with the existence of affiliated constituent elements working toward common objectives in various countries of the world, travel of members, representatives, and agents from country to country is essential for purposes of communication and for the carrying on of activities to further the purposes of the movement.

(9) In the United States those individuals who knowingly and willfully participate in the world Communist movement, when they so participate, in effect repudiate their allegiance to the United States and in effect transfer their allegiance to the foreign country in which is vested the direction and control of the world Communist movement; and, in countries other than the United States, those individuals who knowingly and willfully participate in such Communist movement similarly repudiate their allegiance to the countries of which they are nationals in favor of such foreign Communist country.

(10) In pursuance of communism's stated objectives, the most powerful existing Communist dictatorship has, by the traditional Communist methods referred to above, and in accordance with carefully conceived plans, already caused the establishment in numerous foreign countries, against the will of the people of those countries, of ruthless Communist totalitarian dictatorships, and threatens to establish similar dictatorships in still other countries.

(11) The recent successes of Communist methods in other countries and the nature and control of the world Communist movement itself present a potential danger to the security of the United States and to the existence of free American institutions and make it necessary that Congress enact appropriate legislation recognizing the existence of such world-wide conspiracy and designed to prevent it from accomplishing its purpose in the United States.

SEC. 3. The Attorney General is hereby authorized and directed to prepare and submit to the Congress—

(1) A detailed report of efforts by the Department of Justice to enforce—

(A) The Federal Corrupt Practices Act, 1925, as amended;

(B) The act of June 8, 1938, entitled "An act to require the registration of certain persons employed by agencies to disseminate propaganda in the United States, and for other purposes";

(C) The Alien Registration Act, 1940; and

(D) The act of October 17, 1940, entitled "An act to require the registration of certain organizations within the United States, and for other purposes."

(2) Specific and detailed recommendations as to what additional legislation is needed to bring about the complete exposure of all activities looking toward the creation in the United States of a totalitarian system; and

(3) Specific and detailed recommendations with respect to strengthening each of the laws specified in paragraph (1) for the purpose of protecting the United States against the activities of those working toward the establishment of a totalitarian system of Government in the United States.

As used in this section, the term "totalitarian system" shall include any Communist or Fascist system whether it be under foreign or domestic sponsorship, management, direction, or supervision.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] such time as he may require.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, in my opinion H. R. 5852 is good legislation and should be enacted into law at the quickest possible date. This bill is designed to control and ultimately outlaw communism in America. Americanism and communism cannot live together. Communism cannot be permitted to live and thrive in the United States of America, whether it be under the guise of a political party or otherwise. To permit a continuation of Communist activities in America is certainly a dangerous practice on the part of Americans. Events are transpiring every day that should convince us that our form of government and the freedom that we enjoy here in America could very easily be destroyed and no doubt to a great extent will be destroyed unless we unite and chart a course that will stamp out this great menace to our way of life. Certainly we agree that it will require the coordination and wholehearted cooperation of all true Americans if communism is to be checked before it is too late. If we continue to procrastinate, then the overthrow of our democracy by force will be the price that we will have to pay.

Mr. NIXON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I have come to the conclusion that this bill deals with just about the most important question in the world. That is taking in a good deal of territory, but here is my reason for that broad statement: In your Foreign Affairs Committee we have been holding hearings on strengthening the United Nations. We have had organizations and individuals representing vast groups of American citizens coming in and pointing out what we all know, the dreadful threat of atomic warfare to civilization, the frailties and failures of the United Nations, the ominous threat of Communist aggression, and the ago-

nized anxiety of our people. As we consider the various suggestions that are advanced we realize this: Suppose we successfully abolish atomic warfare and do nothing else? We then are threatened with mass army warfare with the Soviets and their mass armies are greater than ours, for they are better at conscription than we are. We will have merely gone back to an old-fashioned method of slaughtering each other, and we will surely lose, having eliminated the new-fangled way, atomic warfare, by which we might win. Next we realize this: Suppose by action of the United Nations, or by other international action, we eliminated mass conscription, which is one of the most virulent forms of modern warfare; suppose we eliminated that, what would we still be faced with? Every country in the world would then, having eliminated atomic warfare and heavy arms, and having eliminated small arms, be liable to aggression and infiltration from within at the hands of this world-wide subversive conspiracy called communism, which is so accurately defined in the early sections of the present bill.

So we come down in this bill to one of the most important problems that faces the world at this time. If the Soviets were suddenly to agree to universal disarmament, with inspection and enforcement, and if all the arms for modern warfare were destroyed all over the world, in Russia and outside, the world would still face deadly danger if the present revolutionary, subversive, Communist conspiracy, directed from Moscow continues. How will the free nations of the world solve that problem? What will the United States, the leader of the free world, do about it? Let us make no mistake about it. What we do here will have an effect all over the world.

In my judgment, the bill that the committee has brought in is a very sound attempt to meet that difficult question in the American way.

This bill, however, has been badly misconstrued and misunderstood by many people. I want to read from a letter I received from my district opposing this bill:

Legislation designed to suppress ideas differing from ours is contrary to the fundamental principles of our Government. Thus, the Mundt bill is in direct contradiction to the basic ideal of our country and weakens our position in our fight against communism. Let us not employ totalitarian methods to fight totalitarianism.

If that were an accurate description of the Mundt bill, I would be against it; but the bill does not suppress differing ideas and does not employ totalitarian methods. On the contrary, it uses democratic methods to strengthen our position in our fight against communism. What the committee has done, in drafting the bill, is to separate the political right to express ideas in the American way from the criminal, subversive international conspiracy, and to permit the one and outlaw the other. The legal obligations which apply to any political party are applied to the Communist Party—registration and identification of members,

identification of campaign material, reports of campaign funds, just as in my State we require the registration and identification of members of the Republican or Democratic Party, signed campaign material, financial reports. We have a Federal Corrupt Practices Act applying to political activities. Most political parties want publicity. The fact that the Communist Party wants secrecy is no reason for releasing it from these standard legal obligations. It is a good reason for requiring special laws to enforce these standard obligations. That is what this bill provides, so that those who wish to believe and to proclaim an ideology which is dictated from abroad may do so with impunity if they comply with the same type of laws that are applicable to all the rest of us. We will combat these foreign ideologies by discussion, debate, by the ballot box, in the American way.

On the other hand, when it comes to the deliberate attempt in any manner to establish a totalitarian dictatorship controlled from abroad, we outlaw that, we prohibit it by fine and imprisonment. So, what we have done, going back to my constituent's letter, is not to have legislation designed to suppress ideas differing from ours but to make it possible for those ideas to be expressed; not to employ totalitarian methods to fight totalitarianism but to employ democratic methods, American methods, requiring, as we do for other citizens, registration according to party affiliation, prohibiting un-American criminal conspiracy, stating what the crime is, and outlawing that sort of crime. In this way we take a most important step to combat totalitarianism in our country.

The Daily Worker for May 12 carries an appeal by the national board of the Communist Party, which says:

At stake is the legal existence of our party, which the Mundt bill seeks to outlaw.

This is very significant. If the Communist Party in America is what it has claimed to be, it will not be outlawed. If it is, in fact, attempting "to establish in the United States a totalitarian dictatorship under the control of a foreign government, organization, or individual," then those who are in the conspiracy will be subject to fine and imprisonment under section 4 of the Mundt bill. The national board of the Communist Party, who know the facts, know whether the legal existence of their party is at stake or not. If no one can belong to it, under their own rules, without violating section 4, then its existence is at stake, as it should be.

The Mundt bill does not outlaw the Communist Party. It gives the party, however, the choice of outlawing itself, and it may choose to do so.

Let us remember that we are combating a foe who does not fight fairly. In our foreign affairs hearings what we were constantly impressed with was that the Soviets, the Communist Party, is using the present structure of the United Nations to destroy the United Nations. We do not want to permit that same group to use the constitutional structure of America to destroy America.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN].

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, a study of H. R. 5852, known as the Mundt bill, reveals that if this legislation is enacted into law in its present form, our country is making a violent departure from its constitutional protection of free speech, free assembly, and free thought.

It is indeed surprising that a committee of the Congress should seriously propose a measure so fraught with dangers. We already have Federal laws against organizations or individuals who would attempt to overthrow the Government by force or violence. In fact, revolution is illegal almost everywhere.

This legislation would convict any person or group by the Government merely making a charge that the defendants are attempting to overthrow our Government without having to produce proof. This legislation would convict any and all who might innocently join an organization which the Government later could prove was affiliated with the Communist Party. Under the bill, any organization whose activities make it reasonable to conclude that it is under the control of a Communist political organization could be legally labeled as a Communist front. It has become popular with certain politicians to label everybody who does not believe in reactionary policies to be either members of Communist-front organizations or almost on the verge of being Communists. This bill would substitute fear for argument and knowledge and it seeks to destroy communism with legalistic clubs instead of intelligent arguments and persuasion. It also advocates proceeding against people in the mass or groups instead of against an individual, and giving him the American right to present a proper defense.

The Attorney General, under this bill, is given practical dictatorship over political beliefs of any individual or organization that in his mind might be communistic or leaning thereto. The bill is very loosely drawn and could be aptly classed as political legislation. During the debate on the Taft-Hartley bill, certain inferences were made by some of the newspapers and commentators that anybody opposed to that legislation was a communistic fellow traveler or if not, closely adhered thereto. I can imagine certain lawyers in this country, if they were appointed Attorney General of the United States, would use this legislation as a club over numerous organizations and societies far removed from the Communist Party. This legislation could be used as a threat against clubs organized for the purpose of reestablishing price control or the extension of social-security laws, antitrust laws, and so forth. This legislation could also be used as a threat against organizations fighting racial and religious discrimination and makes it highly dangerous for any persons or organizations to support such causes. Legislation which

gives power to curb, to any substantial extent, the advocacy of progressive causes is not only unconstitutional, but politically unwise. Communism could be more practically curtailed by extending democracy rather than passing legislation of this kind. The safeguards of our liberty are far more in danger from groups who endeavor to stifle free and independent thought than it is from organizations which are out in the open advocating their theories. Let us not undermine the basic principles of our Constitution by passing ill-advised and dangerous legislation of this kind.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ISACSON].

Mr. ISACSON. Mr. Chairman, what words can I say to express my troubled thoughts as I stand here today, a Representative of the people, newly come to this Congress, confronted by a measure which spells disaster for all the traditions of the American people in its every line and paragraph?

It is only a few short months ago since I was elected to Congress. I came here laden with the problems of thousands of people of all races, creeds, and political beliefs; but sharing their expectations and their hopes, that this Congress, meeting in this time of economic unrest and world turbulence would heed the clear call of the peoples of the world for peace and surcease from the burdens resultant from the devastation of the last World War.

It is their hope, and mine, that we here would achieve the continued extension of our democracy and its bounties. I know that it is their hope and prayer that the rich guaranty of American democracy, so fiercely and proudly nailed to our Nation's masthead by the patriot founders of American freedom, may be fulfilled in our time for all our people.

And so, Mr. Chairman, it is with a heavy heart that I contemplate this measure before us.

For this bill is not the legislation of a democracy against something that menaces that democracy. Rather, this is legislation against the founding traditions of America—the traditions of free speech, free thought, free worship, free association, free movement.

This is legislation, not against communism but rather against that prospect which is far more menacing in the eyes of the ruling few, the prospect of full and free democracy in America. I shall attempt to demonstrate these contentions.

The House Un-American Activities Committee in its official report to this body alleges that Communists in this country are agents of a world Communist movement and that they are treasonably intent on using force and violence to establish a totalitarian dictatorship in the United States.

But once having stated these propositions, the committee then proceeds to admit that existing law is sufficient to control the activities of the Communist Party. It properly refers to:

First. The Smith Act which makes it a crime to advocate the overthrow of the

Government of the United States by force and violence.

Second. The McCormack Act which requires registration of agents of foreign principals.

Third. The Voorhis Act which requires registration of organizations which are the agents of foreign governments.

While the committee has some criticism about the alleged failure of the Department of Justice to indulge in vigorous prosecution—a criticism which incidentally has no basis in fact—it does admit that enforcement of existing laws would stultify the growth of any movement that believes in the overthrow of our Government by force and violence.

Why then is this committee not content with advocating more vigorous enforcement?

Why does the committee seek new legislation at this time?

It would seem clear that if existing Federal law adequately restrains those who would overthrow the Government by force and violence—the proposed new legislation must seek to reach persons other than those who would engage in this activity.

Toward whom does this legislation reach? Who are the persons this legislation attempts to brand as subversive?

Examination of the bill discloses that it prohibits, under penalty of high fines, long imprisonment and loss of citizenship, any attempt in any manner to set up a totalitarian dictatorship in this country.

But then it does a remarkable thing. In its preamble and in its supporting verbiage, it sets up the doctrine that anybody who joins a Communist political organization or a Communist-front organization or who works with it or some of its members in any organization is in effect helping to set up a totalitarian dictatorship. The Attorney General is given the right to list an organization as Communist.

Thus the bill ceases to be one aimed against actions of a certain kind and becomes a bill aimed against people of a certain kind. It ceases to be a bill directed against the activity of overthrowing the Government, but becomes a bill directed against the people who may be members of an organization which may not agree with some of the policies of the administration.

It is a bill which seeks to identify loyalty to our Government with a passive acquiescence in the status quo and to stamp as subversive any criticism of administration policies. Does that sound like an extreme statement? Well, let us look at the bill again.

The main provision of the bill is its compulsory registration, section 8. This requires organizations which the Attorney General has designated either Communist political organizations or Communist-front organizations to register annually. An organization branded Communist political organization being required to list not only their officers and finances, but also the name of every member.

What are Communist political organizations and Communist-front organizations as conceived by the framers of this bill?

They are defined in section 3. Are identified as a matter of law by the following characteristics:

Communist political organizations:
(a) The extent and nature of its activities, including the expression of views and policies.

But this subdivision (a) constitutes a violation of the first amendment which forbids Congress to pass any law abridging the freedom of speech and press. And under this subdivision, organizations and persons are subjected to the penalty and the harmful effects of registration solely for the exercise of these rights.

(c) The extent to which its views and policies are the same as those of such foreign government or foreign organization.

But under this subdivision (c) an organization which adopts resolutions upholding partition of Palestine or opposing armed intervention in Greece and China is thereby expressing "views and policies" which could be considered the same as those of a foreign government or foreign organization. Thus, the mere exercise of free speech and association subjects individuals and organizations to the penalties of this bill.

(d) The extent to which it supports or advocates the basic principles and tactics of communism as expounded by Marx and Lenin.

But this subdivision (d) would prohibit the study of Marx and Lenin, a study carried on all over the world including the United States by scholars and students would be restricted from this time on, and those who accept "the basic principles" as expounded by these scientists and philosophers will be subject to the registration requirements of this bill. This is not only an obvious violation of the first amendment but book burning on a scale matched only by the Nazi barbarians.

(1) The extent to which it fails to disclose or resists efforts to obtain information as to its membership.

A Communist-front organization may be identified by even broader and looser acts. An organization may be so declared if it is reasonable to conclude, first, that it is under the control of a Communist political organization; or, second, that it is primarily operated for the purpose of giving aid and support to a Communist political organization or movement; or, third, that its views and policies are in general adopted and advanced because such views or policies are those of a Communist political organization.

Thus there is no organization in American life which can be proof against such an administrative finding. Be it a union of workers discussing wage issues or possibly a strike, a tenants' council discussing a rent protest, a political party drawing up a program of opposition to the administration in power, this act menaces their freedom of action, speech, and even existence. Opposition to a policy of segregation in the armed forces, to lynching, to poll taxes, to discrimination in employment, high taxes, any and all people's protests and actions in their own behalf can become illegal under this act.

Let us see how this works out.

The district I represent has many families with low incomes. Often they live in dilapidated, unsanitary houses. Their children go to outmoded and overcrowded schools.

So the husband, Mr. Jones, joins a trade-union which fights to obtain higher wages and better working conditions for him.

The wife joins a tenant organization which defends her against eviction and rent increases.

They both join the local parents' association to help assure a better education for their children.

Then one day the Attorney General lists the trade-union as a "front" organization under section 3, subdivision (4). Namely, that it is operated for the purpose of giving aid and support to a Communist political movement. This is entirely possible. Many strikes in the past have been called political. The finding of the Attorney General need be only a reasonable, not an actual, conclusion.

Or it may be that the union, for example, will be found to be "controlled" by a Communist organization because some of its officers and members are, or are believed to be, Communists. Or because the union's policies are the same as the Communist Party in such respects as, say, opposition to the Taft-Hartley Act, criticism of Wall Street, opposition to aid-to-Greece, or advocacy of price controls or Federal housing, extension of social security and minimum-wage legislation, opposition to the NAM, the poll tax, Jim Crow, the draft, UMT, and so forth.

Farfetched? No.

The CIO has just issued the same condemnation in a letter from Nathan Cowan, its legislative director.

Farfetched? No.

In September 1938 the original un-American committee headed by Representative Martin Dies, Democrat, Texas, heard that the Transport Workers' Union, CIO, was negotiating its first contract with the city-owned New York subways.

The committee issued a statement denouncing the union as un-American, blasting its leaders as Reds, and so forth. The statement was issued by Committee Member Dempsey, Democrat, New Mexico. Dempsey was once a vice president of the New York subway lines when they were owned by a private company. Dempsey left town when a scab-driven subway train killed 92 passengers during a strike in 1926.

In October 1938 the un-American committee heard two witnesses describe the great organizational strikes in the automobile industry in Michigan as un-American. The two witnesses—William Gernaey and Jake Spolansky—were described by the Civil Liberties Committee of the United States Senate as being employer-paid labor spies.

Now let us go back to our Mr. Jones from the Bronx. He has joined a union. He is now deemed a member of an organization which by legislative edict is part of a conspiracy to overthrow the Government and establish totalitarianism.

Under section 8, the organization is required to register and becomes, from

that time on, subject to inspection and interference by the Government. Its finances, its receipts and expenditures, its publications, its radio addresses are all subject to the compulsory interference by Government. It is no longer free to function as an association of freemen. It is in constant danger of criminal action being taken against it. It is permanently held up to suspicion and ostracism.

But even more startling is the fact that when the union registers under section 8, Mr. Jones may be subjected to prosecution under section 4, entitled "Certain Prohibited Acts." Section 4 provides:

It shall be unlawful for any person (1) to attempt in any manner to establish in the United States a totalitarian dictatorship; * * * (2) to perform or attempt to perform any act with intent to facilitate * * * a totalitarian dictatorship; (3) actively participate * * * to establish such a totalitarian dictatorship; (4) actively to facilitate or aid in bringing about such a totalitarian dictatorship; (5) to conspire to do anything made unlawful by this subsection.

Mr. Jones, by mere virtue of his union activities, could be found guilty under section 4, punished by imprisonment up to 10 years, and fined up to \$10,000. For the organizations which are compelled to register under section 8 are by that action alone, under the provisions of this bill, already branded as organizations which are presumably engaged in doing the very things made unlawful under section 4. Hence, it follows that by the act of registration, organizations and their members automatically subject themselves to prosecution under section 4. Since section 4 prohibits "attempts in any manner," it is clear that the normal activities of these organizations, once they are required to register, become punishable under section 4.

Mrs. Jones might find herself in the same situation as a result of the struggle of her tenants' organization for public housing under section 3, subdivision (4).

Both husband and wife might again be subjected to penalty as a result of the struggle of the parents' association for improved conditions, under the same section.

If Mr. and Mrs. Jones are Negro and belong to an organization which fights to end segregation in the armed forces—they can be penalized.

If they are Puerto Rican and belong to an organization which fights for the liberty and independence of Puerto Rico—they can be penalized.

If they are Jews and fight for the partition of Palestine and the lifting of the embargo—they can be penalized.

If they are members of an independent political movement—like the Wallace movement—they may be penalized.

Is it not clear then what this bill would accomplish? The elimination of attempts to overthrow our Government? Not at all. This bill would achieve the uncritical and unquestioning acceptance of status quo conditions—the policies of the administration, the social relationships, the economic practices. It would prohibit inquiry into bias and bigotry and prejudice and discrimination; or a national health program; or

public housing, or into the wisdom or validity of our foreign policy. It abandons evolution. It repudiates the once popular concept of progress. It regards America as a finished product, rigid and unchangeable.

The concept of loyalty as conformity and criticism as subversion is false.

The effort to equate loyalty with conformity is opposed to American traditions because it assumes that there is a fixed and static content to loyalty. But loyalty is neither fixed nor static. It is devotion to the best interests of the commonwealth, and may require opposition to the particular policies which the Government currently pursues.

In the case of *Board of Education v. Barnette* (319 U. S. 624, 642), the Supreme Court said:

If there is any fixed star in our constitutional constellation, it is that no official, high or petty, can prescribe what shall be orthodox in politics, nationalism, religion, or other matters of opinion, or force citizens to confess by word or act their faith therein. If there are any circumstances which permit an exception, they do not now occur to us.

The effort to equate criticism with subversion is opposed to American traditions because those who would impose upon us this new concept are presumptuous to believe that they are competent to write the definition. We are reminded of Whitman's defiance of the "never-ending audacity of elected persons." Who are those who would set the standards of loyalty? The John Rankins, the Parnell Thomases, the officials of the DAR and the NAM, the Hearsts and McCormicks.

The effort to freeze America into status quo is pernicious because it distracts attention from activities that are really disloyal and silences criticism inspired by true loyalty. This, I charge, is the underlying significance and real purpose of the bill. It is an attempt by the administrative bipartisan coalition to stifle the mounting criticism of its Wall Street-West Point policies.

Who are those who are really disloyal? Those who inflame racial hatreds, who sow religious and class dissensions, who preach anti-Semitism and Jim Crow. Those who subvert the Constitution by violating the freedom of the ballot box through un-American poll taxes. Those who make a mockery of majority rule by the use of the filibuster. Those who impair democracy by denying equal educational facilities. Those who frustrate justice by lynch law or by making a farce of jury trials. Those who deny freedom of speech and of the press and of assembly. Those who press for special favors against the interest of the Commonwealth. Those who regard public office as a source of private gain. Those who would exalt the military over the civil. Those who for selfish purposes and private profits stir up national antagonisms and expose the world to the ruin of war. Those who flout the decisions of the United Nations and destroy its effectiveness.

Will this legislation interfere with the activities of these? The answer is "No." What this legislation will do if it is successful, is to silence criticism, stamp out dissent, or drive it underground.

If our democracy is to flourish it must have criticism. If our Government is to function it must have dissent. Only totalitarian governments insist upon conformity, and this bill is itself the first step toward totalitarianism.

Without criticism abuses will go unrebutted; without dissent our dynamic system will become static.

Our independence was the result of revolution; republicanism was something new under the sun; the Federal system was a vast experimental laboratory. Physically Americans were pioneers; in the realm of social and economic institutions, too, their tradition has been one of pioneering. From the beginning, intellectual and spiritual diversity have been as characteristic of America as racial and linguistic diversity.

When the policies pursued by an administration no longer represent the expressed opinion of the American people and no longer meet the social and economic requirements of the American people it is not the people who should conform to the administration, but the administration which should conform to the people.

That is what we mean by government of the people.

Let us keep it inviolate.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SADOWSKI].

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, we will all agree that the mousetrap was a good invention, but the mousetrap will also catch the family cat as well as mice; so when we bait a mousetrap we set it so that it will not catch the family kitty.

Mr. Chairman, the Mundt bill imposes disabilities merely on the basis of organizational affiliation and not on the basis of personal illegal acts. The purpose for the provision is obvious. It is to frighten everybody out of every organization except the Republican Party, the Democratic Party, and the Boy Scouts. Now, I have no objection to membership in the last two organizations. I am a member of the Democratic Party, and as a kid I was a member of one of the first Boy Scout units organized. However, a good many Republicans belong to their organization solely because their grandfather voted for Abraham Lincoln, the only liberal President that the Republicans ever had.

Now, they say this bill is aimed at Communists. What kind of Communists? Just who is a Communist, anyway? President Franklin D. Roosevelt was called a Communist by his political enemies. Some of the old guard, reactionary, Tory Republicans used to refer to us New Deal Congressmen as Communists. Yes; I would not be a bit surprised if you boys from Tennessee and Mississippi, who fought so valiantly for TVA last Tuesday, are regarded by the big Power Trusts as TVA Communists. Those who may wish to nationalize the coal mines or the railroads will be called Communists by those who do not believe in public ownership to any degree.

When we took over the street railway system in Detroit some years ago, Senator James Couzens, a Republican, who was mayor of Detroit at the time, was also called a Communist.

In the eyes of the great power monopolies, there is no greater Communist than JOHN RANKIN, yet we all know that he is not.

In this bill it is proposed to violate the Constitution and to condone such action, because we are doing so to fight communism. I say that if you can scratch the Constitution a little bit, if you can bleed it a little bit, then you can later maim it, dismember it, and amputate from it the rights and guaranties of every citizen of America.

About 25 years ago in Michigan a group of fanatics tried to cripple and outlaw the parochial school system. It took the combined efforts of all the liberals of Michigan to stop them, and we did.

This bill should make every American recoil in horror. It is the beginning of the Hitler doctrine where the Government assumes the right to punish and imprison its citizens for belonging to organizations in disagreement with the ruling authorities. It goes further; it permits the Government to punish without having to supply proof of the guilt of a citizen.

Would Thomas Jefferson, the great defender of personal rights, who himself was called a Jacobin and a radical of the worst type by the smug Tories of Boston, support such a measure? Certainly not. Would Andrew Jackson, Woodrow Wilson, Franklin D. Roosevelt, or Abraham Lincoln support it? Positively not.

For 25 years before the war we witnessed the sinister growth of huge propaganda machines which slowly, but gradually, crushed free expression in the press and on the radio, and eventually destroyed or completely muzzled all democratic leaders. In Japan, Russia, Italy, and Germany the huge propaganda machines controlled the press, radio, public platform, motion pictures, the theater; yes, even music, art, science, and the pulpit.

This was intended to make the parliamentary system incapable of independent action, and the plan succeeded. If free debate of government policies had not been crushed, it is wholly possible that Hitler would not have been able to plunge Germany into a war.

This is a lesson that every one of us must learn and remember.

The beginning of such controls have recently popped out under Republican administration in Lansing, Mich., and now in the Republican Congress in Washington. In Lansing they enacted the Callahan bill; in Washington the Republicans are sponsoring the Carl Mundt bill. This Republican administration and the Committee on Un-American Activities and its big-business backers are treating with contempt the ruling of the United States Supreme Court, which held:

If there is any fixed star in our constitutional constellation, it is that no official, high or petty, can prescribe what shall be orthodox in politics, nationalism, religion, or other matters of opinion or force citizens to confess by word or act their faith therein.

And if the Supreme Court decision is not enough, then let us read from the Constitution of the United States:

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the

free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of its grievances. (First amendment, United States Constitution.)

There is no doubt about it, this bill is designed to stifle the freedom of any individual or organization to express views on public issues.

The definitions of "Communist political" and "Communist front" organizations are couched in language sufficiently broad to bring under the bill's condemnation virtually every organization which supports a liberal view on any controversial public issue.

The Taft-Hartley law is a hot issue in this campaign and Labor contends that it seriously threatens the existence of bona fide labor unions.

This bill has the vigorous support of the Taft-Hartley boys and I believe that one of the main objectives is to black out union labor opposition in the coming campaign by frightening them and gagging them to death. Yes, under this bill any organization whose activities make it "reasonable to conclude that it is under the control of a Communist political organization" could be legally labeled as a Communist front. The chain of guilt by association is there so loosely set up that if there were one or two Communists in an organization the whole membership could be connected right back to the Kremlin.

The words, "any attempt in any manner" is language that the Taft-Hartley boys are betting heavily on. This is truly buckshot legislation. Here we have the Taft-Hartley boys firing at the whole mass of the people. They are not interested in treasonable actions of an individual Communist. They want to penalize opinions and associations, they would deny basic rights to American citizens solely because of their opinions and associations. They would usurp the functions of the courts to determine offenses and punishments. They would bully the citizen out of every constitutional right. Yes, they would drive good citizens from virtually every kind of progressive public activity.

We have recently witnessed the unwarranted discrediting of genuine liberals as who have been earnestly and sincerely seeking reforms in labor, monopolies, and civil rights. This has been accomplished by smear methods, innuendo, distortion, and false propaganda through the press and radio. Now they want the Mundt bill to implement these activities.

That is the way Hitler started and when he finished with the so-called subversives every person in Germany was goose-stepping and hailing Hitler; and the people were led over the precipice into the most devastating and brutal war in history.

In this campaign the Republicans do not want to discuss the issues, the pledges they made 2 years ago. They do not want to mention the disastrous inflation that has seized the country, the exorbitant profits of big business, the neglect of our aged and incapacitated, the miserable housing situation, the phenomenal growth of trusts, monopolies, and cartels in the last 2 years. The Re-

publicans ripped wide open all the controls and promised the people low prices and a plentiful supply of everything, and instead gave us the "good old days of Harding," where big business and the big banking interests ran hog wild over the people.

So in this election the Republicans propose not to discuss the issues; in fact, they propose to gag and stifle all discussion with the threat of being labeled a Communist. That is the real purpose of the Mundt bill.

Yes, under the Mundt bill, organizations and individuals will be punished, restrained, and regimented solely on the basis of political opinions rather than on the basis of overt acts of disloyalty.

Because of high prices and high profits, the worker is living from week to week. He has spent all of his war savings and inflation has him by the throat.

Organized labor is now making demands for a reasonable adjustment of wages through the process of collective bargaining and through the institutions of free trade-unions. How easy it would be to use the Mundt bill to cripple the activities of the unions and to blacklist its officers and members. Very simple, every worker who goes out on strike for an adjustment of wages is a Communist or a subversive, and that ends it. Seems like someone has been studying the pages of Hitler's prewar activities. It worked in Germany, why not here?

Under the guise of outlawing the Communist Party, this bill would actually destroy the constitutional right that the citizen does now enjoy to advocate peaceful, economic, political, and social changes in our Government. This bill would place an extraordinary amount of power into the hands of the Attorney General over the functioning of any liberal or progressive organization.

Just recently the Department of Justice was holding labor leaders without bail, pending deportation proceedings. This method of harassing and discriminating against labor leaders would be encouraged by this bill. Every member of a labor union knows full well that every time his union asks for a raise, they are attacked as subversives and Reds by the company. Every fight for improved social or labor legislation, and all organizations participating in such a fight could be labeled subversives and Reds under this bill. Even now, most strikes are being termed political strikes. The recent coal strike was also called a political strike. Those who are anxious to smash trade-unions are smacking their lips in anticipation of the passage of the Mundt bill.

We in Michigan know the full meaning of the Mundt bill, which would create a police state in America, and would make out of the Attorney General the chief gaulier. This Mundt bill had a counterpart in Michigan known as the Callahan bill. It was passed last year by a Republican legislature. In a few days over 115,000 aroused and indignant Michigan citizens signed a referendum petition to repeal the Callahan Act. A Michigan attorney general later declared it to be clearly unconstitutional. The Callahan bill, like the Mundt bill, was intended to intimidate our citizens and

to frighten them into abject servitude. But the people of Michigan were not to be bulldozed and arose in all their might and fury, and the Callahan bill is now a dead duck.

I can assure you that the same fate awaits the Mundt bill if it should be passed. Already I have received thousands of letters and telegrams in protest—far too many to list into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Many of these are from ministers and pastors. But just to show that these protests are not coming from labor organizations alone, I want to include a petition that within 24 hours received the signatures of 73 lawyers, including members of the bench:

We, the undersigned, members of the bar of Michigan, urge you to speak and vote against the so-called Mundt-Nixon bill (H. R. 5852).

We believe this bill to be a product of mounting hysteria in our land. As lawyers, we have a special responsibility to maintain the Bill of Rights and to defend it with all of our resources against invasion from any source. This bill, under the guise of outlawing communism, will require the registration of one's political beliefs, a concept wholly at variance with our Constitution and democratic tradition. It would place in the hands of the Attorney General power to outlaw organizations, which no Government official has ever before possessed by act of the Congress.

The terms used in the act are so vague and indefinite that it could be utilized to repress criticism of our existing institutions and thus subvert the democratic process and place the lid upon man's progress toward a better world. The principle embodied in this bill, of guilt by association, and requiring registration as a condition of the exercise of freedom of speech and assembly, is violative of the Bill of Rights. We believe, as the Supreme Court said in the case of *Board of Education v. Barnett*:

"If there is any fixed star in our constitutional constellation, it is that no official, high or petty, can prescribe what shall be orthodox in politics, nationalism, religion or other matters of opinion or force citizens to confess by word or act their faith therein. If there are any circumstances which permit an exception, they do not now occur to us."

Hon. Patrick H. O'Brien, Joseph J. Beck, M. A. Guest, Hon. Carl M. Weldeman, G. Leslie Field, H. W. Love, R. E. Bine, Ernest Goodman, Samuel Weisman, George W. Crockett, Harold Ryan, Sol A. Dann, Alan N. Brown, A. A. Sugar, Harry Anbender, Benjamin L. Safir, Morton A. Eden, Allen J. Davis, Fremont Sweetwine, Louis Tucker, Jack J. Kralzman, Walter M. Nelson, Oscar Freudenberg, A. G. Breene, Carleton H. McIntyre, Daniel P. O'Brien, Samuel W. Barr, Julius J. Stooman, Harold M. Silverston, Samuel Brezner, Allen Bibb, C. LeBron Simmons, Jerome H. Brooks, Cecil Pearl, Sol Lumberg, Elvin L. Davenport, John Miller, Irving S. Wolfe, Arthur L. Robbins, Anthony Nelson, Helen C. Bryant, Hon. Joseph C. Brown, Philip F. Greco, Jack N. Tucker, Erwin B. Ellmann, Hobart S. Taylor, Jr., Edward A. Simon, Don M. Harlan, Abner A. Tatkin, Patrick S. Nertney, Brooks S. Barron, Nedwin L. Smokler, Morris Lieberman, James Montante, Gerald K. O'Brien, Hon. John Kaminski, Irving I. Boigen, Philip H. Bornstein, Hon. Fred'k Paliaer, Edward A. Simmons, Charles Kaufman, William Kaufman, Donald W. Loria, Max H. Horwood, George D. Kent, Sol J. Schwartz, Isadore A. Berger, Irving B. Ackerman, N. B. Shillman, Nathan J. Kaufman, Samuel Grandon, Milton R. Atlas, Harry Gonte.

The Mundt police state bill did not get that way by accident—it had a model. The model is Hitler's early 1933 decrees through which he gave his Nazi dictatorship legal standing. These decrees are paralleled in some of the minutest details by the Mundt bill and, if it is passed, its sponsors hope to force America to take more steps along the Hitler path.

A product of the House Un-American Committee, the Mundt bill (H. R. 5852) is now up before Congress. The Mundt bill decrees, without proof, that all Communists and Communist sympathizers are conspiring to establish a totalitarian dictatorship and should be subject to \$10,000 fine and 10 years in jail. Its passage would place all progressive organizations and individuals under the control of the Attorney General.

A study by the Civil Rights Congress revealed the similarity between the bill and the Hitler decrees.

There is an example: The Mundt bill provides that if any of its provisions are violated, both naturalized and native born citizens, can lose their citizenship. Now look at this law passed by the Nazis in 1933:

Law regarding the revocation of naturalization and the deprivation of German citizenship (Reichsgesetzblatt, I, 480, July 14, 1933):

Section I. Naturalization made in the period from November 9, 1918, to January 30, 1933, may be revoked if the naturalization is deemed undesirable.

Section II. Citizens of the Reich sojourning abroad, may be declared to have forfeited the German citizenship if they have injured the German interests by conduct violating their duty to loyalty against the Reich and the people.

An ordinance to effectuate this measure was passed two weeks later (Reichsgesetzblatt I, 538, July 26, 1933. It provided:

"Conduct violating the duty to loyalty against the Reich and people will be found particularly if a German assists in the hostile propaganda against Germany or if he has tried to insult the prestige or the measures of the national government."

Despite contrary claims, the Mundt bill is intended to outlaw the Communist Party. It gives that power to one man, the Attorney General, without any limits on the exercise of that power. All he has to do is find that the organization is a Communist political organization under the vague standards of the bill, and at a subsequent criminal trial that finding will bind the jury and the court, according to this law. Americans will be imprisoned because one official of Government says so.

But this isn't a bill for one group of persons only. It covers all decent, progressive Americans. Because the Attorney General will be empowered to do the same thing with respect to Communist front organizations.

Now look at the Nazi pattern. On May 26, 1933 (Reichsgesetzblatt, I, 293), the following law was passed:

"Section I: 1. The supreme authorities of the State or the authorities designated by them may confiscate in favor of the State, the property and rights of the Communist Party of Germany and its auxiliary and substitute organizations, as well as the property and rights used or destined for the advancement of Communist endeavors."

And just 6 weeks later, the Nazis passed another law (Reichsgesetzblatt, I, 479, July 14, 1933):

"The provisions of the law regarding the confiscation of Communist property of May 26, 1933 (RGBl, I, 293) are applicable to property and rights of the Social Democratic Party and its auxiliary and substitute organizations, as well as to property and rights used or destined for the advancement of Marxist or other endeavors found by the Reich Minister of the Interior to be hostile to the people and state."

Look at the Mundt bill. It's all in there. The Nazis made no distinction between the Communists, Social Democrats, or any other progressives. The Reich Minister of the Interior (Hitler's attorney general) treated them all alike—because they were all common enemies of the Fascists, no matter how much they differed on issues of the day.

Take the employment of progressives in government. The bill would make it impossible for anybody but a reactionary civil-service employee to enforce such laws as social security, rent control, housing and labor acts. Hitler did the same.

On April 7, 1933, the following law was passed (Reichsgesetzblatt, I, 175, April 7, 1933):

"Sec. 1. Civil servants who have been members of the Communist Party or Communist auxiliary and substitute organizations or who have otherwise been active along Communist lines, are to be discharged from Civil Service."

"2. Civil servants who will hereafter be active along Marxist (Communist or Social Democratic) lines are likewise to be discharged."

"Sec. 4-1. Civil servants who by their previous political conduct do not afford assurance that they will at all times identify themselves without reserve with the National State may be discharged from the service."

"Sec. 15. The provisions regarding civil servants are equally applicable to employees and workers."

These are not mere words. They are reality. Two years after his accession to power Hitler enacted the following law (Reichsgesetzblatt, I, 1146, September 15, 1935):

"Sec. II. A citizen of the Reich is only a citizen of German or kindred blood who proves by his conduct that he is willing and able to serve loyally the German people and the Reich."

"3. A citizen of the Reich is exclusively vested with full political rights in accordance with the laws."

The Mundt bill takes away the citizenship of naturalized and native-born citizens whenever the Attorney General deems them disloyal, but if such power is vested by this law, if such a precedent is set, then the next law will soon determine, as they did in Germany, that only persons of a certain race or a certain creed can remain citizens.

The Mundt bill virtually makes the courts the rubber stamp for every decree of the Attorney General. Is this any different from the practices of the Nazis? It is not. On June 28, 1935, the penal code of Germany was amended (Reichsgesetzblatt, I, 839, June 28, 1935) to read as follows:

"Sec. II. A person is punishable who commits an act which the law declares to be punishable, or which deserves punishment in accordance with the fundamental purpose of a penal law and sound popular feeling."

"Sec. 267a. If it appears at the trial that the accused has committed an act which deserves punishment according to sound popular feeling, but which is not declared punishable by law, then the judge must examine whether the fundamental purpose of a penal law covers the act and whether the analogous application of such penal law is required."

Mr. NIXON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. OWENS].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a short remark?

Mr. OWENS. I yield briefly.

Mr. NICHOLSON. The gentleman from Michigan talked about the smart Tories in Boston during Jefferson's time. I wish to tell him something about the history of Massachusetts, there were no Tories in Boston in Jefferson's time; all

the Tories left Boston with the redcoats in 1776.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OWENS. No; I am sorry, my time is limited.

Mr. SADOWSKI. I want to answer the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. OWENS. Not on my time.

Mr. Chairman, I also heard some remarks of the gentleman from Michigan in which he castigated the members of the committee which drafted the Labor-Management Relations Act, commonly known as the Taft-Hartley Act. Let me say with respect to the provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act which required the officers of Communist organizations also to register by filing an affidavit with the Labor Board seemed to have a pretty good effect on the labor movement.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OWENS. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I wish to ask the gentleman from Illinois whether he agrees with the gentleman from Michigan in his conclusion that all of the outstanding labor unions in this country are under the control of foreign governments or foreign governmental or political organizations?

Mr. OWENS. I can hardly be expected to agree with that statement.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield briefly?

Mr. OWENS. I yield.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. But the point the gentleman from Michigan tried to make was that every enemy of labor makes that charge against a labor union when a labor union is engaged in a serious industrial dispute.

Mr. OWENS. Now I will get down to the points I want to make. First, the bill may be said to divide itself into two main parts. The first and most important part seems to be sections 2 and 4. Section 2 sets forth that there is a system of government known as totalitarian dictatorship which exists by means of a single political party, organized on a dictatorial basis, and there is a world Communist movement to establish such a totalitarian dictatorship in all parts of the world.

As I mentioned the other day there are some parts of this bill which I think are good. I despise communism and I do not want to see it grow here in this great country.

After the bill defines "totalitarian dictatorship" and "world communism" it states in section 4 that it shall be unlawful for any person to attempt in any manner to establish such a totalitarian dictatorship, under the subservience of a foreign nation, in this country, and it sets out a penalty for such act. No one can argue with such provision, at least with reason.

The gentleman from California [Mr. HOLFIELD] stated that there must be an intent to facilitate or aid in bringing about the establishment in the United States of such a totalitarian dictatorship, and he criticized "intent." I do not criticize the word "intent." As one who has handled both civil and criminal law for a period of 20 years, I know that a criminal act must be proved beyond a

reasonable doubt, and to a moral certainty; it must be shown that the person charged intended to do the act in question; but you do not show intent by what he was thinking; you merely show the acts he committed and the acts show the intent. This is a criminal statute, and, being such, that matter takes care of itself. It is covered in section 4.

The parts I am concerned with I brought to the attention of the committee. I must say that the committee received my remarks very courteously and has indicated that they are going to accept practically all of the amendments which I suggested, and there are about 12 different amendments that are concerned with other sections. There is a provision there with respect to employment in Government of members of Communist political organizations. Another section with respect to issuance of passports to people when it is shown they are members of such an organization.

In the section on employment on which I want clarification as to knowing or believing or having reasonable grounds for knowing or believing that the organization is a Communist political organization. Then it sets out the fact that he cannot be accepted in a job or position and so forth. Of course, that would be wrong if you were to put in all those words "knowing or believing or having reasonable cause for knowing or believing." The word "knowing" is sound, but the balance of the provision, that is, the words "or believing or having reasonable cause for knowing or believing" should be deleted. Otherwise, a person could not hold a position with the Government, and it would be unlawful for an officer or employee of the United States to employ such individual if they only believed that he was a member of a Communist political organization. That would be too drastic and it would be dangerous for everyone in the country.

The same situation exists with reference to passports. It states that it shall be unlawful for any member of the Communist Party knowing or believing or having reasonable cause for knowing or believing that the organization is a Communist political organization, to make application for a passport. Then it states that it shall be unlawful for any officer or employee of the United States to issue a passport to any individual knowing or believing that such individual is a member of a Communist political organization. If that were permitted to stand no one would be issued a passport because such officer or employee could go on the theory that he believed the person in question was a Communist, and therefore he would not issue it. The word "knowing" would cover the situation very well.

There are several other illustrations in here which I will not try to give at this time. There is one in section 10, and we have another in section 11 with respect to the use of the mails. We have the words in here, "Any publication which is intended to be or which it is reasonable to believe is intended to be circulated or disseminated," and so forth. I say the words "which it is reasonable to believe" should go out and I believe they will go out without question.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OWENS. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Does not the fact that the committee is willing to accept 12 amendments indicate there are 12 reasons for a Member opposing the bill as it is presented to us?

Mr. OWENS. Well, it shows that they have been willing to acknowledge there are errors.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. We have to pass on the bill as it is presented to us by the committee.

Mr. OWENS. The committee indicated its assent, but did not fully agree to all the amendments. I am making my statement in advance, because what I will do at the finish will depend on how many of these amendments will be accepted.

Another thing about which there has been a great deal of talk is the definition of "Communist political organization" and "Communist-front organization" because the definition of those two constitute a Communist organization. Those two are defined to be Communist organizations a little later on.

There are a great number of other terms. It says:

The extent and nature of its activities, the extent to which its policies are formulated and carried out to effectuate the policies of a foreign government, the extent to which it supports the principles of Marx and Lenin—

And so forth; then it says:

It is reasonable to conclude that it is under the control of a foreign government.

I say all of those things should be embodied under one statement because in section 2 it sets forth that such a political organization, that is, a Communist dictatorship, means political organizations which are acknowledged by such communistic dictatorship as being constituent elements of the would-be Communist movement.

I will read the language which I would advocate in defining a Communist organization:

Means any organization in the United States that is a constituent part of the world Communist movement or the establishment of a totalitarian dictatorship in the United States of America defined in section 2 of this act.

As soon as you do that you bring it right within that definition that is given in section 2. There cannot be any more argument against any one of those things than there is against the provisions of section 4, covering the penalty.

I close by saying with respect to the substantial evidence rule, if you use the word "knowing" which I have advocated, once a person is found to have affiliated himself with a Communist organization, and doing it deliberately after knowing it, if there is proof by substantial evidence of that fact, then later he is charged with having failed to register, knowing he was a member of a Communist organization, there is no doubt about the fact of his having known it, then you have intent and if he is convicted he is sent to prison for 2 years for violation of the act.

What I am going to do with respect to my vote depends upon what the committee does in reference to these amendments because I for one do not want to see the civil liberties of the citizens of this Nation infringed in any way. With the exercise of care, a proper and necessary measure can be passed and enacted into law.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. NIXON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KERSTEN].

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, all afternoon and all during the debate we have heard Members of the opposition claim that it would be possible to include labor unions within the provisions of this bill. That charge is absolutely ridiculous. The phrase to which they point is that which refers to Communists who are set forth in the bill as being known to disrupt trade and commerce, and that, therefore, a labor dispute, which may in a measure disrupt trade and commerce, would also include labor unions. Now, I want to point out to the gentlemen who make this argument that other provisions of the bill make it necessary to prove much more than the mere disruption of trade and commerce. Section 4 provides that any person who seeks to set-up a totalitarian dictatorship in the United States shall be included within the provisions of this bill, but this dictatorship must also be shown and proved to be under the control and domination of a foreign government or a foreign organization, and that is not possible with any American labor organization. So much for that.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] in opposing this bill has stated that its measures could be used against every independent political movement making peace an issue. This is clearly an erroneous statement, just as erroneous as is the contention that the bill could be applied to labor unions or any other organization other than a subversive one.

Section 3, subsection 4, excludes any political party from within the definition of "Communist-front organization."

The strange paradox of today is that those forces that are most loudly proclaiming peace are the very ones who are working for war. The Communist world conspiracy is constantly putting out propaganda under the label of peace, while it plots universal class conflict, whether it be an insurrection in Prague or in Bogotá.

I should like to call to the attention of the committee, Mr. Chairman, a recent issue of the official organ of information of the Cominform. It is called *For a Lasting Peace, for a Peoples' Democracy*. This organ is the official thought control for those nations formerly independent and now caught in the Soviet police state net. It is printed in Belgrade. It contains directions for the Governments of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Hungary, Yugoslavia, Finland, Bulgaria, and Albania. It also contains directions for the Communist

Parties in other parts of the world—Italy, France, India, United States, and so forth. It is central intelligence for the world Communist movement. Its headline is "For a lasting peace," but every article in the sheet is filled with a driving hate and urgency to action against any force in the world that will oppose the Marxist-Leninist line, the new gospel for peace.

This is the peace that the gentleman from New York talks about. The peace that comes when all forces of opposition to the Marxist-Leninist line are finally silenced. The peace that follows the earthquake. The peace that broods on a battlefield strewn with the dead. When the gentleman from New York speaks of peace in these Halls of Congress, it is the echo of another voice that spoke from a balcony in Petrograd in 1917 that shouted out to the people that he, Lenin, had returned to Russia to bring them bread and power and peace.

Mr. Chairman, the preamble of this bill is most important. It sets out clearly in legislative finding the web of the Communist world conspiracy. It throws the searchlight on a plot that seeks to hide from the light.

Section 4 of the bill contains the most powerful provisions. It provides heavy penalties for any person who seeks to set up in this country a totalitarian dictatorship under the control of a foreign government. It cuts the nerves of the international body so that the limb that lies in the United States is separated from the brain that lies in Moscow. The leaders of our country for the past 10 years should have known of the world ambitions of the Bolsheviks. In 1938 Stalin wrote publicly to Ivanov in Russia, quoting the words of Lenin with approval, as follows:

We live not only in a state but in a system of states, and the existence of the Soviet Republics next to a number of imperialist states for a long time is unthinkable. In the end either the one or the other will have the better of it. Until that end comes, a series of most terrible conflicts between the Soviet Republics and the bourgeois states is inevitable.

The constitution and rules of the Communist International as published by the Workers Library provide:

The ultimate aim of the Communist International is to replace world capitalist economy by a world system of communism. The dictatorship of the proletariat presupposes the existence in every country of a compact Communist Party hardened in the struggle, disciplined, centralized.

The Soviet blueprint for world control has not remained a theory. But the strange phenomena of our time is that independent states have fallen, not by invasion from without but by international conspiracy from within. And when these nations have fallen, Communist archangels move in to take charge of the government.

Into Yugoslavia went Tito who had served in the Red Army from 1917 to 1921. Into Czechoslovakia went Gottwald who had been trained in Moscow from 1938 to 1945. Into Poland went Bierut who moved in with the Russian Army. Into Bulgaria went Georgi Di-

mitrov, general secretary of the Communist International in Russia until 1943 and a Soviet citizen until 1945. Into Rumania went Anna Pauker, a Soviet citizen from 1930 until the end of the late war. And similarly other archangels are waiting to take over power in other countries. Togliatti, a member of the Comintern in Moscow, did not come to Italy until 1944; in France, Thorez, was Moscow trained until 1944.

And thus the world conspiracy extends itself. It must have direction, it must have brains, it must have central control, it is international and it must have world direction, and that direction is in the hands of the new materialist god who blows golden rings from his pipe toward the sun from a window in the Kremlin.

The President is quoted in the morning papers as being against the outlawing of the Communist Party. This bill does not outlaw the Communist Party as an American political party. The Communist Party is not part of the body politic of the United States. It is a secret organization that seeks to gain power and subject our country to foreign direction, not by political methods, not by free elections, nor by open debates or a recognition of the majority rule and the protection of minority rights, but in every instance where it has gained power it has done so by rigged elections or by coup d'etat, secret orders, a suppression of the majority voice and the annihilation of minorities. This bill makes it possible for the Communist Party to become a political party. It cuts off its foreign control and if it is to have a political policy, that policy must be formulated in the United States. The bill brings the Communists from underground where the people can see them. It puts labels on their propaganda so that the people know what it is. Every American political party operates above ground. It is labeled, and what is most important, it is directed and controlled by Americans in America. If the American section of the Communist conspiracy is cut off from foreign control and forced to come above ground, it will wither and die, not by virtue of any provision in this bill but by virtue of the oxygen in the air of free America where tyranny does not thrive.

During the past few days hundreds of individuals have called on the offices of Congressmen with a message of confusion and distortion to oppose the bill. Some of these individuals are undoubtedly sitting in the galleries. But, gentlemen, beyond the opponents in the galleries are the 140,000,000 people in the United States whose liberties we are sworn to protect. If the precious liberties of our people should ever be lost, it will be by conspiracy from within. A limb of the conspiracy that has caused the fall of other countries in the world lies in the United States. This measure is a sword that separates that limb from the brain that lies abroad. This country could fall from an internal attack but it will never fall from an assault from without though all the powers of hell are hurled against it.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McDOWELL].

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Chairman, referring to the suggestion I made a while ago that a lot of the letters coming in here about this bill were phony, here is a letter from the Episcopal League for Social Action, 412 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich., Tashmoo 5-5010. In the short time we have been in possession of this letter we have checked seven of the long list of names on the left-hand side of the page, and the check reveals 15 full pages of fellow-traveling Communist-front activity. This is an almost perfect example of what is in here opposing the Mundt bill.

Mr. Chairman, the letter to which I have referred and the committee reports on some of those listed as the officers of this organization are as follows:

THE EPISCOPAL LEAGUE
FOR SOCIAL ACTION,
Detroit, Mich., May 12, 1948.
The Honorable ANTON J. JOHNSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. JOHNSON: In behalf of the constituency of this Episcopal church organization, I wish to express our complete opposition to the Mundt-Nixon bill (H. R. 5852). We agree with sundry other patriotic and religious groups, that the passage of such an undemocratic measure would strike at the very heart of our historic democratic freedom.

As church people, we can see how such a measure can seriously jeopardize the fundamental right of freedom of the pulpit and you can be assured that church men and women of all denominations will defend that right to the death.

No man can serve two masters. In this day and age, in America, this seems to say that no man can serve God Almighty and the House Committee on Un-American Activities concurrently.

Trusting that you will do all in your power to defeat this bill, I am,

Sincerely yours,

Rev. WM. B. SPOFFORD, Jr.,
Executive Secretary.

INFORMATION FROM THE FILES OF THE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES, UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
MAY 14, 1948.

For: Hon. ANTON J. JOHNSON.

Subject: Episcopal League for Social Action; president, Edward L. Parsons; vice presidents, Walter Russell Bowie, J. Howard Melish, Mrs. Mary Simkhovitch, Vida D. Scudder, Mary Van Kleeck; and, executive secretary, William B. Spofford, Jr.

No reference is found in files, records, or publications of the committee to the Episcopal League for Social Action, but the following record is found on its officers:

EDWARD L. PARSONS

A folder issued by the American Committee To Save Refugees, and its bulletin, Spot News, page 1, shows that Edward L. Parsons was a sponsor of that organization which has been cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities (see committee report, March 29, 1944).

Edward L. Parsons was also a sponsor of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born, according to an official letterhead of the organization, dated September 11, 1941, and the program of the group's fifth national conference, held in Atlantic City, N. J., March 29-30, 1941. The Daily Worker, October 28, 1940, page 3, listed him as a signer of the Statement for American People, endorsing the campaign for American citizenship and citizenship rights under the sponsorship of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born. The Special Committee on

Un-American Activities cited this organization as a Communist-dominated front in two committee reports, dated June 25, 1942, and March 29, 1944, respectively.

A letterhead of the National Emergency Conference, dated May 19, 1939, reveals that Edward L. Parsons was a sponsor of the conference which has been cited as a Communist front in Report No. 1311 of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, issued March 29, 1944.

Edward L. Parsons has been affiliated with the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee as a national sponsor of the organization's Spanish Refugee Appeal (letterhead, February 26, 1946); as a supporter of the Spanish Refugee Appeal (People's World, November 5, 1947, p. 3); as chairman of the JAFRC's reception for Dr. Edward K. Barsky (People's World, March 1, 1948, p. 5); and as a member of the organization's national reception committee for Mme. Irene Joliot-Curie (invitation to dinner, New York City, March 31, 1948).

The Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee was first cited as a Communist-front organization by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in the March 29, 1944, report of the committee. Dr. Barsky, its chairman, and all members of its executive board have been cited for contempt of Congress, and convicted, because of their refusal to testify to certain questions and to produce records as subpoenaed by the Committee on Un-American Activities in 1946. And the JAFRC was included in the list of subversive organizations compiled by Attorney General Clark and released on December 4, 1947, by the United States Civil Service Commission.

The Daily Worker, March 5, 1946, showed Bishop Edward L. Parsons as a sponsor of the Win-the-Peace Conference held in Washington, D. C., April 5-7, 1946. At this conference the National Committee To Win the Peace was formed—an organization termed subversive by Attorney General Clark. (See press release of the United States Civil Service Commission, December 4, 1947.)

Edward L. Parsons has shown his support of Communist causes in the following instances: He signed a statement to the President of the United States defending the Communist Party (Daily Worker, March 5, 1941, p. 2); he issued a statement in support of the U. S. S. R., which was printed in Soviet Russia Today, October 1941, page 30; he was writer of a letter which appeared in Soviet Russia Today, June 1947, page 3; and he was a sponsor of the National Free Browder Congress as shown in the Daily Worker, March 6, 1942, page 1. Soviet Russia Today, was cited as a Communist-front periodical in two reports of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities (June 25, 1942, and March 29, 1944); and the National Free Browder Congress was one of the organizations urging the release from prison of Earl Browder, general secretary of the Communist Party (cited as a Communist front in Report No. 1311, Special Committee on Un-American Activities, March 29, 1944).

In 1937-38 many so-called relief organizations were formed in support of the Spanish Loyalist cause. Of these organizations, cited as Communist fronts in Report No. 1311 of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, we find Edward L. Parsons affiliated with the following: He was a member of the committee of the medical bureau, American Friends of Spanish Democracy (letterhead, November 18, 1936); and a member of the Committee of the American Friends of Spanish Democracy (letterhead, February 21, 1938). He was a signer of a letter to the President sponsored by American Friends of Spanish Democracy (Daily Worker, February 16, 1938, p. 2), a letter urging the Catholic Church to influence Franco (issued by the organization and appearing in the Daily Worker, March 22, 1938, p. 2), and of the organizations' petition to lift the arms embargo (Daily Worker, April 8, 1938, p. 4). He was a

national sponsor of the Medical Bureau and North American Committee To Aid Spanish Democracy (letterhead July 6, 1938), as well as a sponsor of the Spanish Refugee Relief Campaign (leaflet, Children in Concentration Camps, back cover). The booklet, These Americans Say, page 5, issued by the Coordinating Committee To Lift the Embargo contains a statement by Edward L. Parsons in support of the lifting of the embargo against loyalist Spain.

Edward L. Parsons' name is shown in a leaflet, attached to an undated letterhead of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties as a signer of a message to the House of Representatives which the organization issued in support of one of its policies. He is also listed in the Daily Worker, March 18, 1945, page 3, as a signer of the federation's statement hailing the War Department's order on commissions for Communists. The National Federation for Constitutional Liberties has been cited as a Communist-front organization by both the Special Committee on Un-American Activities (committee reports of June 25, 1942, and March 29, 1944) and by Attorney General Francis Biddle (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, p. 7446).

His signature also appeared on the list of signers of an open letter to the American people which was sponsored by the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, according to the account in the New York Times, May 18, 1943, page 17C. The National Council of American-Soviet Friendship has been cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities (Report of March 29, 1944) and as a subversive organization by Attorney General Clark (press release of United States Civil Service Commission, December 4, 1947).

DR. W. RUSSELL BOWIE

In a booklet entitled "Six Hundred Prominent Americans," W. Russell Bowie is listed as one of those who signed an open letter of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties; he signed a news release of the same organization dated December 26, 1941; identified as being associated with the Union Theological Seminary, the Reverend W. Russell Bowie signed an open letter of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, denouncing United States Attorney General Biddle's charges against Harry Bridges and the Communist Party (see Daily Worker, July 19, 1942, p. 4; and People's World, July 15, 1942, p. 2). He signed a statement of the organization hailing the War Department's order on commissions for Communists, according to the Daily Worker of March 18, 1945 (p. 2); he was identified as being associated with the Union Theological Seminary, New York City, in this last source.

The National Federation for Constitutional Liberties has been cited in two reports of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities. (Rept. No. 2277 of June 25, 1942, and No. 1311 of March 29, 1944). Former Attorney General Biddle found that it was "part of what Lenin called the solar system of organizations, ostensibly having no connection with the Communist Party, by which Communists attempt to create sympathizers and supporters of their program." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, p. 7446), it was also included on a list of "subversive" organizations prepared by Attorney General Clark and furnished for use of the Loyalty Review Board. (Released to the press by the United States Civil Service Commission December 5, 1947.)

W. Russell Bowie was listed in a printed program of the Fifth National Conference of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born, held in Atlantic City, N. J., March 29-30, 1941, as one of the sponsors of that organization. The American Committee for the Protection of Foreign Born has

been cited by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in Report 2277 of June 25, 1942, and in Report 1311 of March 29, 1944. In the latter report the organization was cited as "one of the oldest auxiliaries of the Communist Party in the United States" (p. 155).

According to the Communist publication, the Daily Worker of February 23, 1938 (p. 2), W. Russell Bowie signed a letter of the American League for Peace and Democracy, cited in three reports of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities. (Report 1476 of January 3, 1940; Report 2277 of June 25, 1942; Report 1311 of March 29, 1944.) Attorney General Francis Biddle found that the league "was designed to conceal Communist control, in accordance with the new tactics of the Communist International" having been established in 1937 as successor to the American League Against War and Fascism. (See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sept. 24, 1942, p. 7455.)

W. Russell Bowie signed a telegram to President Roosevelt and Attorney General Jackson in behalf of the International Fur and Leather Workers Union, defendants, sponsored by the New York Conference for Inalienable Rights, as shown in the Daily Worker of September 17, 1940, page 1. The New York Conference for Inalienable Rights was cited by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in Report 1311 of March 29, 1944.

In a booklet entitled, "These Americans Say," (p. 9), W. Russell Bowie is listed as a representative individual who endorsed the Coordinating Committee to Lift the Embargo, cited in Report No. 1311 of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, dated March 29, 1944.

W. Russell Bowie signed an open letter which was sponsored by the National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights, as shown in the Daily Worker of May 13, 1940 (pp. 1, 5). The National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights has been cited in Report No. 1311 of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities.

According to the Daily Worker of July 19, 1942 (p. 4), W. Russell Bowie was one of those who signed the Open Letter on Harry Bridges, cited by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in Report No. 1311, of March 29, 1944.

Both the September 28, 1937, and October 5, 1937, issues of New Masses, a monthly publication of the Communist Party, list Russell Bowie (with no middle initial shown), as one of the sponsors of the North American Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in two separate reports (January 3, 1940, and March 29, 1944), has cited the North American Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy.

The Daily Worker of July 25, 1940 (p. 2, c. 3) revealed that W. Russell Bowie was one of those who signed an open letter of the American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom. The letter contained a five-point program to aid refugees and was sent to the Hon. Cordell Hull, Secretary of State. The American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom has been cited in Report No. 1311 of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, dated March 29, 1944.

MARY K. SIMKHOVITCH

In a pamphlet entitled, "Youngville, U. S. A." (p. 64), Mary K. Simkhovitch is listed as a member of the National Advisory Board of the American Youth Congress. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities has cited the American Youth Congress in two of its reports—one dated June 25, 1942, and the other dated March 29, 1944. Former Attorney General Francis Biddle cited the Congress as a front organization of the Communist Party (in re Harry Bridges, May 28, 1942, p. 10); he found that

the Congress was organized in 1934 and since its inception has been controlled by Communists and manipulated by them to influence the thought of American youth (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sept. 24, 1942, p. 7456). Attorney General Clark included the organization on his list of subversive groups furnished for use of the Loyalty Review Board. (Press release of the U. S. Civil Service Commission, dated December 5, 1947.)

The Special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the Consumers National Federation in Report No. 1311 of March 29, 1944; according to a pamphlet entitled, "The People vs. H. C. L." dated December 1937 (p. 3), Mary K. Simkhovitch is shown as one of the sponsors of the organization.

Mary K. Simkhovitch has contributed to the publication, Soviet Russia Today (see March 1942 issue, p. 11), which has been cited as the "mouthpiece of the Communist Party" by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in its report dated June 25, 1942. It was also cited in the special committee's report of March 29, 1944.

Mary Simkhovitch (with no middle initial shown) is listed as a member of the general committee of the Greater New York Emergency Conference on Inalienable Rights, in a printed program of the conference which was held February 12, 1940. (See fifth paragraph of this memorandum concerning W. Russell Bowie.)

The Daily Worker of January 21, 1938 (p. 2) lists Mary K. Simkhovitch as one of the sponsors, as well as a member of the advisory board of the Descendants of the American Revolution; the Daily Worker of February 13, 1939 (p. 2) lists Mary Kingsbury Simkhovitch as a member of the organization; a pamphlet entitled "Descendants of the American Revolution" (back page), lists Mary Kingsbury Simkhovitch as a member of the advisory board of that organization.

In Report No. 2277 of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities we find that the Descendants of the American Revolution is a Communist-front organization set up as a radical imitation of the Daughters of the American Revolution. "The descendants have uniformly adhered to the line of the Communist Party" (p. 18).

Mary K. Simkhovitch's affiliation with the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship is shown as follows: She signed an open letter to the American people, sponsored by the council, according to the New York Times of May 18, 1943, page 17 C; she signed an open letter to the mayor of Stalingrad, sponsored by the national council, as shown in Soviet Russia Today, June 1943, page 21; she was listed as a sponsor and a member of the committee of women of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, according to the Call to a Conference on Women of the U. S. A. and the U. S. S. R. in the Post-War World, November 18, 1944, at the Hotel Commodore, New York City. She signed greetings to the women of the Soviet Union, under the sponsorship of the national council, according to the Daily Worker of March 9, 1948 (p. 5).

In a report of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities dated March 29, 1944, we find that "in recent months the Communist Party's principal front for all things Russian has been known as the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship." The organization was also cited as subversive on a list furnished by Attorney General Clark for use of the Loyalty Review Board and released to the press by the United States Civil Service Commission December 5, 1947. Richard Morford, director of the organization, was cited for contempt on August 2, 1946, by Congress for refusal to testify and produce records. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date.)

Mary Simkhovitch is shown on a letterhead dated July 6, 1938, as a member of the Social Workers Committee of the Medical

Bureau and North American Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy. She is listed as a sponsor of the organization in the May 18, 1937, issue of New Masses, page 25. (See par. 9 concerning W. Russell Bowie in this memorandum.)

Mary K. Simkhovitch is listed as a sponsor of Social Work Today, in the December 1937 issue, page 2; the June-July 1940 issue of the same publication (p. 2) lists her as co-operator-sponsor. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities has cited Social Work Today as a Communist-front publication in its Report No. 1311 of March 29, 1944.

In the booklet, These Americans Say, (p. 10) published by the Coordinating Committee To Lift the Embargo, Mary K. Simkhovitch is listed as a representative individual endorsing the coordinating committee. (See report on W. Russell Bowie for citation on this organization.)

WILLIAM B. SPOFFORD, JR.

In a pamphlet entitled "Seeing Is Believing," dated 1947 (on the back cover) the name of W. B. Spofford, Jr. appears as a member of the Council on African Affairs, Inc., cited by Attorney General Clark as subversive and included on a list furnished for use of the loyalty review board. (Released to the press by the U. S. Civil Service Commission December 5, 1947.)

A mimeograph list issued by the Congress on Civil Rights, held in Detroit, Mich., April 27-28, 1946, shows the name of Rev. William Spofford, Jr., as a member of the resolutions committee. The Daily Worker of February 28, 1947 (p. 2) lists the Reverend William Spofford (with no middle initial shown) as one of those who signed a statement in defense of Gerhart Eisler, under the auspices of the Civil Rights Congress.

The Civil Rights Congress was "founded at a conference held in Detroit on April 27-28, 1946, effectuating the merger of the International Labor Defense and the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties." The foregoing was quoted from a report on the Civil Rights Congress by the Committee on Un-American Activities, dated November 17, 1947, in which the committee concluded that "the Civil Rights Congress is an organization dedicated not to the broader issues of civil liberties, but specifically to the defense of individual Communists and the Communist Party, that the organization is controlled by individuals who are either members of the Communist Party or openly loyal to it, and that in carrying out its defense aims, the organization has at the same time engaged in a campaign of vilification against the American Government" (p. 19).

The Civil Rights Congress and its affiliated organizations was cited as subversive by Attorney General Clark and included on his list prepared for use of the loyalty review board and released to the press by the United States Civil Service Commission December 5, 1947.

The Worker (the Sunday edition of the Daily Worker for November 9, 1947 (p. 8, c. 3)), revealed that Rev. William Spofford of Middleton, editor of The Witness, was one of those who cooperated with the Communist Party in the civil-rights campaign, by signing a statement sponsored by the American Veterans Committee, the American Civil Liberties Union, the Civil Rights Congress, and others.

On letterheads of March 29, 1939, and September 11, 1939, of the American League for Peace and Democracy, the Reverend William B. Spofford is listed as a member of the executive board of that organization. (See paragraph 4 of this memorandum concerning W. Russell Bowie.)

(NOTE.—Various references appear in the files concerning a William B. Spofford; however, we have only used those whom we can identify as being the Reverend William B. Spofford, Jr., about whom you inquired.)

REV. WILLIAM HOWARD MELISH

The records, files, and publications of the Committee on Un-American Activities reveal the following information concerning the Reverend William Howard Melish:

William Howard Melish was a national sponsor of the Spanish Refugee Appeal of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee, according to a letterhead of that organization dated February 26, 1946. The Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee was cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in the report of March 29, 1944. The officers and members of the executive board of this organization were cited by Congress for contempt for refusing to produce records for the Committee on Un-American Activities. All were tried and convicted of the charge on June 27, 1947. (Washington Star, June 28, 1947, pp. 1 and 6, and the Washington Post, June 28, 1948, pp. 1 and 6).

The Daily Worker of March 15, 1947, page 5, reveals that William Howard Melish was one of the signers of a statement in protest of a ban on the Communist Party.

A letterhead of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, dated February 8, 1946, lists the name of Rev. William Howard Melish as vice chairman, religious committee, affiliated with the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, Inc. Richard Morford, the director of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, was cited by Congress for contempt on August 2, 1946, for his refusal to produce records and testify before the Committee on Un-American Activities, and the organization itself was cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in the report of March 29, 1944.

William Howard Melish is shown as one of the signers of an open letter sponsored by the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties (p. 26 of a booklet, 600 Prominent Americans). This organization was cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in reports of June 25, 1942, and March 29, 1944. Attorney General Francis Biddle described the organization as: "Part of what Lenin called the solar system of organizations, ostensibly having no connections with the Communist Party, by which Communists attempt to create sympathizers and supporters of their program. . . . The defense of Communist leaders such as Sam Darcy and Robert Wood, party secretaries for Pennsylvania and Oklahoma, have been major efforts of the federation." (See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sept. 24, 1942, p. 7458.)

Rev. William H. Melish was one of the signers of a statement released by the American Youth for Democracy, which condemned the revocation of the charter of the Queens College Chapter of the organization (Daily Worker of April 22, 1947, p. 4). The Special Committee on Un-American Activities cited this organization as a Communist front in the report of March 29, 1944, and the following is quoted from report 271, April 17, 1947, of the Committee on Un-American Activities: "The committee calls upon the governors or legislatures of the various States as well as the administrative heads of the various colleges and universities to thoroughly expose the Communist connections of the American Youth for Democracy as well as the inimical objectives of the Communist Party in America." (See report 271, April 17, 1947, Committee on Un-American Activities, p. 18.)

Rev. William Howard Melish, Brooklyn, N. Y., has been affiliated with the Civil Rights Congress as one of the signers of a statement sponsored by that organization defending the Communist Party (Washington Post May 20, 1947, p. 13). In a report by the Committee on Un-American Activities on the Civil Rights Congress dated November 17, 1947, it was stated that: "The Civil Rights Congress has received the support of numerous Communist front organizations and has cooper-

ated with such organizations on frequent occasions." In a program listing of the conference of the Civil Rights Congress of New York, W. H. Melish was shown as vice president of the Congress.

William Howard Melish was listed as a member of the board of trustees of the Jefferson School of Social Science (Spring Catalog, April 14, 1947, and the Summer Catalog, July-August 1947, p. 2). The Special Committee on Un-American Activities in Report 1311, March 29, 1944, cited this school as a Communist front. He was also shown as a member of the board of trustees of the Jefferson School of Social Sciences in its catalog (September-December 1947, p. 1). The Worker, southern edition, of October 12, 1947, page 9, lists Mr. Melish as a lecturer at the school.

William Howard Melish was a signer of an open letter to Gov. Thomas E. Dewey on behalf of Morris U. Schappes, a self-admitted Communist, who was convicted of perjury in the State of New York. The letter was sponsored by the Schappes Defense Committee, which was cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in its report of March 29, 1944. This information was obtained from the New York Times of October 9, 1944, page 2.

The name of Dr. William Howard Melish, Church of the Holy Trinity, Brooklyn, N. Y., appears on a letterhead dated September 11, 1941, on a list of committee members and sponsors of the Citizens' Committee for Harry Bridges, cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in Report No. 1311, March 29, 1944. He was also one of the signers of the Open Letter in Defense of Harry Bridges, cited as a Communist front in the same report of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities. (See Daily Worker, July 19, 1942, p. 4.)

William Howard Melish is shown as a contributor to the magazine Soviet Russia Today, according to the July 1946 issue, page 23. In the letterhead, dated September 8, 1947, he was listed as a member of the advisory council of the Soviet Russia Today. This publication was cited as a Communist front and also cited as a mouthpiece of the Communist Party by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in reports of June 25, 1942, and March 29, 1944.

In the September 26, 1944, issue of New Masses, page 32, William Howard Melish answered a query of the magazine, "What Presidential ticket are you supporting, and why?" Rev. William H. Melish was a contributor to the September 4, 1945, issue of New Masses, page 9; he contributed a book review to the January 28, 1947, issue, page 25; and sponsored a plea for financial support of New Masses, according to a copy of that publication dated April 8, 1947, page 9. New Masses was cited as a Communist periodical by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities and was termed a "Communist publication" by the Committee on Un-American Activities in the report of June 12, 1947, page 10. In addition, Attorney General Francis Biddle has called it a Communist periodical. (See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sept. 24, 1942, p. 7458.)

According to the Worker, January 9, 1944, page 9, William H. Melish endorsed the Daily Worker, official organ of the Communist Party.

Rev. William Howard Melish wrote a letter on Yugoslavia in the Daily Worker (cited as official organ of the Communist Party) on August 22, 1947, page 8, and the completion of the article in the August 23, 1947 (p. 8), edition.

Rev. William Howard Melish wrote a letter in support of Yugoslavia. (New York Times, Sept. 22, 1947, p. 22.)

Rev. William H. Melish spoke on Yugoslavia before the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, United Committee of South Slavic Americans. (People's World, Sept. 17, 1947, p. 8.) The National Council of

American-Soviet Friendship was cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on March 29, 1944.

In the testimony of Walter S. Steele, delivered before the Committee on Un-American Activities on July 21, 1947, under the heading "In the field of newspapers, magazines, and bulletins the Communists, Red fronts, and fellow travelers are well represented," is found the following: "Reporter, a biweekly publication, is published by the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, Inc., 114 East Thirty-second Street, New York, N. Y. The editor is William H. Melish" (pp. 33 and 36). (See citation, p. 1.)

The New York Times of April 2, 1948, published an article in which it was stated that "The outside activities of the Reverend William Howard Melish, associate rector of Holy Trinity Episcopal Church, . . . have been condemned by the church's lay governing body in a letter sent to the parishioners March 15 last. . . . Specific objection was voiced to Mr. Melish's chairmanship of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship and his sponsorship or active support of organizations with similar leanings. . . ." In an article in the April 22, 1948, issue of the same publication, it was reported that "Backed by a congregational referendum, the vestrymen and wardens of Holy Trinity Protestant Episcopal Church . . . issued a statement yesterday repeating their contention that the outside activities of the Reverend William Howard Melish, assistant rector, constituted a threat to the continued progress of the church. The vestrymen's statement was based on a tabulation of replies to a letter sent out on March 15 to 550 church members."

MARY VAN KLEECK

New Masses, January 5, 1937, page 31, shows Mary Van Kleeck as a general committee member of the American Friends of Spanish Democracy, Medical Bureau, one of the so-called Spanish relief organizations cited as a Communist front in Report 1311 of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, March 29, 1944.

She is a sponsor of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, according to a memorandum issued by the council March 18, 1946. This organization has been cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities (report of March 29, 1944), and as subversive by Attorney General Clark (press release of the U. S. Civil Service Commission December 4, 1947). Mary Van Kleeck has also been a speaker on two occasions for the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, at a rally at St. Nicholas Arena November 9, 1947 (Daily Worker, November 3, 1947, p. 5), and at its meeting on Atomic Energy: Opportunity for International Cooperation. (The Worker, June 15, 1947, p. 10.)

In 1935, Mary Van Kleeck signed the call to the National Congress for Unemployment and Social Insurance, according to Unemployment Insurance Review, volume 1, 1935, page 3. This congress was cited as a Communist-front gathering in the March 29, 1944, report of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities. Among the sponsors of this meeting were such well-known Communists as I. Amter, Max Bedacht, Herbert Benjamin, Harry Bridges, Earl Browder, Ben Davis, Jr., William Z. Foster, Ben Gold, and others.

The Daily Worker, March 13, 1934, page 5, revealed that Mary Van Kleeck spoke with Earl Browder, of the Communist Party, at a meeting under the auspices of the New Masses and the John Reed Clubs. New Masses has been cited as a Communist periodical by both the Committee on Un-American Activities and Attorney General Biddle (see Committee Reports of June 25, 1942, and March 29, 1944; and CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sept. 24, 1942, p. 7459). The John Reed

Clubs, named after one of the founders of the United States Communist Party, were cited as Communist-front organizations by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities (report of March 29, 1944).

According to the Daily Worker, April 28, 1948, page 4, Mary Van Kleeck signed a petition in defense of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee which has been cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities (Report of March 29, 1944) and as subversive by Attorney General Clark (press release of the United States Civil Service Commission, Dec. 4, 1947). She also acted as a member of the national reception committee of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee at its dinner for Madame Irene Joliot-Curie (see Invitation to Dinner, New York City, March 31, 1948).

Mary Van Kleeck was a speaker at the convention of the United Office and Professional Workers of America, according to the Daily Worker, March 2, 1948, page 3. This is one of the unions in which the Special Committee on Un-American Activities has found Communist leadership entrenched (see Report No. 1311, March 29, 1944, pp. 18-19).

Letterheads of Soviet Russia Today, dated September 8, 1947, and September 30, 1947, show Mary Van Kleeck as a member of the advisory council of this Communist-front periodical (cited in Report 1311 of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities). The August 1947 issue of the magazine contains an article written by her (p. 7).

Mary Van Kleeck sent greetings to the Soviet women under the auspices of the American Council on Soviet Relations, as revealed in the pamphlet Soviet Women to the Women of the World, page 32. This is still another organization cited as a Communist front in Report No. 1311 of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities.

The Communist Party organ, Daily Worker, has quoted Mary Van Kleeck as defending the Soviet Union (July 20, 1935, pp. 1 and 2); and the Communist, monthly organ of the party, contained a favorable review of one of her books, according to an account in the Daily Worker, July 6, 1936, page 5.

An article, contributed by Mary Van Kleeck, appeared in the Communist-front periodical, Woman Today, as reported in the Daily Worker of March 13, 1936, page 5. (Citation of periodical in Report 1311 of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities.) She also spoke at a meeting under the auspices of Woman Today, where Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, the prominent Communist leader, was a speaker (see Daily Worker, May 12, 1937, p. 9).

VIDA D. SCUDDER

Seaman Scudder was listed as a gunner of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade by the Daily Worker of September 8, 1937, page 5. The Abraham Lincoln Brigade was cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, March 29, 1944.

Vida D. Scudder was a signer of a petition sponsored by the American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom according to a mimeographed sheet attached to a letterhead dated January 17, 1940. The American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom was cited by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on June 25, 1942 and on March 29, 1944, as a Communist front organization.

The Daily Worker of November 23, 1939, page 3, listed Vida D. Scudder as a signer of a letter opposing alien registration sponsored by the American Committee for the Protection of the Foreign Born.

A letterhead of the Fourth Annual Conference, Hotel Annapolis, Washington, D. C., March 23, 1940, listed Vida D. Scudder as a sponsor of this conference of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born.

A letterhead of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born announcing the national conference of the organization listed Professor Vida D. Scudder as a sponsor of that conference which was held in Cleveland, Ohio, October 25 and 26, 1947. The American Committee for the Protection of the Foreign Born was cited as a Communist front organization by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, June 25, 1942 and March 29, 1944.

A folder of the American Committee to Save Refugees listed Vida D. Scudder as a sponsor of that organization. A bulletin Spot News, page 1, listed Vida D. Scudder as a sponsor of the American Committee to Save Refugees. The American Committee to Save Refugees was cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, March 29, 1944.

Professor Vida D. Scudder sent greetings to the Soviet women according to a list sponsored by the American Council on Soviet Relations which appeared in "Soviet Women to the Women of the World," page 31. The American Council on Soviet Relations was cited as a Communist front organization by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in Report 1311, March 29, 1944. Attorney General Francis Biddle cited the organization as being a Communist front. (See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sept. 24, 1942, p. 7459.)

According to the Daily Worker of February 16, 1938, page 2, Vida D. Scudder was a signer of a letter to the President sponsored by the American Friends of Spanish Democracy. The American Friends of Spanish Democracy was cited as a Communist front organization by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, March 29, 1944.

Vida D. Scudder was an endorser of the conference of the American League Against War and Fascism according to the Daily Worker, March 4, 1937, page 2. The American League Against War and Fascism was cited as a Communist-front organization by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities January 3, 1940, and March 29, 1944. Attorney General Francis Biddle cited this organization as being "a Communist-front organization" in re Harry Bridges, May 28, 1942, page 10. Attorney General Biddle also said that the American League Against War and Fascism was "established in the United States in an effort to create public sentiment on behalf of a foreign policy adapted to the interests of the Soviet Union." (See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sept. 24, 1942, p. 7454.)

Vida D. Scudder was a signer of a statement on the international situation issued by the American League for Peace and Democracy according to the New Masses, March 15, 1938, page 19. The American League for Peace and Democracy was cited as "a Communist-front" organization by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, January 3, 1940, June 25, 1942, and March 29, 1944. The American League for Peace and Democracy was established in 1937 as successor to the American League Against War and Fascism. Attorney General Francis Biddle said "the American League for Peace and Democracy . . . was designed to conceal Communist control, in accordance with the new tactics of the Communist International." (See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sept. 24, 1942, p. 7455.) Attorney General Biddle also said that the American League for Peace and Democracy was "established in the United States in an effort to create public sentiment on behalf of a foreign policy adapted to the interests of the Soviet Union." (See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sept. 24, 1942, p. 7454.)

Vida D. Scudder was listed as a member of the Citizens' Committee to Free Earl Browder on a letterhead dated February 11, 1942. The Citizens' Committee to Free Earl

Browder was cited as "a Communist-front organization" by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, March 29, 1944, and by Attorney General Francis Biddle as "a Communist organization." (See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sept. 24, 1942, p. 7458.) Vida Scudder was a signer of a letter to President Roosevelt sponsored by the Citizens' Committee to Free Earl Browder according to the Daily Worker of March 19, 1942, pages 1 and 2.

Vida D. Scudder was a signer of a statement in defense of Gerhart Eisler sponsored by the Civil Rights Congress, according to the Daily Worker of February 28, 1947, page 2.

Vida D. Scudder was a signer of a statement defending the Communist Party sponsored by the Civil Rights Congress according to the Washington Post, May 20, 1947, page 13. In a report on the Civil Rights Congress issued by the Committee on Un-American Activities, September 2, 1947, it was concluded:

"From the facts cited above it should be clear that the Civil Rights Congress is an organization dedicated not to the broader issues of civil liberties, but specifically to the defense of individual Communists and the Communist Party, that the organization is controlled by individuals who are either members of the Communist Party or openly loyal to it, and that in carrying out its defense aims, the organization has at the same time engaged in a campaign of vilification against the American Government" (p. 19).

Prof. Vida D. Scudder was a sponsor and a member of the Committee of Women of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, according to a call to a conference on women of the United States of America and the United Soviet Socialist Republics in the postwar world, November 18, 1944, Hotel Commodore, New York City. The National Council of American-Soviet Friendship was cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, March 29, 1944, and as a subversive organization by Attorney General Clark.

Vida Dutton Scudder was listed as a member of the League of American Writers in the Bulletin of the League of American Writers, page 7. Vida D. Scudder was a signer of a call to the fourth congress, League of American Writers, held June 8-8, 1941, in New York City, according to New Masses, April 22, 1941, page 25. Vida Scudder was listed as a member of the League of American Writers in the Worker of September 22, 1940, page 7. The League of American Writers was cited by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, January 3, 1940, June 25, 1942, and March 29, 1944, by Attorney General Biddle. (See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sept. 24, 1942, p. 7457.)

Vida Scudder was a signer of an open letter sponsored by the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, according to a booklet, 600 Prominent Americans, page 29. Vida D. Scudder was a signer of a message to the House of Representatives sponsored by the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, according to a leaflet attached to an undated letterhead. Vida D. Scudder was a signer of an appeal on behalf of Darcy—a Communist—which was sponsored by the same organization, according to the Daily Worker of December 19, 1940, page 5. The National Federation for Constitutional Liberties was cited by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, June 25, 1942, and March 29, 1944. The organization was also cited by Attorney General Francis Biddle. (See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sept. 24, 1942, p. 7458.)

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK].

Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The statement has been made here about echoing the voice of somebody or other. The statement was made by the gentleman from Wisconsin. I listened to his speech attentively—it does remind me of a certain voice—it reminds me of the voice of the Balillas. The Balillas were the Boy Scout organization of the Fascist Mussolini government.

THE MUNDT BILL

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, in the short time that has elapsed since the Mundt bill was made available to Members of Congress, I have studied it carefully, and I agree wholeheartedly with that minority of my colleagues who have pointed out on this floor that this measure is not aimed at the American Communists alone.

Let me make clear at the outset that I hold no brief for the Communist Party or its program, and if the actions of any members of the Communist Party or of any other group in this country can be shown in a court of law to constitute "a clear and present danger" to our free institutions, I should be the first to insist that decisive action be taken. There are already laws on our statute books for the preservation of the peace and for the punishment of treason.

These laws, written in the framework of the Constitution of the United States, have protected the American system of government for more than 150 years. If a need exists for a tightening-up of these laws, let the need be presented in a straightforward way, and the legislation drawn up along constitutional lines to provide for more effective protective legislation and also give protection to all patriotic Americans, whatever their views on controversial subjects.

The Mundt bill is not the answer. Far from destroying the Communist Party, it would tend to drive it underground into illegal channels, where it would be more difficult to keep track of its activities. But other persons and organizations—labor unions, political groups, associations of minority racial and religious groups—would bear the brunt of this attack on civil liberties.

To make a specific illustration, let us see what could happen to organized labor under the provisions of the Mundt bill.

The Mundt bill gives large corporations and employers at least two powerful weapons with which to fight strikes:

First. The power to arrest strike leaders both in the national and in the local unions and threaten them with fine and imprisonment under section 4.

Second. Power to cause the union to be charged by the Attorney General as a Communist-front or Communist political organization, and to stand trial, not in the courts, but in an administrative hearing without a jury or the legal safeguards of our courts. The Attorney General need not initiate this action himself, since a resolution of either House of Congress would compel him to investigate any union or organization.

The legal basis on which either of these charges would be based would be the similarity of the methods or objections of the person or organization to the methods and objections of the person or organization to the methods and objectives of a vaguely defined world Communist movement. Some of these methods, defined in the Mundt bill, section 2, page 2 of the bill are:

First, disruption of trade and commerce;

Second, inciting of economic, social, and racial strife and conflict;

Third, dissemination of propaganda calculated to undermine established Government and institutions; and

Fourth, corrupting officials of the Government and securing appointment of their agents and sympathizers to offices and positions in the Government.

Labor unions and other groups operating legitimately have been accused for years of just such tactics, and it is easy to see how, in a period of hysteria, legitimate trade-union activities could lead to conviction.

As the CIO has pointed out in a statement by Nathan E. Cowan, CIO legislative director, referring to the Mundt bill, and I quote:

A labor union, engaged in a strike or other form of legitimate labor action to secure its normal objectives, might be branded, in the heat engendered by the dispute, as having either political objectives or goals consonant with those of some foreign political organization.

Such an administrative determination by an irresponsible occupant of the Office of Attorney General, could lead easily to the branding of the organization as subversive within the meaning of this bill. Such action could easily and quickly lead to the crippling of the union's activities and to the blacklisting of its members and officers.

The officers of the union would have three choices:

First. They could admit the charge, thereby pleading guilty, register with the Attorney General, make their membership lists public, and suffer the excommunication reserved for Communist political organizations.

Second. They could refuse to submit to investigation and to open their books to a hostile Attorney General. They would then be cited for contempt, the union would be listed as a Communist political organization, and all the members would have to drop out or be liable for the penalties of the Mundt bill.

COURTS BYPASSED

Third. They could fight the charges, not in the courts, but under the administrative procedure set up in the Mundt bill. Since the officers, records, and membership lists would be subpoenaed by the Attorney General under the rules of this procedure, it would be impossible to conduct a strike once such an investigation was under way.

A hearing before the Attorney General under the Mundt bill would resemble in procedure the familiar hearings before the House Committee on Un-American Activities. Since it would be administrative, there would be no jury, and no requirement of the rules of evidence compulsory in every court. The case would

be investigated, prosecuted, and determined by the same person or his representatives, and the rule of guilt beyond a reasonable doubt, a fundamental of Anglo-Saxon jurisprudence, would not apply.

An appeal within 60 days by the organization to the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia is allowed. Such a review would also be without benefit of a jury, and the organization would not be allowed to introduce additional evidence into the record without court permission.

Long before the 60 days had elapsed for the appeal, the strikers would be effectively beaten. Such is the new due process of law.

My colleagues may accuse me of letting my imagination run wild in presenting this illustration. Let me point out what happened just 3 days ago.

PHILIP MURRAY TARGET

I want to quote here from an editorial entitled, "Speaking of Swashbuckling" which appeared in the early edition of the Washington Daily News, May 12, 1948, in connection with a recent speech by Philip Murray, president of the CIO, before the Amalgamated Clothing Workers convention in Atlantic City:

CIO president Philip Murray is on patriotic ground, we think, when he issues what is described as a "blunt warning to Communist elements" that his organization has no room for groups that oppose the European recovery plan.

We've never doubted Mr. Murray's personal dislike for communism. * * *

Among other things, he charged that the free-enterprise system in this country had been replaced by a form of commercial conspiracy, hijacking, and racketeering.

Here Mr. Murray crosses the danger line. The News goes on:

When Mr. Murray talks about the American system being completely out of balance, he might possibly do well to give a little thought to his own sense of proportion. And, we wonder, does he ever pause to reflect that such recklessly overdrawn swashbuckling against the American system, by the head of a great American labor organization, lends comfort to communism and gives its propagandists just the sort of ammunition they want.

Thus Philip Murray, outstanding and patriotic leader of one of the largest and most respectable labor groups in the Nation, is already singled out as one of the first prospective victims of the Mundt bill. While his patriotism and his dislike of communism are not questioned, he is seen to lend comfort and aid to the Communist movement. For such an accusation, under the loosely worded Mundt bill, Philip Murray would be liable to stand trial, and if convicted, could be fined, imprisoned, and threatened with loss of his American citizenship.

The proponents of this measure say, "Oh, it is impossible for this to happen; organized labor will not be affected at all," as was said in effect a few minutes ago by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KARSTEN], I say it can happen because it has happened. As the late Al Smith used to say, "Let's look at the record." Let us look at the

record—the record of the House Un-American Activities Committee itself—the committee which is sponsoring this legislation before us.

In 1944, the report of the House Committee on Un-American Activities on CIO-PAC charged that organization with the very activities which that committee declares in its Mundt bill to be illegal.

Here is a side-by-side comparison of the Mundt bill defining Communist political organizations and prescribing penalties for certain prohibited acts, and the committee's own statements on CIO-PAC in its 1944 report:

HOW THE MUNDT BILL COULD BE USED AGAINST CIO-PAC

Section 3. "Definitions"—lists characteristics of Communist organizations, among them:

(1) The extent to which its views and policies are the same as those of such foreign organization or foreign government.

(2) The identity of the persons who are active in its management, direction, or supervision, whether or not holding office.

(3) The extent to which it fails to disclose its membership * * * or records other than membership lists.

SECTION 4. CERTAIN PROHIBITED ACTS

It shall be unlawful for any person (1) to attempt in any manner to establish in the United States a totalitarian dictatorship * * * (4) to facilitate or aid in bringing about the establishment in the United States of such a totalitarian dictatorship.

Here you have a specific example of what the effects of this proposal, should it become law, would be on a labor organization. I ask the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KERSTEN] and the other proponents of this measure who have spoken this afternoon, to deny that were this Mundt bill the law in 1944, that Philip Murray, the late Sidney Hillman, and the CIO-PAC would not have faced every penalty described in the bill.

Nor would Philip Murray be the only victim. The leaders of the American Federation of Labor, the railroad

brotherhoods, the American Civil Liberties Union, and many others would be subject to prosecution and penalty.

A member of the Committee on Un-American Activities stated in the hearings of February 1942 that Mr. A. F. Whitney of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen was, and I quote, "tied up with Earl Browder as president of an organization having a Communist front." Had the Mundt bill been a law in the spring of 1946 at the time of the railroad strike, Mr. Whitney's fate is clear.

A "friendly" witness at the committee's hearings last July 1947 charged 40 major unions with being Communist fronts, including steelworkers, AFL hod carriers, rubber workers, and textile workers. On behalf of the committee, the chairman said:

In my 8 years with the committee I have never seen a more complete and more documented statement on this subject. * * * You are to be congratulated. For all of us, I just want to thank you very much.

Run down the list of unions since charged by the Un-American Activities Committee with being Communist-front, Communist-dominated, or Communist-utilized. They cover the whole range of organized labor in the United States—the A. F. of L., CIO, and railroad brotherhoods—farm-equipment workers, auto workers, packinghouse workers, tobacco workers, electrical workers, transport workers, maritime workers, Hollywood studio workers, die-casters, woodworkers, smelter and mine workers.

Now it becomes plain what the authors of the Mundt bill had in mind when they made facilitating the setting up of a totalitarian dictatorship a crime and when they made similarity of views a test of Communist political organization.

The Taft-Hartley Act is the cornerstone and the Mundt bill the capstone of the proposed policy to break the back of the labor movement.

And what I have shown could happen to organized labor could also happen to many other groups.

Soon it may be considered subversive to oppose universal military training or to support a Jewish state in Palestine or world disarmament. There is no limit to the number of the victims of this measure, and in their names I call upon my colleagues to join me in voting down the Mundt bill, which represents a wholesale repudiation of the Constitution of the United States and its Bill of Rights.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman state that it is possible under the furthest stretch of the imagination that any American labor organization would be guilty of subjecting this country to the domination of a foreign power? Does the gentleman think that it is possible that a labor organization would be guilty of subjecting this country to the domination of a foreign power?

Mr. BLATNIK. I say it is possible to use the provisions within this measure, if it becomes law, to destroy the labor movement of America; and I say here that it is my firm conviction that this measure which we have before us today, the Mundt bill, through its negative course of action, will help us lose rather

than help us maintain that which we all want to preserve, a society of free men and women, living together under a democratic, constitutional, free government, under God.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Let the gentleman from Wisconsin read sections 2, 3, and 8 together and then he will have to agree that this does involve labor organizations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. NIXON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to take time, due to the lateness of the hour, to discuss the provisions of the bill. I should like to state that when the bill comes before the House to be read under the 5-minute rule on Tuesday and Wednesday of next week I shall be glad to answer the objections that have been raised today and that may be raised then to the bill.

I do want to say, however, as this debate is concluded that I think that the necessity for this legislation has been clearly established by the very statements made by the opposition to the measure on the floor. Member after Member has expressed the fear that this bill strikes at all progressive organizations, that it would prohibit strikes, smash labor unions, and destroy all liberal groups.

That is exactly the trouble in the country today. There is too much loose talk and confusion on the Communist issue. By passing this bill the Congress of the United States will go on record as to just what is subversive about communism in the United States; not that the economic and social theories of communism are in themselves subversive because they happen to be different from those we believe in but that the Communist movement in the United States is under the control of a foreign Communist dictatorship which seeks to destroy our Government by any means possible.

This legislation, Mr. Chairman, will clear the air; it will allow the country to see what the really subversive aspects of the Communist movement are, and it will once and for all spike many of the loose charges about organizations being Communist fronts because they may happen to advocate some of the same policies which the Communists support. If you will read the definitions carefully and fairly, you will find that no organization is required to register as a Communist organization unless it is established that it is under the control of a foreign Communist government or is controlled by an organization which is under the control of a foreign Communist government. In other words foreign control, directly or indirectly, is the only legitimate basis upon which Communists can or should be classified as subversive and that is exactly what this bill does.

I trust that when the bill comes up for amendment on Tuesday and Wednesday of next week the Members of the House will be able to be on the floor to consider the amendments which may be offered

and the specific provisions of the bill very carefully, and that when the vote is taken there will be an overwhelming majority in favor of this bill. Not because the bill happens to be against communism and this is a political year—I am not going to ask any Member of the House to vote for the bill on that basis—but because there is need for legislation in this country to control Communist activities, because any such legislation which is enacted must be in the best American constitutional tradition and because any legislation which is adopted must be effective in controlling the evil against which it is directed.

I believe that if the Members of the House will measure this bill against those standards they will become convinced that the legislation measures up to those standards. It is only on that basis that I ask the Members of the House to support the legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. If any section of this bill is now read, then pursuant to agreement the Committee rises, does that preclude Members from offering amendments to that section when the Committee resumes its deliberations on this bill?

The CHAIRMAN. The general custom, may the Chair say to the gentleman, is to read the first section.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I realize that. I am inquiring as to amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. Then the Committee rises. Amendments will be in order to the first section.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. To the first section when the Committee resumes its deliberations?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

The Clerk read as follows:

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This act may be cited as the "Subversive Activities Control Act, 1948."

Mr. NIXON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. WADSWORTH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 5852) to combat un-American activities by requiring the registration of Communist-front organizations, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TOLLEFSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

VETERANS' HOMESTEAD BILL

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] may extend her remarks

at this point in the RECORD and include a telegram.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the recently reported veterans' homestead bill which is an amendment to the GI bill of rights is an aid to the veteran on the farm as well as the city dweller. I want to particularly stress the fact that veterans living on farms or in farming communities have distinct advantages under my bill.

A farm veteran can belong to a homestead association and have the same rights, benefits, and privileges as a veteran who lives in the city. In addition, special attention is given to him by channeling funds through the Federal land banks; and the Secretary of Agriculture through the Farmers' Home Administration—\$100,000,000 per year for 5 years is allocated by the bill to the Secretary of Agriculture to provide farm-loan financing.

Such loans of course apply to both the farm and buildings thereon. Funds for farm loans at so low a rate as 4 percent are limited in many farm communities, and many World War II veterans have been unable to find any lender to make them loans. Full use of the Federal land banks is made under the homestead bill, and veterans on the farms will find it much easier to own and operate their own farms.

Mr. Speaker, I have received the following telegram from the national commander of the American Legion:

WASHINGTON, D. C., May 13, 1948.

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
Chairman, House Veterans' Committee,
House of Representatives:

The American Legion congratulates you on successful report on Veterans' Homestead Act, 1948. I trust we will be as successful in securing its passage.

JAMES F. O'NEIL,
National Commander,
The American Legion.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. OWENS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. CURTIS (at the request of Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. KENNEDY (at the request of Mr. DEANE) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. BUCHANAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole and include an article entitled "What Is a Communist? How Can You Spot Him?" by Allan Nevins.

Mr. SADOWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in three instances and include excerpts.

Mr. MULTER (at the request of Mr. MARCANTONIO) was given permission to

extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. HARTLEY (at the request of Mr. AUCHINCLOSS), for 10 days, on account of official business.

THE STRIKE SITUATION

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, I take this time in order to comment upon the statement made earlier in the House by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] with respect to a pending labor dispute in the State of Minnesota. I recognize that it is news when the State of Minnesota has a serious labor disturbance, because in the State of Minnesota we have established an enviable record in this connection. It is not unusual, therefore, to see the gentleman from Michigan take special note of this. We all deplore the fact that violence arises, but I want to assure the gentleman from Michigan that the State of Minnesota will be fully able to deal with the situation. Also, and most important, I want to direct his particular attention to the fact that the State of Minnesota has done an enviable job in connection with labor disputes and a much better job than his own State. In the State of Michigan there were, according to the 1940 census statistics 5,256,000 people, and in the State of Minnesota there were 2,792,000 people. In other words, there are in the State of Michigan not quite twice as many people as there are in the State of Minnesota. But last year Michigan had almost four times as many work stoppages as Minnesota. Michigan had almost eight times as many workers involved in strikes than did the State of Minnesota. They had more than seven times as many man-days lost through idleness, and Michigan's ratio of total strikes in the Nation was seven and four-tenths times the Minnesota percentage ratio.

The comparison between Michigan and Minnesota is also interesting since 1939. Leaving out 1944, which I have been unable to obtain in the short time available, they show that over this period Michigan had, by number, almost 10 times as many work stoppages as Minnesota; over 15 times as many workers involved; almost 14 times as many man-days lost; and Michigan's percentage ratio of total strikes in the Nation was about 10 times larger than the Minnesota percentage ratio.

These facts speak for themselves.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include the statistical data from the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics of work stoppages in the State of Minnesota and in the State of Michigan from 1939 through 1947, with the exception of 1944, which I have been unable to obtain.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACKINNON. The statistical data referred to are as follows:

	Number	Stoppages (workers involved)		Man-days idle (all stoppages)	
		Number	Percent of total	Number	Percent of total
1939:					
Michigan.....	89	130,410	11.2	2,499,115	14.1
Minnesota.....	26	18,742	1.6	107,033	.6
1940:					
Michigan.....	73	25,773	4.5	195,297	2.9
Minnesota.....	25	3,223	.6	99,228	1.5
1941:					
Michigan.....	252	333,571	14.2	1,897,649	8.2
Minnesota.....	47	7,459	.3	98,880	.4
1942:					
Michigan.....	261	114,723	13.7	258,623	6.2
Minnesota.....	26	5,879	.7	65,257	1.6
1943:					
Michigan.....	413	274,531	13.9	592,270	4.4
Minnesota.....	13	666	.1	5,056	.03
1945:					
Michigan.....	478	528,000	15.2	6,143,000	16.2
Minnesota.....	29	10,900	.3	246,000	.6
1946:					
Michigan.....	311	248,000	5.4	10,600,000	9.2
Minnesota.....	55	45,100	1.0	873,000	.8
1947:					
Michigan.....	188	180,000	8.3	2,550,000	7.4
Minnesota.....	50	24,000	1.1	358,000	1.0
Totals and averages:					
Michigan.....	2,065	1,835,008	10.3	24,735,954	19.2
Minnesota.....	271	114,969	.8	1,852,654	.93

¹1943 eliminated because no data for Minnesota.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 1308. An act for the relief of H. C. Biering;

H. R. 4966. An act directing the Secretary of the Interior to sell and lease certain houses, apartments, and lands in Boulder City, Nev.;

H. R. 5669. An act to provide for adjustment of irrigation charges on the Flathead Indian irrigation project, Montana, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6067. An act authorizing the execution of an amendatory repayment contract with the Northport irrigation district, and for other purposes.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had adopted the following resolution (S. Res. 235):

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of Hon. JOHN H. OVERTON, late a Senator from the State of Louisiana.

Resolved, That a committee of 23 Senators be appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate to take order for superintending the funeral of the deceased Senator.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the Senate do now take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

THE LATE SENATOR JOHN H. OVERTON

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, it becomes my sad duty to announce to the House of Representatives the death of the senior Senator from Louisiana the Honorable JOHN H. OVERTON. Senator OVERTON passed away this morning at the Naval Hospital. He was born and reared in the Eighth Congressional District of Louisiana at Marksville, in Avoyelles Parish, and spent his entire life there and at Alexandria, La. He was elected to the House of Representatives on May 12, 1931, to fill an unexpired term and was reelected for the succeeding term. He was elected to the United States Senate on November 8, 1932, and has served in the Senate continuously since.

A member of the Louisiana delegation, our own friend and colleague, Representative OVERTON BROOKS, is a nephew of Senator OVERTON and is not in the House today because he is with Mrs. Overton and the family to comfort and to help them.

Senator OVERTON was an outstanding lawyer in the State of Louisiana and had a long and distinguished legal career. He was a great constitutional lawyer. In addition to being a master of the English language, he was a ready speaker in the French language.

Senator OVERTON, while being a great lawyer, was also active in community and State matters and contributed greatly to public moves for the betterment and welfare of his State and Nation.

Mr. Speaker, after Senator OVERTON came to the Congress of the United States, he gave himself unstintingly and unselfishly to the solution of State, National, and international problems almost to the hour of his death. Louisiana being greatly interested in the cause of flood control, Senator OVERTON was assigned to the Flood Control Committee of the House when he first entered Congress, and throughout his long career has made a contribution to this great cause not surpassed by any other man in Congress. He had broad knowledge of the subject as it concerned every section of the Nation and he endeavored to bring to all sections of the Nation the greatest measure of protection from floods.

I know also, Mr. Speaker, that Senator OVERTON was greatly interested in our national defense program before, during, and since the last World War and his contribution to the cause of national defense has been outstanding. I do not have the time to detail the many other phases of legislation in which he was greatly interested.

In reflecting upon the life and work of this distinguished son of Louisiana, I am prompted to say here that one of the outstanding characteristics of Senator JOHN H. OVERTON was that he had the courage of his convictions. I have noted that fact throughout the years as I have seen him take positions on great national and international issues in the Senate. He was a man possessed of strong convictions.

Mr. Speaker, today the State of Louisiana mourns the passing of one of her most distinguished sons. Today the State of Louisiana has sustained a great loss. The mantle has fallen from the shoulders of a great citizen and an able Senator whose life and work will live on. We of the Louisiana delegation will miss him. The people will miss him. His fine judgment and his great ability undoubtedly will be missed in the Senate of the United States. Mr. Speaker, I personally feel a great loss in the passing of Senator OVERTON. He was my constituent and friend and I was his friend. I extend to Mrs. Overton and all the family my deep personal sympathy, and I pray that God will bless them and sustain them in this tragic hour.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DOMENGEAUX].

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Mr. Speaker, I was aware, of course, that Senator OVERTON was a very sick man, but his death early today came as a shock to me. Only yesterday evening I had been at the hospital, where members of his family felt much encouraged over his condition. He appeared to be gaining strength, and I was most hopeful that, despite the handicap of advancing age, he would be able to win this battle just as he had won so many in his long years in public life, working for the best interests of the Nation and of his beloved State of Louisiana. It was not to be.

Senator OVERTON was one of my dearest friends. I admired him greatly, and I appreciated and respected his counsel. He was always cooperative, helpful, and kind. His energy and ability were inspirational, particularly to us younger Members of Congress. Time did not diminish his enthusiasm and his interest in matters pertaining to the welfare of his fellow men. His understanding and his personality drew to him his great circle of friends who loved and respected him.

Senator OVERTON was recognized for his capable leadership, his soundness of judgment, and his ability as a forceful speaker. He possessed the faculty of presenting a subject in a convincing manner, with practical, clear argumentation. He enjoyed a pleasant sense of humor, which he employed on many occasions to the delight of his listeners.

While he had many achievements to his credit, Senator OVERTON was perhaps best known for his outstanding work in behalf of flood control. He was a leader in that field, and the results that he accomplished for Louisiana and the lower Mississippi Valley in that connection are well known. He was thoroughly familiar with all waterway matters. Louisiana, which is so dependent upon flood-control measures for the safety and prosperity of her citizens, can feel most fortunate in having had Senator OVERTON's services.

In Senator OVERTON's death the South has lost a valiant champion who was always prepared to defend, in a most vigorous manner, any attacks upon Southern principles and ideas. Frequently his voice was raised in Congress in opposition to those who would destroy States' rights

for which the South stands and upon which the South was founded.

Louisiana had high confidence in Senator OVERTON as is demonstrated by his reelection on two occasions since he was first elected to the Senate in 1932. Prior to 16 years of faithful, devoted attention to his duties in the Senate he had served in the House of Representatives from the Eighth Congressional District of Louisiana.

Senator OVERTON was a member of a number of professional, fraternal, and civic organizations. He was a man who greatly enjoyed his friendships and his associations. He liked to be with other people, to exchange ideas and to feel the public pulse on public matters. He was sympathetic to the needs of others and he was democratic in his views and in his actions. He was a real American.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LARCADE].

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, Louisiana has lost one of its most beloved citizens and a brilliant statesman. The Mississippi Valley and the Nation have lost one of its most valued workers and friends.

The Senate of the United States has lost one of its most able and lovable characters.

Mr. Speaker, I have lost one of my dear friends—Senator JOHN H. OVERTON. The ancient Arabs had a saying that "Death is a camel that kneels before every man's tent," and so in the midst of the battle of life comes death, the implacable foe of person, time, or place. Ever walking by our side, it cannot be avoided and none can escape it. Its sway is universal and the hour of its coming is uncertain. In joy or sorrow it finds us out and we must follow at the summons. Even as our departed friend was called, to us shall come perhaps without warning the Grim Messenger who shall dash the cup of life all fraught with love and success from our lips and we shall stand as strangers at the gates of eternity.

What will our earthly life, our lofty hopes, our success or failure matter to us at that time?

How paltry and insignificant our own individuality, and how small will seem the part we played in the drama of the universe?

There we shall stand in the presence of the Everlasting Judge, and human imagination shall not take us a step farther, dare not enter that presence for between us and the soul of departed friends there is a veil which we cannot penetrate, and its secret will not be revealed to us until we, too, pass behind it from the light which is darkness to the full light of perfect knowledge.

Although Senator OVERTON was much older than I, due to our association for many years in public life, and especially in matters having to do with flood-control and rivers and harbors matters, it had been my happy privilege to become a dear and staunch friend of Senator OVERTON, and more because of our disparity in age, I was honored and flattered to have enjoyed the friendship of such a distinguished and lovable man. That

friendship of long years' standing was to my advantage since I have been a Member of the House of Representatives, as all of you well know, Senator OVERTON was always solicitous about me and my work in the Congress and was most helpful to me in my work and contributed greatly to my success and accomplishments in behalf of my district and our State.

There is no friend like an old friend
Who has shared our morning days;
No greeting like his welcome,
No homage like his praise.
Fame is the scentless sunflower
With gaudy crown of gold,
But friendship is the breathing rose
With Sweets in every fold.

Mr. Speaker, my words are inadequate to pay tribute to this great statesman that the State of Louisiana was so proud to claim, but I do know that Senator OVERTON experienced great joy and satisfaction resulting from the real friendships that he had formed during his years, and especially the friendships made during his service in the Senate with all of his colleagues.

In this greatest of deliberative bodies, neither invective, sarcasm, nor partisanship can sever the bonds of real friendship.

Senator OVERTON was one of the most highly respected Members of the Senate and had the admiration of his colleagues for his great knowledge and ability, and his integrity and espousal of high principles was an inspiration so necessary in a national legislative body.

Senator OVERTON literally gave his life to the public service. At the end of World War II, due to his health, Senator OVERTON desired to retire from the arduous duties which are incumbent upon a Senator as active as he was, but as the champion of flood control and rivers and harbors development in the Senate, and due to his great experience and accomplishments in the Congress in that field, it was only at the insistence of the great majority of the people of the State of Louisiana and upon the demand of thousands of his friends in the Mississippi Valley that Senator OVERTON reluctantly decided to continue to serve in the Senate. Mr. Speaker, as I stated in my opening remarks, not only the State of Louisiana and the Mississippi Valley, but the entire Nation will suffer in the loss of their friend and defender of flood control and rivers and harbors legislation in the Congress of the United States, and his wise counsel and indomitable spirit will be missed by his colleagues in the carrying on of this most important problem which means so much to our State and Nation.

In this connection, I am reminded of a passage from a poem by Ralph Waldo Emerson, and he must have had a man such as Senator OVERTON in mind when he wrote:

What builds the Nation's pillars high
And its foundations strong?
What makes it mighty to defy
The foes that round it throng?
Not gold, but only men can make
A people great and strong;
Men who, for truth and honor's sake,
Stand fast and suffer long.

Brave men who work while others sleep,
Who dare while others fly;
They build a nation's pillars deep
And lift them to the sky.

I remember the Biblical quotation, "Greater love hath no man than he that layeth down his life for a friend," but I may well say that Senator OVERTON gave his life for his country in building the pillars of flood control and rivers and harbors in his State and the Nation.

Senator OVERTON was a man of high character and honor, and among his many attributes was that of tolerance and kindness that drew to him so many friends and admirers.

Reared in an atmosphere of culture and refinement, possessed of the world's goods as measured in a material sense, he lived a simple life, and he was devoted to his splendid family and his host of personal friends.

Senator OVERTON had a very high conception of the importance, responsibility, dignity, and independence of the position of a Senator of the United States. As I have said, he was personally the most unassuming and unostentatious of men, he jealously guarded the prerogatives of his position as Senator against any encroachment or attempted encroachment by any citizen or by any official whether of high or of low degree. I know of occasions when he administered stinging rebukes to persons who sought to enlist his support for measures or for courses of action on grounds of favor or on any other ground apart from the merits.

Indeed, independence and courage were two of his outstanding virtues. Having made few, if any, promises—except that he would do the best he could for his State and for the Nation as a whole—he was not embarrassed, as are some elected officials, and his independence was not restricted by any improvidently given preelection pledges or assurances. As for moral courage, he had always been plentifully endowed with that virtue.

Lives of great men all remind us
We can make our lives sublime,
And departing, leave behind us
Footprints on the sands of time.

Senator OVERTON had a brilliant mind and even at his advanced age his mind was clear as a bell and even recently he reveled in quoting poems and poetry, so I quote a poem written by an anonymous author which, I feel, could well be intended for him:

A good man never dies;
In worthy deeds and prayer,
In helpful hands and honest eyes,
If smiles and tears be there;
Who lives for you and me
Lives for the world he tries to help;
He lives eternally.
A good man never dies.

The good and deeds of Senator OVERTON will never die.

The passing of Senator OVERTON is a distinct loss to Louisiana and the Nation, and is a personal loss to me.

I know that there is nothing that I can say that will assuage the grief of his wife and family, but I sincerely extend my heartfelt sympathy and condolence to them in their great loss and

in this hour of sorrow, with the hope that God may add His blessing to these readings from His holy word.

Death is only an old door,
Set in a garden wall.
On quiet hinges, it gives at dusk
When the thrushes call.
Along the lintel are green leaves,
Beyond, the light lies still.
Very willing and weary feet
Go over that sill.
There is nothing to trouble any heart,
Nothing to hurt at all.
Death is only an old door
In a garden wall.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON].

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the passing of one of Louisiana's most able and distinguished officials. His work on flood control and for rivers and harbors will live on for years in our Nation's history.

While in the course of Louisiana's turbulent politics we have differed on some occasions in the past, they arose from political alignments rather than from the heart. I shall always pay tribute to and admire Senator OVERTON's outstanding accomplishments, for both our beloved State and Nation.

It is with sincere regret that due to previous engagements which I am unable to change, that I will be unable to attend the funeral in Louisiana. To Mrs. OVERTON, to his daughters, to his many friends go my profound and deepest sympathy.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS].

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, it was approximately 8 years ago when I first came to the House of Representatives. From the moment of my arrival here the office of my senior Senator from Louisiana was open to me, and his counsel, his friendly, almost fatherly advice, was mine for the asking. There soon grew within me a friendship and affection and a love for JOHN H. OVERTON which became stronger and dearer with time. I shall miss him always.

My State has lost a peerless leader. The Nation has lost one of its great statesmen, and I have lost a priceless possession—a friend.

My colleagues have told you of his life and achievements. Those achievements shall long survive him because through him the grave threat of the Mississippi River and its tributaries has been removed from the minds of my fellow citizens.

When JOHN H. OVERTON first came to the House of Representatives, and later to the United States Senate, the development of my State was being retarded and held back in agriculture, in business, and in industry because of recurrent, expensive, devastating floods from the Mississippi River and its tributaries.

While never neglecting the over-all requirements of the office of a United States Senator, he plunged into the problem of flood control and because of his work the great Federal flood and conservation program was brought into being. In this work he was never sectional nor partisan. He gave of his time with equal generosity

to the people suffering from devastating floods, whether they occurred in the Mississippi Valley, in the East or in the West, and all of you who live within areas subject to overflowing owe a debt of everlasting gratitude to my senior Senator.

In his last days Senator OVERTON showed the same courage and fortitude and determination which characterized his whole life. He was at his desk in the United States Senate until about 10 days ago. He was rushed to the Bethesda Hospital for an emergency operation, and since Saturday of last week he has lingered at death's door. Time and time again during the past few days he has denied the call of death, but finally early this morning he went to meet our Maker.

To Mrs. OVERTON, his devoted lady, Mrs. Boggs and I extend our deepest sympathy. To his daughters, three charming, delightful girls, devoted in their love for their father, we extend our love and admiration.

My colleague, Representative OVERTON BROOKS of the Fourth Louisiana District, is not present now because Senator OVERTON was his uncle, and he, of course, is with the family. To my colleague, I also extend my sympathy and profound regret.

Senator OVERTON was forceful in debate, steadfast in his devotion to principles, loyal to his friends, and forgiving to his opponents. He possessed a warm, friendly, cheerful disposition. He was devoted to his family and they to him.

In closing, I extend to the family my gratitude for the help, for the counsel, for the guidance which Senator OVERTON so freely gave to me.

I extend the gratitude and sympathy of the people of the great city of New Orleans and of the Second Congressional District of Louisiana. I pray that our Divine Saviour will grant him peace and everlasting joy.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN].

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, our hearts are saddened, as are the hearts of all Louisianians, by the death of our beloved senior Senator JOHN H. OVERTON. We mourn that so great a man as Senator OVERTON has been taken from us, but since it was the will of the Supreme Architect of the universe that this great man be taken away, our greatest consolation is to know that the world is a better and a happier place in which to live because of the Senator having lived in it.

Those of us who have labored with Senator OVERTON and knew him best can praise him most because we recognized his great ability and respected and appreciated his advice and able counsel. The Senator was a brilliant man and his knowledge of our Nation's problems not only endeared him to his fellow Louisianians but to countless Americans throughout our Nation. For many years the Senator championed the cause of adequate drainage and flood control, and his efforts in this field of endeavor have been so great, along with his many other outstanding accomplishments, that he is recognized as one of the Nation's foremost statesmen and leaders.

The Senator was my personal friend, and any measure of success that I have attained as a Member of Congress is in good part due to Senator OVERTON's willingness to advise me often and wisely on the many problems that have confronted me as a Congressman. On many occasions he told me that the facilities of his office were at my disposal when, in my wisdom, such service would enhance the value of my services to my district, my State, and our Nation.

Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, even though our beloved Senator has been called to the Great Beyond, we will always cherish his memory here and improve our services to mankind by following the many fine examples set by this great servant of the people.

To Mrs. OVERTON and the family I extend my heartfelt sympathy and pray that God, through his loving kindness, may sustain them and console them in their hour of great bereavement.

Almighty Father, in Thy hands we leave with humble submission the soul of our departed friend and Senator.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON].

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, Senator JOHN H. OVERTON was born at Marksville, La., September 17, 1875, and died in the city of Washington May 14, 1948. He received his academic degree at the Louisiana State University and his law degree at Tulane University.

Following his graduation, he located at Alexandria and was engaged in the practice of law until his election to the House of Representatives for an unexpired term on May 12, 1931.

Possessed of unusual native ability, and with a keen mind, he attained high rank in the legal profession. For many years he had a large and lucrative practice.

On November 8, 1932, he was elected to the United States Senate, and was re-elected in 1938 and again in 1944.

From the first, Senator OVERTON devoted himself to mastering problems of flood control and rivers and harbors. He was universally regarded as the leading authority on these subjects in the Senate of the United States. While broadly and liberally informed, he concentrated his work in the Senate by familiarity with all public questions and by mastering the paramount public questions and problems of the State of Louisiana under the jurisdiction of the committees of which he was a member.

No State in the Union is more interested in the improvement of rivers and harbors and in the production of sugar than Louisiana. In practice Senator OVERTON early realized what all Members of Congress know, that it is impossible for a Member to master the details of all public questions and public problems. His career was unique because he was the master of the two important problems that engaged the attention both of his State and of his country during his service in the Congress. While interested in the improvement of the natural resources of his own State, he realized that other States had comparable problems and that Federal assistance would not be extended to Louisiana unless com-

parable legislation were enacted for other States. He devoted himself, therefore, to the study of the problems of all the rivers in all the river basins of the country, and to the needs and requirements of the principal harbors of the United States. He recognized that there was need for water in the arid West. He devoted much time to the consideration of the problems of reclamation, for he felt that it was almost as important for cultivation to put water on lands as it was to keep water off of lands. He also knew that Louisiana, for the promotion of the sugar industry, could not obtain protection or assistance at the hands of the Federal Government unless the sugar interests of other States were accorded comparable relief. No man knew more about sugar production and the details of sugar legislation than Senator Overton. I would do injustice to his memory if I left the impression that his efforts were confined to rivers and harbors and to sugar production.

For years he was in charge of the appropriations for the District of Columbia. He became thoroughly acquainted with the problems and with the needs of the District. No Senator ever served the District more acceptably. He insisted that the United States assume the just burden required in the operation of the affairs of the District of Columbia. For years he was known as the champion of the District.

During World War II, as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, he was a supporter of a big Navy and of adequate appropriations for the enlargement of the Navy and its maintenance. New Orleans is the second largest port in the Nation. Senator Overton not only insisted upon adequate appropriations for the Navy, but he championed the expansion and the operation of the merchant marine in peace, and especially in World War II. He was therefore not only a master of the improvement of rivers, but of the expansion of the merchant marine in the growth of commerce and in defense of the country.

Senator JOHN H. OVERTON, when he came to Congress, had succeeded in his profession and acquired a good estate. He was independent as he was courageous in the discharge of his official duties. He had the courage of his convictions. With him, the merit rather than the popularity of the proposal was controlling.

Senator OVERTON was possessed of a delightful personality. He had the faculty of cooperation. He was tolerant of the views of others. He was considerate of both sides of all public questions. I know of no member of any committee who was more industrious or patient. He attended all the hearings involving rivers and harbors and flood control during his service in the Senate.

Louisiana and Mississippi are neighboring States. We have many public problems in common. The political leaders of one State are fairly well known, at least by reputation, in the other State. All of the States bordering the Lower Mississippi River have common flood problems. No Senator or Representative of the Mississippi Valley has ever been more effective in promoting flood

control and river and harbor improvements than Senator JOHN H. OVERTON. His passing is a distinct loss to the people of Louisiana and a great loss to the country. No Senator or Representative in all the history of Louisiana ever contributed as much to the improvement of rivers and harbors of that State as Senator OVERTON.

Senator OVERTON, while not chairman of the Committee on Commerce, now the Committee on Public Works in the Senate, was the acknowledged leader in flood control. He was in charge of flood control and river and harbor legislation from the day that he entered the Senate. I was a member of the Flood Control Committee when Senator OVERTON came to the House and was assigned to that committee. I came to regard him and esteem him for his ability and for his devotion to the cause of flood control. It fell to my lot to pilot through the House of Representatives all of the general flood-control legislation now on the statute books. He was in charge of the legislation on the floor of the Senate.

Together Senator OVERTON and I have worked for the improvement of the rivers not only of our respective States, but of the entire country. As the years come and go, his services will be more and more appreciated. No one will miss him more than I.

I extend to his gracious wife and his devoted daughters my sincerest sympathy. I count them, as I counted him, among my best friends.

Mississippi joins with Louisiana in mourning the passing of one of the outstanding statesmen of our day. Mississippi gladly joins Louisiana in paying tribute to his memory and to his services to his State and country.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DEANE].

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, it was not my privilege to know personally the beloved Senator from Louisiana, but during the first session of this Congress I had the opportunity to read many hearings bearing upon flood control, and as I read those hearings I realized that it was perhaps because of the sincere interest of this great man, to whom we pause at the close of this day to pay honor, that a great flood-control project in North Carolina in which I am vitally interested was initiated. May I say to my colleagues from Louisiana that some years ago it was my pleasure to visit your great State, and I saw there many projects that I am quite sure reached accomplishment through the efforts of this great man. I echo the sentiments expressed by the gentleman from Mississippi. My State of North Carolina, too, shares in your great loss.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 596).

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. JOHN H. OVERTON, a Senator of the United States from the State of Louisiana.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased Senator.

Resolved, That a committee of eight Members be appointed on the part of the House

to join the committee appointed on the part of the Senate to attend the funeral.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as members of the funeral committee Messrs. ALLEN of Louisiana, BROOKS, HÉBERT, DOMENGEAUX, LARCADE, MORRISON, BOGGS of Louisiana, and PASSMAN.

The Clerk will report the further resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the House do now adjourn.

The resolution was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 27 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, May 17, 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:

1553. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, Department of the Interior, transmitting one copy each of legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John and the Municipal Council of St. Croix; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1554. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the fiscal years 1948 and 1949 and prior fiscal years in the amount of \$101,511,535.74 and contract authorizations in the amount of \$25,813,000, together with certain proposed provisions and increases in limitations pertaining to existing appropriations (H. Doc. No. 653); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1555. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting proposed transfer of five picket boats to the Coast Guard Auxiliary Flotilla 22 Foundation by the Navy Department; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1556. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of State, transmitting a proposed bill for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Foreign Service of the United States who, while on the course of their respective duties, suffered losses of personal property by reason of war conditions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

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. WOLVERTON: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 5475. A bill to aid in preventing shortages of petroleum and petroleum products in the United States by promoting the production of synthetic liquid fuels; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1959). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 6564. A bill to credit, in certain cases, military service and training preparatory thereto performed by employees of the postal

service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROSS:

H. R. 6565. A bill to amend the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, to provide preference to certain widows of veterans in the purchase of surplus property; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H. R. 6566. A bill to amend section 101 of the National Security Act of 1947; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. R. 6567. A bill to remove subsidy on exported cotton; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. R. 6568. A bill to authorize the appointment of three additional judges for the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 6569. A bill to amend the Veterans Regulations to provide increased rates of compensation for certain veterans with specific service-incurred disabilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WOLCOTT:

H. R. 6570. A bill to provide for the conversion of national banking associations into and their merger or consolidation with State banks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 6571. A bill to continue for a temporary period certain powers, authority, and discretion conferred on the President by the Second Decontrol Act of 1947; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BEALL:

H. R. 6572. A bill to authorize the granting of Federal aid with respect to the construction of toll bridges, highways, and tunnels; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HOPE:

H. R. 6573. A bill to amend section 8 (b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SCOBLOCK:

H. R. 6574. A bill granting income-tax exemptions for certain blood relatives supported by the taxpayer and for certain dependents under the age of 18 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 6575. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 6576. A bill to amend the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 6577. A bill to establish a Fish and Wildlife Commission as an independent Government agency; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MACKINNON (by request):

H. R. 6578. A bill to provide for the payment of Federal unemployment taxes into the Federal unemployment account to be available for the administration of unemployment-compensation laws and public employment offices, and to return to the States the excess of such taxes over such administrative expenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROHRBOUGH:

H. R. 6579. A bill providing for the construction of a Federal building at Mount Hope, W. Va.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JONES of Washington:

H. J. Res. 403. Joint resolution to authorize the cancellation and release and satisfaction of an agreement dated December 31, 1923, entered into between the port of Seattle and the United States of America, represented by the United States Shipping Board

acting through the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. Res. 595. Resolution to direct the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to recommend a national fuel policy; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. COLMER:

H. R. 6580. A bill to authorize Joe Graham Post, No. 119, American Legion, upon certain conditions, to lease the lands conveyed to it by the act of June 15, 1933; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JACKSON of Washington:

H. R. 6581. A bill for the relief of Andrew L. Johnson and Charles W. Gunstone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 6582. A bill for the relief of Hedwig Pospischil; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MUNDT:

H. R. 6583. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to John Grey Owl; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. POAGE:

H. R. 6584. A bill for the relief of Mr. Sam Patterson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. R. 6585. A bill for the relief of August Michela, infant; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H. R. 6586. A bill for the relief of Karin Sofia Back; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

1928. By Mr. BLOOM: Petition of members of the Provisional Committee for Democratic Rights, New York City, addressed to Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., Speaker, and Hon. SAM RAYBURN, minority leader to urge them to exert their influence to defeat the House Un-American Activities Committee's proposed legislation titled "The Subversive Activities Control Act"; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

1929. By Mr. CASE of South Dakota: Petition of Mrs. Carl Ottman and 21 others, of Hot Springs, S. Dak., urging enactment of a program of universal military training as recommended by the President's Advisory Committee on Universal Training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1930. By Mr. REED of Illinois: Petition of Leslie J. Funk, Elgin, Ill., consisting of 41 signatures, in support of H. R. 5213; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1931. By the SPEAKER: Petition of William A. Bloom 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.

1932. Also, petition of Mrs. Cvinar and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to defeat of legislation titled "The Subversive Activities Control Act"; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

1933. Also, petition of Barbara Minoff and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to defeat of legislation titled "The Subversive Activities Control Act"; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

1934. Also, petition of Iwing Sosonsky and others, petitioning consideration of their res-

olution with reference to defeat of legislation titled "The Subversive Activities Control Act"; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

1935. Also, petition of Allan K. Millman and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to defeat of the Mundt-Nixon bill, H. R. 5852; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

1936. Also, petition of Ruth Turoff and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to defeat of legislation titled "The Subversive Activities Control Act"; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

1937. Also, petition of Jack Safer and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to defeat of legislation titled "The Subversive Activities Control Act"; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

1938. Also, petition of S. Schaeffer and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to defeat of legislation titled "The Subversive Activities Control Act"; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

SENATE

MONDAY, MAY 17, 1948

(Legislative day of Monday, May 10, 1948)

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

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

O God, at this moment the Senators and the Representatives of the people of this Nation humbly implore Thy help and guidance. Make it a sacred moment, a moment when men are aware of their need of God, a moment when answers come and guidance is given. Often we pray for that which is already ours, neglected and unused. Sometimes we pray for that which can never be ours and sometimes for that which we must do for ourselves.

How many times we never pray at all, and then work ourselves to death to earn something that is ours for the asking.

Help us to understand that faith without works is dead and works without faith can never live. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILLS

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 May 14, 1948, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 1142. An act for the relief of Anna Pechnik;

S. 1620. An act to establish eligibility for burial in national cemeteries, and for other purposes; and

S. 1985. An act to amend the act entitled "Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act," approved July 19, 1940.